

Introduction

Our nation has been blessed materially. Our fertile fields, our lakes and rivers and our climate are all beneficial for our production of wealth. We are the largest exporters of food in the world. In addition, we have large deposits of coal, of natural gas and oil as well as being able to generate energy from our streams.

We also in our past registered more patents and invented more devices than anyone else. We produce over 30% of the world's products and have the biggest economy in the world in spite of only having 6% of the world's population.

However, our management of our resources leaves much to be desired. Even though we were first in the development of nuclear energy we are now far behind other developed nations. We are so burdened with rules and regulations that the obstructions to build cause us to take much more time than any others. China is presently building four nuclear power plants using American and French companies to do the construction and their plans are that a plant will be built in four years. In our country if the same construction companies were used it would take ten years. We have not built a nuclear power plant in the last thirty years and even though restrictions are supposedly being lessened there is still nothing under construction.

There have been no oil refineries built in the last thirty years and our productive capacity has decreased while our consumption has increased. We now import 60% of our requirements and thereby allow a cartel to establish prices and determine production. And, the price established has no relationship to the costs of mining, refining and distributing the oil. The cartel sets the price to maximize their profits and we do nothing. Even though we have huge oil deposits off our shores, in the gulf, Alaska and in shale in the Rocky Mountains we are not drilling and mining and trying to produce more oil.

We also are blessed with huge deposits of coal and steps have been taken by our government to reduce our production of coal. Our natural gas fields are really big and even though natural gas is used to heat our homes and produce electricity we have done nothing to encourage its use in transportation where it could reduce our costs.

In other words, our government seems to be against developing our energy production. If we did develop it there would be a substantial reduction in the costs of energy to our country but there is a greater reason for developing our energy especially considering oil for much of the world's production of oil comes from the volatile middle east and oil is an absolute necessity for us. Our security is threatened by our past actions and by our lack of internal energy sources.

Much of the blame for this problem is placed with the environmental movement. It seems that the environmentalists are against energy development as well as wanting to save the environment. They opposed nuclear power development even though nuclear is the cleanest and safest way to produce energy. They place more value on trees, varmints, animals and birds than on people. Many of their programs have financially harmed businesses and individuals to save some obscure critter. Man is the greatest thing God created and the Bible admonishes us to love our neighbor and not to value some fish more than man.

The environmental movement has lots of money and can advertise and write articles and books and hire lobbyists but they do not pass the laws that have led to our problem. The Congress passes those laws and the regulatory agencies they created have established issue rules and regulations that have prevented our energy development. We may conclude that the environmental-wackos are completely, totally wrong but that does not explain why our government has led us to our present situation. One possible explanation is that all of our government people responsible for this are insane. That is a better conclusion than thinking that they are deliberately doing this to harm our country and our people. It is possible that some environmental-wackos would like that but certainly not our own government.

That leaves us with some hope for if they are insane then we have a system that enables us to replace them. That is why this book is being written – we need to replace all of those responsible for interfering with our energy production – whatever reason they may have.

Chapter 1

The Environmental Octopus

This book is about our energy problem and a big part of that problem is caused by the environmentalists. As mentioned before it is really the Congress that is at blame but the thoughts, concepts, reasons and actions of the environmental groups must be addressed and refuted in order to allow us to free up our development of energy. We may even be able to convince some of the insane members of Congress and not have to replace all of them.

The publication, Federal Environment Laws, contains 61 Acts of Congress that have been passed to regulate and control our environment. These regulations started in the middle 1960's and were generally completed in the 1990's. Those laws regulate the air we breathe and the water we drink. They also control asbestos hazards, atomic energy, our coastal zones, nuclear and oil refinery and processing, endangered species, insecticides, and fungicides. They are involved with federal land policy, forest and rangelands,

atmospheric and pollution control, global climate protection, hazardous substances, lead based paint, low level radioactive waste, marine mammal protection, medical waste, mining and mineral resources, coastal monitoring, contaminated sediment, invasive species, noise control, ocean dumping, refuses, renewable energy, rivers and harbors, solid waste disposal, surface mining, toxic substances, and wood residues.

In other words, we are controlled in all aspects of our lives by the environmental laws.

It is probable that our environment is healthier and that our whole country is cleaner and a nicer place to live. However, there must have been some cost for all of that. Maybe we have even given up something of value for that. Or maybe what has been accomplished could have been achieved at lower costs and without depriving ourselves of something that we really need.

These environmental laws have been used to stop our building of nuclear power plants and to reduce our oil refinery capacity. They have prevented our drilling for oil and increased the costs to us of our gasoline. They have forced us to purchase oil from foreign countries in spite of our supply in Alaska, off of our coasts and in shale located in the Rocky Mountains.

They have led to clean-ups in unnecessary locations, have actually led to the mistaken destruction of a whole community, have forced dam construction to be postponed until supposed errors have been fixed, have forced the movement of a hospital to protect some bug, have prevented the clearing of fire-breaks which have led to the fires destroying the property involved, have stopped logging in forests, have stopped farmers from receiving water leading to loss of billions of dollars in lost production and have led to the loss of 40, 000 jobs, have led to the destruction of millions of acres of forest lands by obstructing cleanup in those forests, have had millions of acres of private property placed under the control of the government , have increased the costs of doing business to many companies, have forced us to drive less-safe, less-comfortable and more expensive cars and have enriched thousands of lawyers and law firms in that process.

These laws have been written in a manner that makes it possible for environmentalists to sue at little or no cost to them and has promoted actions which are detrimental to our country. When you examine what has been done it makes you wonder if the purpose was to improve our environment or to harm our nation. The environment in many cases has been improved but in other cases has actually been harmed. Many of the actions taken against businesses has interfered and added to their costs and has deprived us of the use of our own resources.

An excellent example of a law which has harmed us and not helped is the requirement for “environmental impact studies” that is necessary for every project. The study is expensive for it tries to examine all aspects of a project and it also takes a lot of time. Then, some bureaucrat or bureaucrats have to review and approve it and that takes more time and money. When that process is completed nothing has been accomplished. Money has been spent and time wasted but there has been no production of anything. When the project has been finished and completed then tests are done to see if there are violations. If so, then the company is responsible to fix them.

The company was always responsible to meet the requirements of the law and the impact study is ridiculous, expensive and time consuming and does not prevent pollution or anything. It is either an excellent example of bureaucratic stupidity from our government or an actual attempt to interfere with our progress or some form of insanity and should be repealed.

Having a clean environment is obviously good but being deprived of our resources is bad (disastrous?) and anything which substantially increases our costs of doing business is harmful to us. The government is like an octopus strangling us and controlling our economy and the environmentalists have tentacles into every aspect of our lives.

It is time to examine this whole movement and evaluate the results from the environmental laws and their application and what has been done to our ability to produce energy.

Chapter 2

The Global Warming Scam

Global Warming was not identified as a problem until the mid 80's and we have not always had accurate measurement devices to define the problem. Naturally, over the past there have been periods of cold weather and periods of warm weather. Around 1000 AD there was the Medieval Warm Period which was very beneficial for everyone but it was followed by a cooler period. One of our sources for this information is *The Little Ice Age, How Climate Made History 1300 – 1850* by Brian Fagan.

After that period the weather cooled until the late 1840's and after 1850 there has generally been a warming trend. There was cooling in the 1920's, heating in the 1930's and 1940's, cooling in the 1950's, 1960's and 1970's , warming in the 1980's and 1990's and cooling the last decade. There is nothing that has happened to justify the alarms of today.

Today, we have weather scientists and instruments and computers and all sorts of stuff that should enable us to record and analyze and predict the weather. (except what will take place tomorrow). Just 35 years ago – in the 70's- those weather experts presented the following:

Science magazine (Dec.10, 1976) warned of “extensive Northern Hemisphere glaciations”. Science Digest (February 1973) reported that “the world’s climatologists are agreed “ that we must “ prepare for the next ice age”. The Christian Science Monitor (“ Warning: Earth’s Climate is Changing Faster than Even Experts Expect, “ Aug . 27 , 1974) reports that glaciers “ have begun to advance ,” “... growing seasons in England and Scandinavia are getting shorter “ and “ ...the North Atlantic is cooling down about as fast as an ocean can cool”. Newsweek agreed (the Cooling World, “ April 28, 1975) that meteorologists “are almost unanimous “ that catastrophic famines might result from the global cooling and the New York Times (Sept. 14, 1975) said “...may return to another ice age”. The Times (May 21, 1975) also said “... a major cooling of the climate is widely considered inevitable “ now that it is “...well established” that the Northern Hemisphere’s climate “ has been getting cooler since about 1950”. From Fortune (February 1974). “Climatologists now blame those recurring droughts and floods on a global cooling trend. It could bring massive tragedies for mankind”.

In 1969 environmentalist Nigel Calder warned, ”The threat of a new ice age must now stand alongside nuclear war as a likely source of wholesale death and misery for mankind”. In 1968, professor Paul Ehrlich predicted, “...in the 1970’s ...hundreds of millions of people are going to starve to death” as he predicted there would be major food shortages due to the impending cold weather.

There are more comments about the dangers of the new “ice age” but that should be enough to show that global cooling was considered to be a real problem in the 70’s. They were wrong and very wrong. The news media that presented this terrible doom–day forecast about a coming ice age is the same group that presented global warming to us just 25 years later. How could they change so quickly and why should we believe them now?

Phil Jones, head of Great Britain’s University of East Anglia Climate Research Unit (CRU) and a well known promoter of global warming, stated, “...the difference of warming rates for the periods 1860-1880, 1910-1940, and 1975-2009 is statistically insignificant ... and that there has been no statistically – significant global warming since 1995; that in fact global temperatures have been trending to the downside since January of 2002. ”.

Therefore, this chapter should be ended with the conclusion that global warming is non-existent and is not any more of a problem than the previously predicted ice age . However, let me assure the reader that the global warming industry will not accept this and that they will not go away. It is an industry and they have an agenda on which their employment depends and which they will not drop.

Vicious alarmists

Later we will look at the deliberate lies and deceptions involved with Climategate but it is of interest to realize the viciousness and hate that some of these alarmists have for those who disagree with them. A June 2, 2009 article posted to Talking Points Memo asked, “At what point do we jail or execute global warming deniers?”. In June 2009, former Clinton administration official Joe Romm commented on his Climate Progress web site, “An entire generation will soon be ready to strangle you and your kind while you sleep in your beds”. In 2008, Canadian environmentalist David Suzuki called for governmental leaders skeptical of global warming to be thrown “into jail”. In 2007, the Weather Channel’s climate expert called for withholding certification of skeptical meteorologists.

A July 2007 Senate report detailed how skeptical scientists have faced threats and intimidation. NASA’s James Hansen has called for trials of climate skeptics in 2008 for “high crimes against humanity”. Environmentalist Robert F. Kennedy Jr. lashed out at skeptics of 2007 declaring. “This is treason. And we need to start treating them as traitors”. In 2009 RFK Jr. also called coal companies “criminal enterprises’ and declared CEO’s “should be in jail for all of eternity”. These people are radical and vicious (and insane?) and are intent on keeping global warming as an accepted doctrine.

So, let us embark on a look at GLOBAL WARMING.

“The Sky is Falling” said Chicken Little

The term “global warming” does not sound very bad for warm is usually better than cold. Therefore, it is necessary for them to define it in such a manner that we will be concerned about it. So, we have alarmists who will describe all of the terrible things that happen because of global warming so that we will not want that to happen to us.

We’ll start with the most famous of those who claim that global warming is a real problem and that “it is settled science” and that “the debate is over”.– Nobel Laureate, Al Gore who won the prize for his movie , An Inconvenient Truth. However, a British judge, Justice Burton, ruled there were nine instances in the movie in which Gore went so far outside the scientific mainstream that he deemed his presentation “alarmist” and “apocalyptic”. The British government, who is very supportive of global warming dangers, had ordered a copy sent to every public high school in the country and the judge ruled that any school which showed the movie would have to tell the students of nine gross errors. (the judge missed the biggest error for Gore had included the now discredited “hockey stick” graph as truth)

Sea levels were predicted to rise 20 feet, low lying pacific atolls were being inundated with the rising sea levels because of global warming and inhabitants were being forced to evacuate , the Ocean Conveyor will shut down, there is a direct coincidence between the rise in carbon dioxide and temperature, the snows of Kilimanjaro are disappearing, Lake Chad has dried up because of global warming, Hurricane Katrina was caused by global warming, polar bears are decreasing in number, and coral reefs are bleaching and fish species are decreasing at a rate 1000 times greater than normal. All of the claims are indeed “alarmist “ and “apocalyptic” as the judge said and also erroneous. These claims are so ridiculous that it makes you wonder at AL Gore’s sanity. The book and movie were effective for they were not exposed in our country and are essentially accepted and are still used and cited by these nutty alarmists.

Al Gore continues his ridiculous statements for his latest is that the heavy snowfalls of 2010 and 2011 are caused by global warming. Up is down and black is white with Al. I wonder if he has had a psychological exam recently?

And, there are more unbelievable predictions. Daniel Kammen, an energy professor at UC, Berkeley in a speech said, "Enjoy your camping now, people, because the Sierra forests will be burned up by 2050... Greenland's ice cap will melt... the oceans will rise 50 feet.

In July 2003, John Houghton, former co-chairman of the International Panel on Climate Control of the United Nations said that he "had no hesitation" in describing global warming "as a weapon of mass destruction".

From the Economist, July 10, 2010 we read, "Cleo Paskal, at the Royal Institute of International Affairs in London, predicts that floods, storms, the failure of the Indian monsoon and agricultural collapse will bring "enormous, and specific, geopolitical, economic, and security consequences for all of us...the world of tomorrow looks chaotic and violent".

Former U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan, now president of the Geneva-based Global Humanitarian Forum, issued a lengthy report warning that climate change disasters, such as droughts and floods, kill 315,000 each year and cost \$125 billion, numbers that it says will rise to 500,000 and \$340,000 by 2030. However, Roger Pielke, Jr. an expert in disaster trends at the University of Colorado called the report, "a methodological embarrassment" and a "poster child for how to lie with statistics". It is amazing that statements like these are actually accepted as likely to occur.

Because of the involvement of the United Nations and Kofi Annan in global warming it is appropriate to digress and review another activity of the United Nations which really demonstrates the corruption that exists in the UN. The Food for Oil Program that the United Nations and Kofi Annan had with Saddam Hussein really indicates the extent of how much we can trust Kofi Annan and the United Nations. The Oil for Food Program was established in 1995 for the purpose of enabling Saddam Hussein to sell oil and obtain funds to help provide for the people of Iraq. In addition to the usual profits from the sale of the oil Saddam also obtained around \$10.2 billion more for his personal use. He did that by bribing various people and governments (France, Germany and Russia) through granting them options to purchase oil at special prices, usually without taking possession of the oil.

The most interesting part of the Food for Oil program was the investigation that took place. Mr. Annan was able to appoint the investigator, Mr. Paul Volcker. Mr. Volcker was known as a U.N. supporter and was on the Board of Directors of the United Nations Association of the USA and a major contributor to the U.N..

Mr. Annan also appointed the investigative panel. Mr. Annan then refused to grant them subpoena powers and required that all of those interviewed be approved by Mr. Annan. A threatening letter was sent to all the involved contractors informing them that they were not free to talk to the investigation without permission from the UN and UN employees were also instructed to obtain permission before talking to the investigators. The UN audit committee had audited the program on 58 different occasions and Mr. Annan refused to turn those audits over to the investigators and later refused to turn over documents to our Congress who also wished to investigate.

Mr. Vocker also stopped our Congress and withheld documents from them. Mr. Iqbal Riza, chief of staff for Mr. Annan ordered the shredding of thousands of documents potentially of relevance to the Oil for Food inquiry. Some of those documents may have been generated by various organizations that were there to prevent these actions. There was an Undersecretary – general for Management duties, a Board of Auditors, a Joint Inspection Unit, an Office of Internal Oversight and an Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budget Questions. Since the documents were shredded there is no way to find out if these organizations were fulfilling their functions to prevent fraud.

Mr. Annan also stipulated that the final report be turned over to him and approved by him before it was issued.

The final report stated, "Our assignment has been to look for mis-or-mal administration in the Oil for Food program and for evidence of corruption within the U.N. organization and by contractors. Unhappily, we have found both". That report led 60 of our Congressmen to ask for Mr. Annan to resign. Mr. Annan called the findings "deeply embarrassing" but said he had no intentions of resigning". In other words Kofi feels immune to any criticism. In case you were not aware the U.N. is impervious to our criticism and control.

This report tells us that there is no reason to trust anything that Kofi Annan says and this also reveals that the United Nations is also corrupt and not to be trusted which is also borne out by their reports on climate change.

Which leads us to review the activity of the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). The global warming movement needed an organization behind it and the U.N. was perfect for that. Composed of bureaucrats from all over the world with the necessary funding the IPCC was formed in 1988.

In 1990 the UN IPCC issued a report on global warming which had been worked on by two thousand persons and more than 1000 of them were scientists. About 80 people saw and approved what they thought was the final report and then just a few altered it. That alteration was opposed by many who were skeptical about the altered version which included a "Summary for Policymakers" containing a previously unmentioned factor involving human activity's effect on climate. This led to the conclusion that "the balance of evidence suggests there is a discernible human influence on global climate". Those altering the report actually altered a graph and some of the text of the report and got away with it.

The media welcomed the report and ignored those who were objecting to the reports conclusion and maligned those who objected to the alterations. That included Dr. Frederick Seitz, the former president of the National Academy of Sciences whose objection was

published in the Wall Street Journal.

That IPCC executive Summary for Policymakers report says they are certain that emissions resulting from human activities are substantially increasing the atmospheric concentrations of the greenhouse gases, resulting in an additional warming of the earth's surface.

The Supplementary Report was issued in 1992 and confirmed the 1990 report. The Second Assessment report was issued in 1995 and agreed with the past presentations and again blamed human activity for altering the earth's climate as well as placing confidence in the computer models they were using to predict the future. (These models were absolutely necessary for their data was not sufficient to prove their contentions).

The Third Assessment Report was issued in 2001, verifying the past reports and conclusions but this report led to some complaints. Keith Shine, one of the IPCC'S lead authors, discussing the Policymakers Summary said, "We produce a draft, and then the policymakers go through it line by line and change the way it is presented".

Solid- state physicist Frederick Seitz, president emeritus of Rockefeller University, and past President of the National Academy of Sciences, publicly denounced the report, writing "I have never witnessed a more disturbing corruption of the peer-review process than the events that led to the IPCC report". His opposition was printed in the Leipzig Declaration of S. Fred Singer's Science and Environmental Project.

The Fourth Assessment Report was issued in 2007 and continued with their global warming claims. " Most of the observed increase in globally averaged temperatures since the mid-20th century is very likely due to the observed increase in anthropogenic (human) greenhouse gas concentrations". (This presents a problem for the temperature did not increase from the mid-20th century). Further the report states that anthropogenic warming and sea level rise would continue for centuries....However, these claims are no longer being accepted.

The New York Post published an article on Sept. 2, 2010 titled, Meltdown of the climate 'consensus'. "For two decades, The IPCC has spearheaded efforts to convince the world's governments that man-made carbon emissions pose a threat to the global temperature equilibrium – and to civilization itself". IPCC reports are widely cited as evidence for the urgent need for drastic action to "save the planet".

But, the prestigious InterAcademy Council, a consortium of national scientific academies which was formed in 2000 to give "high quality" advice to international bodies, "has finished a thorough review of IPCC practices – and found them badly wanting".

For example, the IPCC's much – vaunted Fourth Assessment Report claimed in 2007 that Himalayan glaciers were rapidly melting, and would possibly be gone by the year 2035. The claim was actually false – yet the IPCC cited it as proof of global warming. Then there's the IPCC earlier prediction in 2007 – which it claimed to have "high confidence" in – that global warming would lead to a 50 percent reduction in the rain-fed agricultural capacity of Africa. But, the Inter Academy council investigation found this IPCC claim was also based on weak evidence.

Some IPCC practices can only be called shoddy. As the Wall Street Journal reported, " some scientists invited by the IPCC to review the 2007 report before it was published questioned the Himalayan claim but those challenges "were not adequately considered". The truth is that the claim was speculation made after a phone interview of a single scientist.

The Wall Street Journal also reported that the InterAcademy council also said that the IPCC ignored scientific nuances and dismissed minority viewpoints in the report. John Christy, a climate scientist at the University of Alabama, who had participated in two of the IPCC's Reports said his doubts about man-made global warming were largely pushed aside both times. The investigation also said the IPCC sometimes failed to adequately reflect " properly documented views of scientists who disagreed with the consensus conclusions".

The 2007 report being criticized had stated that climate change , "is unequivocal" and "very likely" caused by human activity. However, Vice chair of the IPCC, Yuri Izrael, two months later, wrote " the panic over global warming is totally unjustified, " there is no serious threat to the climate" and humanity is "hypothetically ... more threatened by cold than by global warming"

Everyone associated with the IPCC does not support global warming for Mojib Latif who is with the IPCC says we are in the first stage of a long-term cooling trend that will last another 10 to 20 years.

Shall we trust the bureaucrats at the United Nations? Their climate change bureaucrats are dependent upon global warming for their income. It is logical to conclude that they are always going to find that the globe is warming – and the faster the better for them.

The obvious conclusion that can be drawn from this is that the IPCC has an agenda to promote global warming and that this agenda is leading them to present information to "prove" their view and that this proof is not accurate and is even untrue.

There are many, many more predictions of catastrophe that could be cited but that should give an idea of the terrible fate that these alarmists state awaits us if we do not stop the globe from warming.

KYOTO

The Kyoto treaty was signed in 1997 and was rejected by our Senate by a vote of 95-0. Russia, China and India were exempted from it and so even if implemented would have had little effect on the environment. However, it was rejected on excellent grounds by our

Congress.

The Kyoto treaty (1997) will not accomplish anything even if it was implemented states Dr. Fred Singer, head of the S&EPP. The treaty would reduce emissions by a mere 5% among industrialized nations but would have a devastating effect on our economy. The Energy Information Administration has predicted that Kyoto would cost the United States 4.2% of GDP per year from 2008 to 2012 and \$240 billion a year in GDP by 2030.

According to one study, by 2010 Kyoto will trigger a rise in food costs of 9%, medical care of 11% , and housing of 19%.

The Global Warming Petition Project urged Congress to reject the Kyoto pact as there is , “no convincing scientific evidence that human release of carbon dioxide, methane , or other greenhouse gases is causing or will, in the foreseeable future , cause catastrophic heating of the earth’s atmosphere and disruption of the earth’s climate”. More than 31,000 scientists signed the petition.

Dr. Arthur B. Robinson started a petition (The Oregon Petition) which was signed by 20,000 persons, 18,000 of whom have scientific degrees, many of them advance degrees and Dr. Fred Seitz helped get signatures by sending a letter stating the Kyoto agreement was “based on flawed ideas” and that “data on climate change do not show that human use of hydrocarbons is harmful”.

The petition stated:

“We urge the United States government to reject the global warming agreement that was written in Kyoto, Japan in December 1997, and any other similar proposals . The proposed limits on greenhouse gases would harm the environment, hinder the advance of science and technology, and damage the health and welfare of mankind.

“There is no convincing scientific evidence that human release of carbon dioxide, methane, or other greenhouse gases is causing or will, in the foreseeable future, cause catastrophic heating of the earth’s atmosphere and disruption of the earth’s climate. Moreover, there is substantial scientific evidence that increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide produce many beneficial effects upon natural plant and animal environments of the Earth.”

Now there is a real refutation. Carbon dioxide has been pictured as the villain in our atmosphere and here is someone claiming it is beneficial. Someone is very, very wrong and/or lacking in the ability to reason.

Measurements

How do we know the globe is warming? Obviously, we now have a much greater ability to measure temperature than we did 200 years ago. History tells us of Greenland supporting agriculture around the period 1100 AD but we don’t know how warm it was. We know that the Arkansas River froze solidly in the early 1800’s but we don’t know how cold it was then. Even now there are questions about the way we measure and the instruments used and their placement.

Dr. Walter Williams, professor at Georgetown University reported in his column that , “During the 1960’s and into the 1980’s the number of stations used for calculating global surface temperatures was about 6000. By 1990 the number of stations dropped to about 1500. Most of the stations dropped were in the colder regions of the Earth. According to Science & Environmental Policy Project, (S&EPP) Russia reported the East Anglia University Climate Research Unit was ignoring data from colder regions of Russia. NASA satellites uniformly monitor the Earth’s lower atmosphere. The satellite based measurements are uncorrupted by urban heat islands and localized use changes that often taint records from surface temperature stations, giving false indications of warming”.

Meteorologist Joe D’Aleo said, “the global databases of (surface station reports) are all contaminated by urbanization , major station dropout , missing data, bad siting, instruments with known warm biases being introduced without adjustment, and black-box and man made adjustments designed to maximize (reported warming) “

Dr. Fred Singer, past President of the Science and Environmental Project and distinguished research professor at George Mason University has indicated that weather satellites do not show any warming and they have been giving us data for 25 years. Weather balloons give the same results as the satellites.

Unfunded volunteers exposed how 89% of the temperature sensors at NOAA (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration) were being collated from sites polluted by being too near heating and air-conditioning outlets and car parks and other artificial sources of heat.

Satellite based devices are the most uncorrupted and provide the most accurate way of measuring temperatures and the S&EPP state that “data from earth satellites in use since 1979 do not show any warming”. Those scientists who present reports and analyses are free to use whatever they wish and it would seem that all sorts of measurement devices are available and can justify any conclusions. However, anyone using anything other than satellite devices are presenting data to prove their contentions and so there are alarmists that are still saying that the globe is warming and has been for the last decade. They are wrong and probably know it and are deliberately lying to protect their jobs or are lacking in sanity. Satellite devices are the most accurate and incorruptible and any other source should be viewed with skepticism.

Climategate

Michael Mann, James Hansen, Phil Jones, Michael Openheimer, Stephen Schneider, and Kevin Trenberth are some of the most well known players in the global warming scam and Climategate is exposing them.

Clive Cook of the Atlantic, after reading the climate email files of the U.K.'s Climate Research Unit at the University of East Anglia, called the overpowering "stink of intellectual corruption" – combined with mafia like suppression of dissent, suppression of evidence and methods, and "plain statistical incompetence" – exposed by the documents.

Three weeks before the United Nations Climate Change Conference convened on December 7, 2009 in Copenhagen, Denmark an unknown hacker penetrated the computer system of the Climate Research Unit (CRU) at Great Britain's University of East Anglia. Those emails revealed that the climate change bunch were guilty of suppression of dissent, serious charges of fraud, unethical attacks on colleagues, censorship of opposing points of view and possible criminal destruction of, and withholding of evidence. Wow, that makes us wonder if this whole global warming movement is a scam.

Phil Jones, head of East Anglia's Climate Research Unit writes to colleagues that he has just used, "Mike's Nature trick" of adding other temperature data to "hide decline" in recent global temperatures. The Mike referred to is Michael Mann, professor of meteorology at Pennsylvania State University, whose influential "hockey stick" graph utilized statistical manipulation to produce a curve that would support claims about global warming. (Mann later admitted the hockey stick was incorrect). In the same email Jones opines that the death of global – warming critic John L. Daly, "In an odd way this is cheering news".

In a May 29, 2008 e-mail message, Jones writes, "Mike, can you delete any e-mails you may have had with Keith re AR4? Keith will do likewise... Can you also e-mail Gene and get him to do the same? Will be getting Caspar to do likewise".

East Anglia climatologist Keith Briffa wrote, "I tried hard to balance the needs of the science with the IPCC, which were not always the same." In another e-mail Jones suggests to Mann that he has received legal advice that he will not have to comply with the Freedom of Information requests from other scientists that would require him releasing data that would justify his research claims.

A statement from Willie Soon and Sallie Baliunas which was published in the journal Climate Research led to Phil Jones writing to Mike Mann, "I'll be emailing the journal to tell them I'm having nothing more to do with it until they rid themselves of this troublesome editor". Mike Mann responded, "I think we should stop considering Climate Research as a legitimate peer-reviewed journal. Perhaps we should encourage our colleagues... to no longer submit to, or cite papers in, this journal. We would also need to consider what we tell or requests our more reasonable colleagues who currently sit on the editorial board". On July 11, 2003 Mr. Mann wrote to Mr. Jones, "I think the community should ... terminate its involvement with this journal at all levels ... and leave it to wither away into oblivion and disrepute".

In a July 8, 2004 e-mail Jones assures Mann that he and Kevin Trenberth will censor opposing scientific views from the forthcoming IPCC report. Jones writes, "I can't see either of these reports being in the next IPCC report. Kevin and I will keep them out somehow even if we have to redefine what the peer-review literature is".

We then have the minority report from the Senate.

Washington, D.C.-The Minority Staff of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works released a report today titled, "'Consensus' Exposed: The CRU Controversy." The report covers the controversy surrounding emails and documents released from the University of East Anglia's Climatic Research Unit (CRU). It examines the extent to which those emails and documents affect the scientific work of the UN's IPCC, and how revelations of the IPCC's flawed science impacts the EPA's endangerment finding for greenhouse gases.

The report finds that some of the scientists involved in the CRU controversy violated ethical principles governing taxpayer-funded research and possibly federal laws. In addition, the Minority Staff believes the emails and accompanying documents seriously compromise the IPCC-based "consensus" and its central conclusion that anthropogenic emissions are inexorably leading to environmental catastrophes.

In its examination of the controversy, the Minority Staff found that the scientists:

- Obstructed release of damaging data and information;
- Manipulated data to reach preconceived conclusions;
- Colluded to pressure journal editors who published work questioning the climate science "consensus"; and
- Assumed activist roles to influence the political process.

"This EPW Minority Report shows that the CRU controversy is about far more than just scientists who lack interpersonal skills, or a little email squabble," said Sen. James Inhofe (R-Okla.), Ranking Member of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works. "It's about unethical and potentially illegal behavior by some of the world's leading climate scientists.

"The report also shows the world's leading climate scientists acting like political scientists, with an agenda disconnected from the principles of good science. And it shows that there is no consensus-except that there are significant gaps in what scientists know about the climate system. It's time for the Obama Administration to recognize this. Its endangerment finding for greenhouse gases rests on bad science. It should throw out that finding and abandon greenhouse gas regulation under the Clean Air Act—a policy that will mean fewer jobs, higher taxes and economic decline."

Climategate was so significant that the IPCC felt it necessary to have an “independent” investigation. Their report, produced by a committee chaired by Harold Shapiro, former president of Princeton reported as follows, “the IPCC needs clear statements on who decides, and by what criteria, what should be in its reports; on what it is looking for in its authors and on how they measure up; on what constitutes a conflict of interest for a panel member; and on what sort of primary material should be deemed worthy of inclusion (peer-reviewed science, yes; other stuff only if explicitly approved by the authors with appropriate arguments for so doing). Review authors need to marshal the thousands of comments they receive on drafts into clear arguments, and the authors need to respond to those arguments fully. Statements that go beyond the evidence or move into the realm of advocacy need to be avoided”. In their own mealy-mouthed way it would seem that many scientists were being criticized.

A much clearer and direct statement was made as follows:

The July 19, 2010 editorial in the Wall Street Journal reads, “At its core, the scandal (Climategate) was as much about the integrity of the scientific process as it was about the quality of science. Leading climate scientists were caught advising each other to delete potentially compromising emails, stonewall freedom of information requests and game the peer review process to exclude contributions from skeptical colleagues”.

Climategate is not the only instance of corruption in this global warming war.

John Coleman, in an hour long television documentary titled, Global Warming: the Other Side, presents evidence that our National Climatic Data center has been manipulating weather data just as the British University of East Anglia Climate Research Unit.

Stop the Opposition

The opposition has become sufficient enough that the alarmists have felt a need to try to silence it. Al Gore felt it necessary to state that “the debate is over” in the hopes that it would stop and also to say “the science is settled”. That was his hope for his income is dependent upon stopping the opposing views.

The EPA has stifled Dr. Alan Carlin, a senior research analyst at the EPA who questioned the outdated research on the health effects of greenhouse gases. Dr. Carlin produced a report complete with graphs using data from satellites which showed that the actual global temperature has FALLEN by 0.3 degrees C in the last three years. The EPA’s answer to actual data is to tell him to “shut up”.

Recently, they sought to yank a YouTube Video of created by EPA lawyers Allan Zabel and Laurie Williams that is critical of Cap-and-Trade. Carol Browner reportedly threatened auto execs in July by telling them to put “nothing in writing...ever” about negotiations with her.

On May, 2006 The Washington Post asserted that there were only “ a handful of skeptics’ of manmade warming fears. Bill Blakemore on Aug. 30, 2006 said , “after extensive searches, ABC News has found no such (scientific) debate on global warming”. U.N . Framework Convention on Climate Change Executive Secretary Yvo Boer said it was “criminally irresponsible “ to ignore the urgency of global warming. U.N. special climate envoy Dr. Gro Harlem Brundtland on May 10, 2007 declared the climate debate “over” and added “it’s completely immoral, even, to question the U.N.’s scientific “consensus” . C NN’s Miles O’Brien said, “ the scientific debate is over”. Science czar, John Holden , was found in the Climategate files belittling the report.

The Weather Channel’s senior climatologist, Heidi Cullen, has recommended that meteorologists be denied professional certification if they voice doubts about global warming alarmism. If they can shut dissenters up then they can continue to sell global warming.

The Deniers

The media has just told us that there is really not a large group of scientists that disagree with the global warming alarmists but they have applied a term “deniers” in case they find some. There are some.

Among the deniers are Richard Lintzen, the Alfred P.Sloan professor of Meteorology at MIT, the University of Alabama’s Roy W. Spencer, Stephen McIntyre of Climate Audit blog.

The Edmonton Journal (Alberta, Canada) reported that 68 percent of climate scientists and engineers do not believe “ the debate on the scientific causes of recent climate change is settled”.

Weather Channel founder John Coleman said, “ global warming is the greatest scam in history”. He said, “ environmental extremists, notable politicians among them... create this wild ‘scientific ‘scenario of the civilization threatening environmental consequences from global warming unless we adhere to their radical agenda... I have read dozens of scientific papers. I have talked with numerous scientists ... There is no runaway climate change. The impact of humans on climate is not catastrophic. Our planet is not in peril... In time, a decade or two , the outrageous scam will be obvious”.

Richard Lindzen, professor of atmospheric science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology said that it will take several years for the climate change scare to finally die, but “ the death spiral will begin at some point, and it looks like the spinning will start in ‘08”.

In December 2008 the Senate released the U.S. Senate Minority Report: “More than 650 International Scientists Dissent over Man-Made global Warming Claims : Scientists continue to Debunk ‘Consensus in 2008”.

On March 21, 2009, 59 additional scientists from NASA, the EPA, the Navy, the Air Force, the Defense and Energy Departments and

major universities joined the previous 650 who disagreed with the anthropogenic (human) global-warming hypothesis.

Here are some of the highlights of the Updated 2008 Senate Minority Report featuring over 650 international scientists dissenting from man-made climate fears: "I am a skeptic... Global warming has become a new religion." - Nobel Prize Winner for Physics, Ivar Giaever.

"Since I am no longer affiliated with any organization nor receiving any funding, I can speak quite frankly....As a scientist I remain skeptical...The main basis of the claim that man's release of greenhouse gases is the cause of the warming is based almost entirely upon climate models. We all know the frailty of models concerning the air-surface system." - Atmospheric Scientist Dr. Joanne Simpson, the first woman in the world to receive a PhD in meteorology, and formerly of NASA, who has authored more than 190 studies and has been called "among the most preeminent scientists of the last 100 years."

Warming fears are the "worst scientific scandal in the history... When people come to know what the truth is, they will feel deceived by science and scientists." - UN IPCC Japanese Scientist Dr. Kiminori Itoh, an award-winning PhD environmental physical chemist.

"The IPCC has actually become a closed circuit; it doesn't listen to others. It doesn't have open minds... I am really amazed that the Nobel Peace Prize has been given on scientifically incorrect conclusions by people who are not geologists." - Indian geologist Dr. Arun D. Ahluwalia at Punjab University and a board member of the UN-supported International Year of the Planet.

"So far, real measurements give no ground for concern about a catastrophic future warming." - Scientist Dr. Jarl R. Ahlbeck, a chemical engineer at Abo Akademi University in Finland, author of 200 scientific publications and former Greenpeace member.

There are many, many more scientists who have expressed their doubts.

"Anyone who claims that the debate is over and the conclusions are firm has a fundamentally unscientific approach to one of the most momentous issues of our time." - Solar physicist Dr. Pal Brekke, senior advisor to the Norwegian Space Centre in Oslo. Brekke has published more than 40 peer-reviewed scientific articles on the sun and solar interaction with the Earth.

"The models and forecasts of the UN IPCC "are incorrect because they only are based on mathematical models and presented results at scenarios that do not include, for example, solar activity." - Victor Manuel Velasco Herrera, a researcher at the Institute of Geophysics of the National Autonomous University of Mexico

"It is a blatant lie put forth in the media that makes it seem there is only a fringe of scientists who don't buy into anthropogenic global warming." - U.S Government Atmospheric Scientist Stanley B. Goldenberg of the Hurricane Research Division of NOAA.

"After reading [UN IPCC chairman] Pachauri's asinine comment [comparing skeptics to] Flat Earthers, it's hard to remain quiet." - Climate statistician Dr. William M. Briggs, who specializes in the statistics of forecast evaluation, serves on the American Meteorological Society's Probability and Statistics Committee and is an Associate Editor of Monthly Weather Review.

"The Kyoto theorists have put the cart before the horse. It is global warming that triggers higher levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, not the other way round... A large number of critical documents submitted at the 1995 U.N. conference in Madrid vanished without a trace. As a result, the discussion was one-sided and heavily biased, and the U.N. declared global warming to be a scientific fact," Andrei Kapitsa, a Russian geographer and Antarctic ice core researcher.

"Nature's regulatory instrument is water vapor: more carbon dioxide leads to less moisture in the air, keeping the overall GHG content in accord with the necessary balance conditions." - Prominent Hungarian Physicist and environmental researcher Dr. Miklós Zágoni reversed his view of man-made warming and is now a skeptic. Zágoni was once Hungary's most outspoken supporter of the Kyoto Protocol.

Ivar Giaever, Nobel Laureate in physics said, "I am a skeptic... Global warming has become a new religion". Dr. Kiminori Itoh, an environmental physical chemist, said warming fears are the "worst scientific scandal in the history... When people come to know what the truth is they will feel deceived by science and scientists". Dr. Jarl R. Ahlbeck, a chemical engineer at Abo Akademi University in Finland and author of 200 scientific publications said, "So far, real measurements give no ground for concern about a catastrophic future warming". Atmospheric physicist James A. Peden, formerly of the Space Research and Coordination Center in Pittsburg, said, "Many (scientists) are now searching for a way to back out quietly (from promoting warming fears), without having their professional careers ruined."

Atmospheric scientist Stanley B. Goldenburg of the Hurricane Research Division of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration said, "It is a blatant lie put forth in the media that makes it seem there is only a fringe of scientists who don't buy into anthropogenic global warming".

David Bellamy, an Australian botanist wrote in the Australian that, "it's not even science anymore; it's anti-science". He noted that, "in every year since 1998, world temperatures have been getting colder, and in 2002 Arctic ice actually increased."

Astrophysicists Sallie Baliunas and Willie Soon at the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics in the Solar, Stellar and Planetary Sciences Division published a report in 2003 showing that "the 20th century is probably not the warmest nor a uniquely extreme climatic period of the last millennium".

A statement sent to Congress in 2009 reads, "The sky is not falling". Far from warming, "the earth has been cooling for 10 years". That was signed by, Hal Lewis, physicist (emeritus at the University of California), physicists Will Happer and Robert Austin of

Princeton, Lawrence Gould of the University of Hartford and climatologist Richard Lindzen of MIT.

There have been several books written explaining that global warming is not a threat. *Climate Confusion* by Roy W. Spencer, *Climate of Fear*, by Thomas Gale Moore, *Taken by Storm*, by Christopher Essex and Ross McKittrick, and *Unstoppable Global Warming: Every 1,500 Years* by S. Fred Singer and Dennis Avery, *The Deniers* by Lawrence Solomon and the *Really Inconvenient Truth* by Ian Murray.

Maybe the news media just didn't want to find anyone that disagreed with global warming for it is very obvious that there are many that find the "science" lacking in truth.

Errors, mistakes or deliberate misrepresentations

The NASA Goodard Institute for Space Studies has now revised their previous erroneous statements and now say the 1934 was the warmest year on record, not 1998; the third hottest year was 1921, not 2006 and three of the five hottest years occurred in the 1930's.

This has enormous significance for the alarmists have claimed that the warming trend is due to mankind and especially to industrialization. However, in 1934 there were only a few cars, fewer planes, not very many smoke-belching factories and not nearly as many humans as there are now. If the temperatures now are lower than 1934 then it is difficult to claim that industrialization and humans are causing the problem. If that is the case then there is no reason or cause to adopt any measures to correct a non-existent problem.

Michael Mann, professor of Meteorology at Pennsylvania University utilized statistical data to produce a curve that would support claims of recent human activities causing the warmest period in the past millennia (known as the "hockey stick" due to the shape of the curve).

Prior to Mr. Mann's "hockey stick curve" the accepted view (see IPCC's 1990 report) was that the world had undergone a warming period in the Middle Ages followed by a mid- millennium cold spell and a subsequent warming period. That view also held that the previous warming period was warmer than the present day.

Two Canadian climate experts, statistician Stephen McIntyre and economist Ross Mckittrick requested copies of Mann's calculations. Mann refused and also refused to divulge the algorithm he had used to concoct his graph. After his refusal the two published several articles challenging Mann's work. By the time the "hockey stick" was discredited the damage was done for many articles accepted the "hockey stick". Al Gore used it in his movie. Mann continues to receive grants from our government to continue his work on global warming.

. Mr. Mann's curve meant that we were now in a much worse situation than ever before which fit in well with the alarmists' programs. That "hockey stick" indicating significant warming trends was based on his computer models which he was unable to present and verify. Since there are no records indicating that catastrophic events occurred in the previous warming period one could conclude that warmer periods were not dangerous. Mr. Mann tried to remove that thought. His "hockey stick" was a projection and not fact but it was used by many to conclude that we were really heading for trouble and his changing of the past history helped show that our present danger was much more serious than ever before.

The obvious conclusion is that existing data does not substantiate the global warming belief and so it is necessary for them to make up data from which conclusions can be drawn to prove their theory.

When all the facts are examined it is clear that the earth has been following a very normal pattern for the last two centuries which we can accurately measure and that there is no need to be concerned about global warming or global cooling nor is there a need to take action to interfere with the climate of the Earth.

Indeed, global warming is the "greatest scam in history".

Common Sense

Although many would like to believe that mankind has a significant effect on the temperature of the earth that is probably not true. The earth is about 25,000 miles around and 70% of it is covered by water. The balance has mountains, deserts and uninhabited areas and so it is probable that mankind is concentrated on less than 10% of the earth. The atmosphere above the earth extends for many miles but the most dense concentration is about five miles. That is a lot of atmosphere to absorb the pollution that man emits and the atmosphere has a self-cleaning mechanism known as rain. Since the atmosphere constantly moves around the earth it is unlikely that any pollution remains in one place for an extended time and thus there is less likelihood of significant problems caused by that pollution. In other words man is puny as far as his influence on our environment is concerned.

With that in mind consider that the two most populous countries – China and India – have no intention of adopting any measures that would increase their costs of producing energy (and Russia is now expressing doubt about global warming). Thus, 40% of the population is not participating in any scheme to reduce carbon dioxide or limit global warming.

Without discussing this with any scientist common sense tells us that any action we take to reduce non-existent man-made global warming or carbon dioxide emissions will have no effect. And then consider that nearly all of Asia will do nothing to combat global warming leads to the conclusion that attempting to change the earth's temperature in fact borders on larceny or stupidity.

Then we must remember that this earth was organized by God with the accompanying solar system. For many thousands of years it

Thank You for previewing this eBook

You can read the full version of this eBook in different formats:

- HTML (Free /Available to everyone)
- PDF / TXT (Available to V.I.P. members. Free Standard members can access up to 5 PDF/TXT eBooks per month each month)
- Epub & Mobipocket (Exclusive to V.I.P. members)

To download this full book, simply select the format you desire below

