

Property Rights Foundation of America®
Founded 1994

The Double-Edged Sword of Eco-Tyranny

Paul Driessen, B.A., J.D.

Author and Senior Policy Advisor

Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow

Washington, D.C.

Twenty-Third Annual National Conference

on Private Property Rights

October 19, 2019

The double-edged sword of eco-tyranny

It slashes and dismembers property rights, energy and civilization with every swing

Paul Driessen

Most people today think of double-edged swords as actions that bestow benefits on some, while imposing costs on others. That's correct. But historically, two-edge broadswords were lethal weapons that could slice, stab and dismember in every direction with equal effectiveness.

2) Today many of our laws and regulations have become lethal double-edged swords in the hands of radical environmentalists who want to eliminate the fossil fuels, pesticides, biotech crops and other technologies that are the foundation of modern agriculture, health, nutrition, manufacturing, transportation, communication and civilization.

Their endangered species swords are highly effective weapons. Acting in consort or in wild independence, radical greens wield these swords with little concern for the havoc they wreak with every thrust and swing.

They can use the Endangered Species Act to prevent farmers from using safe, effective modern *pesticides* – or to block drilling, pipeline, highway and housing projects – by claiming those activities could harm an endangered bird or insect.

Then, with their next swing, they can claim birds, bats and bees will be harmed by *manmade climate change* – caused by plant-fertilizing carbon dioxide – and demand that fossil fuels be replaced by biofuel, wind and solar facilities sprawling across millions of acres ... regardless of the disasters that those supposedly eco-friendly energy systems might have on *other* birds, bats, bees and wildlife.

Property rights and the needs of modern civilization simply go out the window.

3) Consider neonicotinoid pesticides. Derived from nicotine, as their name suggests, neonics have been used for decades, primarily to coat wheat, corn, canola, soybean and other plant seeds, so that the chemical's pest-killing properties are absorbed into plant tissues. Neonics thus target only insects that actually feed on the crops, especially in the early growing season.

Since they don't wash off, neonics also reduce or even eliminate the need for multiple sprays with insecticides that truly can harm bees, birds, fish, other animals and non-pest insects.

By the time the plants flower and attract bees seeking nectar and pollen, the amount of "neonics" in flowers can be measured in a few parts per billion or even per trillion. That's equivalent to a few seconds in 32 to 32 *thousand* years.

All this explains why dozens of extensive studies have found *no harmful effects* from neonics on domesticated or wild bees under *real-world* conditions.

But the fact that neonics can be *detected* in pollen or nectar can give radical greens the ammo they need to seek injunctions to delay or block neonicotinoid use across thousands, millions, even tens of millions of acres.

4) A favorite neonic "victim" is the rusty patched bumblebee. Anti-pesticide groups claim this bee was "once common" in many Northeastern and Midwestern states ... but has experienced rapid population decline over the past twenty years or so because of climate change and neonics.

In reality, say University of Virginia biology professor T'ai Roulston and other experts, rusty patched bee losses are almost certainly related to *disease*, especially a fungal gut parasite that "can shorten the lives of worker bees and disrupt mating success and the survival of queens and males." Bee blood sucking *Varroa destructor* mites and the diseases they carry also play major roles.

Habitat loss is clearly another factor. Cities and suburbs have expanded significantly over the past quarter-century, and farmers have increasingly grown large-scale monoculture crops like corn and canola for food and biofuels.

All of this has reduced rusty patched bumblebee underground nesting sites ... and the varieties of flowers that they and other wild bees prefer.

5) The same diseases and habitat losses have impacted yellow-banded, western and Franklin's bumblebees, and may have driven Franklin's bees into extinction.

Not long ago, even the Xerces Society for Invertebrate Conservation agreed with this analysis. But then anti-pesticide groups, pro-organic farming activists, the Obama Fish and Wildlife Service, and Xerces united in ignoring habitat loss and disease factors ... and blaming pesticides, especially neonics.

They made these chemicals a scapegoat for domesticated and wild bee health problems – despite the lack of evidence for their claims.

In fact, a wide-ranging international study found that only 2% of wild bee species are responsible for 80% of all wild bee crop visits. Most wild bees never even come into contact with crops or the pesticides that supposedly harm them.

Even more compelling, the study determined that the 2% of wild bees that do visit crops – and so would be most exposed to pesticides – are among the healthiest wild bee species on Earth.

Unfortunately for farmers, science and society – radical greens may not have *facts* on their side. But they certainly have power, influence, money, *and* the support of the news media, vocal students and liberal judges.

Their double-edged sword has minimized “mainstream” media coverage of reports like the one I just mentioned. It could easily delay, block or bankrupt farming, drilling, pipeline, road, bridge and housing projects.

6) Their pesticide (and climate) claims can also be used to demand that millions of acres be designated as critical habitat for assorted bumblebee species – and that extensive studies must be conducted before projects can move forward, or even before crops can be planted.

For example, the Fish and Wildlife Service has said *rusty patched* bumblebees are likely to be found “in scattered locations that cover only **0.1%** of the species’ historic range.” However, no one knows what that “historic range” actually was – and 0.1% of the presumed historical range is nearly four million acres – equivalent to Connecticut plus Rhode Island.

Worse, that acreage is widely dispersed in little parcels across *thirteen states* where amateur entomologists have supposedly spotted rusty patched bees since 2000. That’s some 380 million acres: eleven times the size of New York.

No one knows just where those parcels might be. And that lets environmentalist groups and government agencies delay or halt projects, until large areas can be carefully examined for signs of rusty patched bumblebees.

7) More ominously, *yellow-banded*, *western* and *Franklin’s* bumblebees were supposedly once found in tiny areas scattered across a billion acres in some 40 US states! Radical greens also want beetles and other bugs designated as endangered.

The ultimate effect – if not the intent – would be for regulators and courts to let radical groups use “threatened” or “endangered” insects to delay or veto countless projects and activities across large swaths of nearly the entire Lower 48 United States, as well as Alaska and Hawaii.

All this underscores why the Endangered Species Act has to be revised. But it also explains why environmentalists and their allies will battle any proposed changes tooth and nail.

Meanwhile – ironically ... and hypocritically – some of the *real* threats to domesticated and wild bees are pesticides used by *organic* farmers. I know, organic farmers don’t use pesticides – or so they claim.

8) But that’s just a pile of tatonka chesli. (That’s the Dakota Indian word for big buffalo droppings.)

As Professor David Zaruk explains on his RiskMonger.com website –

9) Organic farmers actually employ a dirty dozen highly toxic “natural” pesticides and over 3,000 other “approved” pesticides.

Some of them are highly toxic to bees: acetic acid, copper sulfate, pyrethrins, hydrogen peroxide, rotenone, citronella oil, eucalyptus oil, spinosad and others.

Several “natural,” “organic” pesticides are highly toxic to *humans*. Boron can affect people’s brains, livers and hearts. Rotenone has been linked to Parkinson’s disease. *Nicotine* sulfate is a

nasty, even deadly neurotoxin. And *copper* sulfate can severely injure a gardener's brain, liver, kidneys, stomach and intestinal linings ... or even kill people!

Unfortunately, persuading environmentalists to acknowledge these realities is not likely. They have too much ideology, money, power and prestige invested in their campaigns against synthetic pesticides, conventional farming and biotech GMO crops. And they get billions of dollars from organic food interests.

10) That brings me to **climate change** – or more precisely, *catastrophic manmade climate change*. The kind that sends droves of Extinction Rebellion doomsday activists into the streets ... ranting that fossil-fuel driven climate and weather disasters will send millions of species into oblivion.

I don't have time here to get into temperatures, melting ice caps, polar bears, rising sea levels, more frequent and intense hurricanes and tornadoes, acidic seas or similar mythical disasters. However, I'd be happy to cover some of these issues during the Q and A, over lunch or right after the conference. (See Climate Notes in a separate section at the end of this article.)

Instead, I'm going to talk about what would happen to land use, property rights, wildlife habitats and truly important species – non-insect species, in other words – if we let climate chaos and Green New Deal fanatics eliminate the fossil fuels that provide over *80 percent* of US and global energy ... and *replace* fossil fuels with biofuel, solar, wind and battery power.

11) On this topic, there are three fundamental Rules of Reality.

One: Scientists still cannot separate human influences from the powerful *natural* causes of climate changes and weather events. Blaming climate fluctuations and extreme weather events on humans, fossil fuels and carbon dioxide is pure bunk.

Two: The policy actions that would supposedly stabilize Earth's perpetually *unstable* weather and climate would be far more destructive to our environment than any reasonably likely effects of manmade climate change.

Three: Wind and sunshine may be free, renewable, sustainable and eco-friendly.

However, the technologies, lands and raw materials required to *harness* this widely dispersed, intermittent, weather-dependent energy to benefit humanity absolutely are not. In fact, as Rule Number Two suggests, they cause far more environmental damage than any of the fossil fuel energy sources they would supposedly replace.

Let's start with:

12) Biofuels. US ethanol production currently gobbles up over 40% of America's corn – grown on cropland the size of Iowa ... to displace about 10% of America's gasoline.

Corn ethanol also requires vast quantities of water, pesticides, fertilizers, natural gas, gasoline and diesel ... to produce and transport a fuel that drives up food prices, adversely affects food aid and nutrition in poor countries, damages small engines, and gets one-third fewer miles per gallon than gasoline.

Replacing 100% of US gasoline with ethanol would require some *360 million acres* of biotech corn. That's more than twice the land area of Texas.

But eliminating fossil fuels means we'd also have to replace the oil and natural gas *feed stocks* for pharmaceuticals, cosmetics, wind turbine blades, solar panel films, paints, synthetic fibers, fertilizers ... and *plastics* for cell phones, computers, eyeglasses, car bodies, packaging, and countless other products.

So now we're talking about some *four* times the area of Texas turned into biofuel corn plantations – or canola and soybean farms for biodiesel. How much land would that leave us for *food crops and wildlife*? And that's just to replace *America's* fossil fuels.

They're worried about bumblebee extinctions? other wildlife extinctions? Where the heck are those Extinction Rebellion loonies when it comes to **biofuels**? Do these bumblebee, climate, fossil fuel and other fanatics ever talk to one another?

Maybe they should demand the elimination of biofuels and biofuel crops, to protect all the bugs they want to protect. And we're just getting started.

13) Solar panels on Nevada's Nellis Air Force Base generate a minuscule 15 megawatts of electricity ... about 40% of the year ... from 72,000 panels on 140 acres.

Arizona's Palo Verde nuclear power plant generates *760 times* more electricity, from less land, some 90 to 95 percent of the time.

Generating Palo Verde's electricity output using Nellis technology would require land area *ten times larger* than Washington, DC. And the solar panels would still provide electricity only *30 or 40 percent of the year*, even in the best locations.

Generating the *3.9 billion megawatt-hours* that Americans consumed nationwide in 2018 would mean we'd have to completely blanket twelve million acres – half of Virginia – with solar panels ... and get the Sun to shine at high-noon summertime Arizona intensity 24/7/365, wherever we install those panels.

Obviously, that's not going to happen. So we'd really be talking about blanketing several times the land area of Virginia or New York with solar panels.

But to get a better idea of how many millions of acres of solar panels we would *really* have to install to power American civilization, let's look at **wind energy**.

14) Mandated, subsidized *wind turbines* ... and extensive new *transmission lines* to connect all of them to the electricity grid and urban areas ... likewise require millions of acres – and billions of tons of concrete, steel, copper, rare earth metals and fiberglass.

Like solar panels, wind turbines produce intermittent, unreliable electricity that costs much more than coal or gas-fueled electricity – once subsidies are removed.

Like solar power, wind energy must be backed up by *fossil fuel generators* that have to go from standby to full-power many times a day, very inefficiently, every time the wind stops blowing.

Wind turbine light flicker and infrasonic noise impair human health. Turbines kill numerous raptors, other birds and bats every year: a million or more in the USA alone. Fewer birds and bats also mean vastly more crop-eating and disease-carrying insects.

15) As a quick aside, cow farts are supposedly a far more potent greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide. So cows and beef must be banned ... to save the planet.

But the good news is that killing bats means we'd have a lot more insects to eat, when the Green New Deal crowd imposes Ban Beef-Eat Bugs decrees. We'll have tons of mouth-watering grub burgers, beetles and grasshoppers! Delectable!

16) But back to our topic. Modern coal and gas-fired power plants can generate 600 megawatts ... some 90 to 95 percent of the time ... from less than 300 acres.

Indiana's huge Fowler Ridge industrial wind energy factory also generates 600 megawatts – from 355 turbines ... sprawling across more than 50,000 acres ... less than 30% of the year. With those numbers in mind, just as we did for solar ...

17) Let's suppose we're going to use wind power to replace those 3.9 *billion megawatt-hours* of electricity that the United States consumed in 2018.

Let's also suppose we're going to get rid of all those coal and gas-fired backup power plants ... natural gas for home heating ... coal and natural gas for factories ... and gasoline-powered vehicles. We'll replace them all with wind-based electricity.

We'll also use wind turbines to generate enough extra electricity, every windy day, to charge batteries for just *seven straight windless days*.

AND let's be sure to account for ten percent or more electricity loss along lengthy transmission lines ... and every time we charge and discharge batteries.

It's going to take a *lot* of wind turbines, especially as we are forced to go into lower and lower quality wind locations, and as wind turbines age. That means, instead of generating full nameplate power maybe 33% of the year, on average, they will do so only 16% of the year. So *how many wind turbines* are we talking about?

18) Based on my back-of-the-envelope calculations, instead of the 58,000 we have now, the United States would need some *14 million* turbines, each one 400 feet tall ... each one capable of generating 1.8 megawatts at full capacity, when the wind is blowing at the proper speed.

Assuming a totally inadequate 15 acres apiece, those monster turbines would require some *220 million acres!* That's well over twice the land area of California – without including transmission lines!
(CA = 100 million acres)

Their bird-butchering blades would *wipe out* raptors, other birds and bats across vast stretches of America. What might Extinction Rebellion have to say about *this?*

But each turbine actually needs at least *50 acres* of open space and access roads, and Fowler Ridge uses *120 acres* per turbine. At 50 acres apiece, we're talking about 700 million acres – *seven times* California. At 120 acres per turbine, we'd need 1,700 million acres – ten times Texas ... or most of the Lower 48 United States!

Eagles, hawks, falcons, vultures, geese and other high-flying birds and bats would virtually disappear from our skies. Insects, rabbits, mice and rats would proliferate.

19) Manufacturing those wind turbines would require something on the order of:

- 4 billion tons of steel, copper and alloys for the towers and turbines;
- 8 billion tons of steel and concrete for the foundations;
- 4 million tons of rare earth metals for motors, magnets and other components;
- 1 billion tons of petroleum-based composites for the nacelle covers and turbine blades; and

- massive quantities of rock and gravel for millions of miles of access roads to the turbines.

20) All these materials must be *mined, processed, smelted ... manufactured* into finished products ... and *shipped* all over the world. That would require removing *hundreds of billions* of tons of earth and rock overburden – and crushing and processing *tens of billions* of tons of ore.

Connecting all those turbines to our cities would require thousands of miles of high-voltage transmission lines ... more raw materials ... and more millions of acres.

Just imagine the land use, eminent domain and property rights impacts.

Every step in this process would also require massive amounts of *fossil fuels*, because wind turbines and solar panels cannot operate earth moving and mining equipment – or produce consistently high enough heat to smelt, melt, pour and shape silica, iron, copper, rare earth or other materials ... and operate factories.

21) Most “renewable” energy advocates – including the Democrat presidential candidates – detest fossil fuels.

They want to *eliminate* the coal and gas backup power plants we now rely on, so that our electricity-based homes, offices, hospitals and factories don’t shut down for hours or days on end, whenever the wind and sunshine stop cooperating.

They want *battery power* backup for intermittent, weather-dependent industrial wind and solar facilities that they demand we install.

So ... how many *massive battery arrays* would we need – to power our modern, industrialized, computerized, social media civilization ... AND store enough electricity for seven straight windless days?

Once again, based on my back-of-the-envelope calculations ...

22) something on the order of *one billion* 100-kilowatt-hour, 1,000-pound lithium and cobalt-based battery packs – similar to what Tesla uses in its electric cars!

Would any of you like to calculate the land, energy and raw materials that would be required to manufacture and install all those batteries?

Oh, by the way, that number does not include the extra battery storage we would need to power all the cars, trucks and buses the Democrats want to replace with heavily subsidized *electric* vehicles – and recharge *them* every few hours.

So you’ll have to factor in the raw materials we’d need for all *those* batteries.

And then you will have to factor in the fact that these batteries, wind turbines and solar panels would have to be *replaced* every few years – far more often than we have to replace coal, gas, nuclear or hydroelectric power plants.

Oh – one more little detail. Even Elon Musk’s enormous Tesla Gigafactory near Reno, Nevada would take *centuries* to make all those batteries. But I’m sure Mr. Musk would be happy to build more factories ... if *taxpayers* finance the effort.

23) Here’s yet another bucket of icy cold reality we should dump over the heads of Green New Dealers. Their wind, solar, biofuel and battery utopia would require *the biggest expansion in mining the world has ever seen*.

But when was the last time any environmentalist or Democrat supported opening a single mine?

Maybe they expect magic, minerals manna from Gaia – or finished products beamed down from the Starship Enterprise.

And don't forget **the trash**. What *are* we going to do with all those worn-out and broken-down turbines, panels and batteries? While all those pious, virtue-signaling Earth Protectors are running around banning *plastic straws* ...

24) the International Renewable Energy Agency has said disposing of just the worn out solar panels ... that the UN wants erected around the world by 2050 ... under the Paris Climate Treaty's solar energy goals ... could result in *two times the tonnage* of the United States' *total plastic waste* in 2017!

Are these Green New Dealers simply incapable of seeing the yawning chasm between their flowery sustainability rhetoric and con-artistry ... and their anti-mining, anti-fossil-fuel attitudes?

That brings me to the dirtiest pseudo-renewable, pseudo-sustainable energy secret of all – the one these folks absolutely do not want to talk about:

25) *Slave and child labor*. Thanks to rabid environmentalist opposition, the United States and Europe no longer permit much mining within their borders.

And the same groups that extol the virtues of wind, solar and battery power are equally opposed to *Western* mining companies extracting rare earth, lithium, cadmium, cobalt and other minerals almost anywhere on Planet Earth – even under rigorous Western labor, safety, environmental and reclamation rules.

That means those materials are mined and processed in places like Baotou, Inner Mongolia, and the Democratic Republic of Congo, mostly under Chinese control.

They are dug out and processed by fathers, mothers and *children* – often under horrific, unsafe, inhuman conditions that few of us can even imagine ... under labor, wage, health and safety standards that even nineteenth century robber barons probably wouldn't have tolerated.

Those renewable energy, high-tech slaves get a few pennies or dollars a day – while risking cave-ins ... and being exposed constantly to filthy, toxic, radioactive mud, dust, water and air. The mining and industrial areas become vast toxic wastelands, where nothing grows, and no people or wildlife can live.

For cobalt alone – say UNICEF and Amnesty International – over *40,000* Congolese children ... as young as four years old ... slave away in mines, from sunrise to sundown, six or even seven days a week. A lot of them die.

And that's *today* – for *today's* battery needs. Imagine how many child and slave laborers will be needed to serve the Green New Deal “ethical green energy utopia.”

In fact, Green New Dealers and their allies demand *perfection* from Western mining companies – and *zero* mining in the West. But they don't seem to give a spotted owl hoot about any of this.

26) I'd bet every one of them supports sustainable, ethical, human rights-based coffee, sneakers, T-shirts, handbags and diamonds. Absolutely no child labor, sweat shop ... or toxic, polluted workplace conditions ... tolerated.

But they have had little or nothing to say about the Chinese, Russian and other companies that run the horrid operations that provide their wind turbines, solar panels, smart grids – and batteries for their cell phones, laptops, Teslas and backup electrical power.

In fact, I've never seen them make ethical wind turbines, solar panels and batteries an issue. I've never seen them stage protests outside a Chinese, Russian or Congolese embassy – much less outside corporate headquarters in Beijing, Moscow or Kinshasa. They probably just don't want to get shot or sent to gulags.

In fact, just a couple months ago, California legislators *voted down* Assembly Bill 735. That bill simply said the virtuous state of California would **certify** that “zero emission” electric vehicles sold within the state must be *free of any materials or components that involve child labor*.

The issue is complicated, the legislators said. It would be too hard to enforce. It would imperil state climate goals. And besides, lots of other industries also use child labor ... they “explained.”

The bottom line here is simple.

27) There is no such thing as a free lunch. Wind, solar, biofuel and battery power are *not* free, clean, green, renewable, sustainable, eco-friendly or ethical.

America and the world cannot afford to let delusion, dishonesty and ideology drive public policies that will determine our future jobs, prosperity, living standards, health, personal freedoms, property rights and civilization.

What the Democratic Party and its presidential candidates are talking about has nothing to do with stopping dangerous manmade climate change – or with *real* sustainability, resource conservation or environmental protection.

It has everything to do with increasingly socialist ... largely taxpayer-financed ... activists, politicians, regulators and crony capitalists controlling people's lives ... dictating our energy use, economic growth, job opportunities and living standards

... eliminating free enterprise capitalism ... and redistributing global wealth as they see fit – and getting richer, more powerful and more privileged in the process.

28) Meanwhile the *rest* of us – especially poor, minority and working class families – pay the price. And the world's most destitute families ... in hungry, impoverished, electricity-deprived nations ... pay the highest price.

China, India, Indonesia and Africa are not about to give up their determined efforts to take their *rightful, God-given places* among Earth's healthy and prosperous people. They are not going to stop using fossil fuels to reach their goals.

29) Their billions of people are not going to let anyone – including the UN, EU, US Democrats and other eco-imperialists – tell them they can never enjoy those blessings. Or that they will be “*allowed*” to improve their health and living standards only a *little* ... only at the *margins* ... only to the extent that they can do so with wind, solar and cow dung power.

30) That's why, even as the United States *reduced* its carbon dioxide emissions by 12 percent between 2000 and 2017 – **India's** plant-fertilizing CO2 emissions soared by *140 percent* ...

China's CO2 emissions skyrocketed *194 percent* ...

and other developing country CO2 emissions also climbed ... greening Planet Earth.

That means even *totally eliminating* US fossil fuel use would do absolutely nothing to reduce global CO2 and greenhouse gas emissions. Not that it matters for climate and weather ... which are NOT controlled by carbon dioxide or other greenhouse gases.

So why, in heaven's name – while all these countries continue using more and more fossil fuels to improve their economies, health and living standards – why would the United States want to join Green New Deal Democrats and some crazy European countries ... in a ban-fossil-fuels *economic suicide pact*?

In fact, I'll go a step further – and I do not say this lightly or casually.

31) The climate change / Green New Deal agenda is *eco-fascist and totalitarian*.

It seeks to impose an economic system under which an autocratic national or international government would not *own* companies outright. But it sure would *dictate* what they can and cannot make, do, sell and say ... down to smallest details.

Those are the hallmarks of fascist economics. And Green New Dealers seek to do this based on big, constantly repeated, highly suspect *to outright false* claims about pesticides, dangerous manmade climate change, sustainability and renewable energy.

32) They are also doing all they can to impose an intolerant thought-control police state that allows no discussion or dissent. A government that tells us non-ruling-elites what we can find and post online – what we can think, read, write and say.

Along with Google, Face Book, YouTube, Twitter, Spotify, Wikipedia, universities and the so-called mainstream media – they are trying to censor, marginalize, ostracize, disinvite, shadow-ban, electronic book burn, and algorithm-eradicate differing, alternative, contrarian evidence and perspectives ... on where we are and *ought* to be heading.

Some of them even want to put climate and energy dissenters like me in jail ... or a gulag ... for daring to challenge their claims and agendas.

33) As for property rights and individual freedoms – everything will be defined and dictated by *their* definitions of sustainability, renewability, environmental and endangered species protection, responsible capitalism, and climate justice. They will exempt themselves from their tyrannical dictates, *but will decide for you*:

Whether you will have electricity when you need it ... or when it's available.

Whether your favorite grassland or forest will be bulldozed for a transmission line, biofuel farm, or industrial scale wind or solar energy factory.

Whether wind turbines, solar panels, battery centers or transmission lines will be constructed across your farm, ranch or backyard.

Whether you will be able to reject wind turbines near your home because of sleep loss and other adverse health effects.

Whether you can raise cattle, pigs or chickens ... and eat beef, pork and poultry – or will have to dine on juicy maggots and crispy grasshoppers.

What kind of car you can have ... maybe whether you can even *own* a car ... and how many airline flights you can take for business, pleasure or vacation;

After all, saving Planet Earth has to be our primary, overriding concern. As they like to say, There is no Planet B. To which I say: We will never tolerate Eco-Fascism.

34) We demand serious, honest, robust debates on *all* these issues ... based on *evidence and reality* – with *all* interested and *affected* parties participating – *including* Republicans, farmers, factory workers, America’s and the world’s poor, energy realists, and manmade climate chaos skeptics ... along with Democrats, environmentalists and other would-be ruling elites.

It’s time for tough, pointed but respectful discourse – time to approach these critical, life-and-death decisions thoughtfully, not tendentiously ... democratically, not dictatorially ... in our classrooms, news rooms, social media, town hall meetings, state houses, and halls of Congress ... *before* our 2020 elections.

35) Thank you.

Climate Notes

Addressing some of the most common claims about the “climate crisis”

36) Carbon pollution? It’s not *carbon* pollution. Carbon is soot – and our cars, factories and power plants emit very little soot anymore. It’s *carbon dioxide* – the colorless, odorless, invisible gas that we exhale ... and plants need to grow.

Earth’s atmospheric CO₂ level is now 400 parts per million – 0.04 percent. And that increasing amount is helping to GREEN the Earth, helping plants grow faster and better, and making them more drought resistant, than 30 years ago.

It stretches the bounds of scientific evidence and credibility to say that this tiny bit of CO₂ is now driving climate change that has happened throughout Earth and human history ... that it is driving dangerous, unprecedented climate and weather changes that simply are not happening ... or that it has somehow replaced the fluctuations in solar energy, cosmic rays, clouds, oceanic circulation, volcanoes, planetary orbits and dozens of other powerful natural causes of climate change.

37) Temperatures certainly have risen since the last Pleistocene Ice Age ... a lot, actually. Thank goodness – or North America and Europe would still be under a mile of ice, sea levels would be 400 feet lower than they are – and North America would still be connected to Russia and China by a thousand-mile-long land bridge.

We also had the Roman and Medieval Warm Periods, followed by the *Little Ice Age*, from 1350 to around 1800. Average global temperatures have risen maybe three degrees Fahrenheit since the Little Ice Age ended – again thank goodness, or we’d have a lot less arable land and much shorter growing seasons.

That post-1800 timeframe is also the beginning of the modern industrial and fossil fuel era. That lets climate alarmists blame rising temperatures on fossil fuels.

That’s a real stretch. But it’s an even bigger stretch to claim that less than one more degree Fahrenheit of average global warming would bring planetary disaster

38) Climate models. There’s a huge amount of guess work involved with temperatures, especially since claims about record temperatures are based primarily on measurements taken in and around cities and airports, where they are contaminated by asphalt, vehicle, airplane and air conditioning exhaust heat – and based on climate models that already predict temperatures **nearly one full degree Fahrenheit above** what satellites and weather balloons actually measure.

39) Extreme weather – Tornadoes. More frequent and more intense?

Actually, from 1950 to 1984, the US averaged **55** violent F4 to F5 tornadoes every year. But over the next 34 years (1985 to 2018) only **35** per year. And NOT ONE violent F4 to F5 tornado touched down anywhere in the United States in 2018 ... the first time in recorded history that ever happened.

40) Hurricanes. More frequent and more intense? Not according to government records. From 1920 through 2005, **fifty-two** Category 3 to 5 hurricanes made US landfall. And then, from October 2005 until August 2017 – nearly twelve years – **not one** Category 3 to 5 hurricane struck the US mainland.

The previous record was nine years, set in the Civil War era, 1860-1869.

Then of course we got hammered by Harvey and Irma in 2017, by Michael in 2018. And Dorian certainly devastated the Bahamas.

But looking at government records that go back all the way to 1851, there is simply NO TREND – and no way to separate human from natural *cycles or influences*.

Obviously, if carbon dioxide governs our climate and weather – it is carbon dioxide that slashed the number and intensity of America’s hurricanes and tornadoes.

41) Melting Arctic ice? Ice trends up there tend to be cyclical, and what we see today is pretty much within what’s been observed over the past couple of centuries.

The *Washington Post* did report that “the Arctic Ocean is warming up ... and in some places seals are finding the water too hot.” But that was in **1922**. And explorers wrote about Arctic ice cycles long before that.

“We were astonished by the total absence of ice in Barrow Strait,” British explorer Francis McClintock wrote in **1860**. “I was here at this time in **1854**. It was still frozen up” – and some crewmen doubted we would be able to escape.

Another report said: “Snows are less frequent and less deep, and the rivers scarcely ever [freeze over] now.” That was Thomas Jefferson in **1799**.

42) Dangerously rising sea levels? After rising some 400 feet since the last ice age ended about 12,000 years ago, oceans are rising at about 7 to 10 inches per century. Not much of a threat there – and no increase at all in the RATE of sea level rise.

And don’t forget the role of **land subsidence** in a number of areas, including the Chesapeake Bay area near Baltimore ... Hampton Roads, Virginia ... and the Houston and Miami areas.

43) Acidic seas? Oceans are slightly *alkaline*. They may be getting very slightly less alkaline, depending on where and when scientists measure pH levels. But they are a long way from becoming acidic.

44) The 97% consensus on climate science. Total garbage – American Geophysical Union survey ... John Cook analysis of scientific abstracts ... Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine petition project

45) Power and control: Lester Brown.

47) Power and control: Christiana Figueres and Ottmar Edenhofer.

45) Power and control: Al Gore.

45) Power and control: John Holdren.

Droughts? Trends and intensities differ little from historic trends and cycles – and the destructive Dust Bowl, Anasazi and Mayan droughts lasted years or decades.

Forest fires? There are actually fewer fires than in past decades – and they are primarily due to the unconscionable failure to remove hundreds of millions of dead and diseased trees that provide tinder for massive conflagrations. (CA alone has 129 million dead trees)