

Jack Venrick

From: "Jack Venrick" <jacksranch@skynetbb.com>
To: "AJack R. Venrick" <jacksranch@skynetbb.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 19, 2008 11:30 PM
Attach: topbar_01.jpg; topbar_02.jpg; topbar_03.jpg; topbar_04.gif; spacer.gif
Subject: Climate Catastrophe for Washington by Dr. Michael R. Fox

Sent: Thursday, July 03, 2008 10:09 PM
Subject: Climate Catastrophe for Washington by Dr. Michael R. Fox

To: Freedom Movement, Washington State Collectivists Senate and House, King Collectivist County, King County Ag, Association of Washington Collectivist Cities,

This is a great article on the front page of the Evergreen Freedom Foundaion "Living Liberty" newspaper. If you are not signed up for this newspaper, it is well worth subscribing to -

<http://www.effwa.org/main/page.php?number=147>

Jack Venrick
 Enumclaw, Washington

<http://www.hawaiireporter.com/story.aspx?bfd2938-0f3d-4c06-949c-b1837a5ccd9>



Climate Catastrophe for Washington

By Michael R. Fox Ph.D., 5/29/2008 8:04:28 AM

Author's note: The Heritage Foundation has just completed a state by state analysis of the economic impacts of the Lieberman-Warner bill on Global Climate Change legislation. This will only add to the significant costs of the Washington State legislation. With billion dollar subsidies for farmers, ethanol, wind farms, solar, geothermal, and huge energy taxes and rationing back to levels of the 1800s, can't we elect people who won't steal our wealth, property, prosperity, and freedoms for personal power, favored lobbyists, and futile purposes?

But the catastrophe will be legislative, not bad weather. The State of Washington recently passed a Greenhouse Emissions Law ESSHB 2815. It creates a framework for reducing greenhouse emissions in the Washington economy. It is massive in scope and disastrous in nature. To pass legislation to ration energy and taxing it higher at a time when food and gas prices are rising will be destructive to the state and nation.

This legislation reflects the agendas and values of many Washington State legislators and their green supporters. In general these agendas are destructive and as we will see more than a little totalitarian in nature. This is especially noticeable in the 30 years of environmental attacks on the nation's electrical supply systems.

We have had antinuclear forces opposing nuclear energy, others opposing the hydro systems and the electricity it produces, and now opposing fossil fuel energy through restricting CO2 emissions. Collectively, these represent nearly 98% of the nation's total suppliers of electricity. Try to imagine your home, business, and family if 98% of the electricity were shutdown. And no, ethanol won't cure this staggering problem, nor will unreliable, intermittent, heavily

subsidized windmills and solar facilities fill the energy gap. This bill is a recipe for catastrophe.

Important Features of the Bill

The bureaucratic processes leading up to the research and drafting of the legislation helps explain why this is such a dangerous bill for the economy and people of the State of Washington.

First, there are major problems with the body of scientific research used as a basis for the legislation. One of them was the singular assumption that manmade CO₂ was a major culprit, and needed to be limited.

To disparage the important role of CO₂, it is now redefined as a pollutant, instead of an essential life-giving material. CO₂ is well known to be an essential chemical in the crucially important process of photosynthesis. This process assembles CO₂ and water to produce life-giving cellulose and the precious oxygen. Nearly all plant life needs CO₂, and nearly all animal life needs both the oxygen produced as well as the plant food containing the cellulose. To proclaim CO₂ as a pollutant is little more than an uninformed sneer.

Secondly, the promoters of warming have also redefined other terms to better suit their agendas. The term "global warming" has been changed to "climate change" to permit implicating man's activities as the cause of nearly all sorts of natural disasters. These include hurricanes, tornados, blizzards, and recently obesity---honest.

To help implement the intrusive and costly features of the bill, it calls for the hiring of 16000 new employees, public and private, bringing this effort to a total of 25,000 people, all paid for by the taxpayers, forever. As a rough estimate this will cost more than \$2 billion dollars annually, forever. There will be enormous long-term costs from this program, with little upside benefits.

Third, the legislation also calls for limiting the per-vehicle miles the citizens can travel by 50%. Granted this is a goal 4 decades into the future, with travel restrictions beginning before then, but legislating such draconian edicts in a state and nation so large, means that families' interstate travel will be severely impacted, not to mention the engines of commerce like trucks and trains. Notice that this has nothing to do with increased fuel efficiencies for cars. This isn't science. This is governmental tyranny.

Fourth, the legislation calls for CO₂ emissions to be 50 % below the emissions of 1990. This is madness, costly madness, with little potential benefit. A number of EU nations which have adopted such commitments are not reducing their CO₂ emissions at all, but are rapidly increasing them. The US as a matter of cost reductions and energy efficiency, is doing much better than the EU nations in restraining such emissions without such commitments. Two Spanish steel mills have recently left Spain and resettled in the US because of rising costs of energy in Europe.

Fifth, the legislation does not spell out the desired target temperature the bill seeks. Without such a target, we can never know when we have succeeded, and the program would go on forever. It would also help if the bill described why the targeted cooler temperature is more desirable. The state is coming out of one of the coldest winters and heaviest snowfalls in its history. It would be helpful if the legislators would tell us what was so desirable with such a brutish, long winter, and why we should spend billions to get more of them.

Sixth, there has been the state-imposed policy to forbid discussions of the underlying science of global warming. Such a repressive policy reeks of political arrogance, driven perhaps an aversion to robust scientific inquiry. George Will recently got it right when he said "People only insist that a debate stop when they are afraid of what might be learned if it continues." New climate research findings are being published weekly. Other studies are also finding that major pillars of the global warming theory are crumbling.

A number of years ago this author was a participant in a Hearing of the Washington State House of Representatives (Agriculture Committee) on this subject. One supporter of man-made global warming from the University of Washington presented the Committee with the now famous "Hockeystick" graph of global temperatures over the past 1000 years.

This graph has now been thoroughly discredited and does not accurately describe the actual observed temperature record, and brought very harsh criticisms from the National Academy of Sciences. Now the state leaders want to ignore such findings, avoid discussions, or take any corrective action based on the new evidence.

A recent test of 22 climate models also demonstrated the inability of the models to replicate actual temperatures observed at low latitudes. All of these models made estimates which were too high; all of them overstated the observed temperatures. This is the very definition of an upward temperature bias. State environmental policies made on the basis of such computer climate models are similarly flawed. Other upward biases have also been determined. Notably, there have been no downward biases found. These errors thus appear to be systematic, and not random. This is very telling.

Seventh, while worrying about CO₂ emissions, the bill's notable failure to suggest the CO₂-free energy option, nuclear energy, indicates a lack of seriousness in solving the CO₂ problem. France now generates almost 80% of its electricity using nuclear energy, and it also enjoys some of the cleanest air in the industrialized world.

It should be of interest to the readers that the single nuclear power plant in the state, the Columbia Generating Plant, is now producing some of the lowest cost electricity in the state, at 3.2 center kw-hr. This is lower than cost of electricity from some of the Northwest's hydroelectric dams. Is it the intention of the legislature to ration energy, increase energy costs, cripple industry and the economy, and destroy jobs? If so, say so. This bill will do so. Eighth, this bill does not mention that of all the greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, water vapor represents about 95% of the total. Water vapor is involved with infrared absorption (heat), with cloud formation, and with precipitation, all of which have large and poorly understood impacts on the climate. We don't even know whether water vapor warms or cools the climate, let alone its magnitude.

The omissions of the effects of water vapor on the climate indicate a poor understand of what a greenhouse gas is. To suggest that the scientific basis for this legislation is sufficiently known to justify billions in new taxes is clearly not demonstrated. We don't know the climate processes well enough to do so. No one does.

Ninth, as a general observation there are no provisions in the bill to provide transparency in the overall costs of implementing this program. There are few provisions of agency transparency, accountability, and notably there are no provisions to evaluate and distribute the cost/benefit analyses incurred by the program. What will be the measurable benefits, if any, and how will you know unless you quantify them? How will the taxpayers know whether they are getting their money's worth from the billions they will pay?

Examples of global cooling

Escaping notice by the media, the greens, and Hollywood, many locations and surface temperature stations have shown cooling for decades. For example, there was a famous period between 1940 and 1975 where global temperatures were declining. Remember those scary times in the 70's of a looming Ice Age. The media, fiction writers, and some errant PhDs were screaming doom and gloom about a coming ice age. While the temperatures actually declined during this period, the use of fossil fuels (and the release of CO₂), increased 6-fold. We are repeatedly told that CO₂ causes global warming yet it did not during this time.

The temperature station at the Amundson-Scott base at the South Pole has shown a cooling trend since it started in 1957. Yet the CO₂ levels rose more than 10% during that time. Is CO₂ warming, cooling, or none of the above? A number of surface temperature stations in the State of Washington also have shown cooling for decades as well. Ritzville shows a decline since 1918 and the Spokane station shows a decline since 1880, or 128 years.

Recently, as reported in *Science Magazine*, global temperatures have not risen for the past 10 years, while CO₂ rose. All of the above examples of surface stations showing cooling trends, are contrary to and do not support the hypothesis of CO₂ causing warming. It most certainly does not support the theory that man-made CO₂ (a small fraction of the total atmospheric CO₂) causes warming. The rules of logic tell us that one cause cannot produce two

opposite effects.

The Political Agenda

The agenda behind this massive movement is part of the continued effort initiated by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) nearly 2 decades ago. The agenda includes doing harm to the West in general and to the United States in particular. There at the famous 1992 Rio Conference, Maurice Strong, a major leader of the United Nations declared: "Isn't the only hope for the planet that the industrialized civilizations collapse? Isn't it our responsibility to bring that about?"

It is amazing that our elected officials seem to be unaware of this agenda, instead supporting this horrific agenda through legislative actions. Another past Democratic governor of Washington State wrote extensively about this agenda, as she witnessed it unfold as a participant of the Rio Conference.

Dixy Lee Ray noted in her book, "Environmental Overkill" that about 5% of the agenda discussed environmental issues while the remaining 95% of the effort discussed wealth transfer methods from the developed nations. As Vaclav Klaus, president of the Czech Republic, told us about in March 2008, at an international conference on global warming in New York City, "It's not about the climate." Washington State leaders would do well to read Ray's book, or Klaus's warnings.

This horrific agenda has been pushed, promoted, and embraced by many nations of the world. It has also been promoted and embraced by a large fraction of the main stream media, not to mention Hollywood. Thoughts of even more Western billions being transferred to Third World despots seem irresistible, especially when Western governors are promoting it, including the State of Washington.

In 1994 ABC's Ted Koppel showed himself to be an exception among media personalities in demanding that actual science be used in global warming issues. Al Gore had contacted Koppel to seek his aid to discredit some of Gore's critics.

Koppel concluded his interview with Al Gore by noting: "There is some irony in the fact that Vice President Gore---one of the most scientifically literate men to sit in the White House in this century---[is] resorting to political means to achieve what should ultimately be resolved on a purely scientific basis. The measure of good science is neither the politics of the scientist nor the people with whom the scientist associates. It is the immersion of hypotheses into the acid of truth. That's the hard way to do it, but it's the only way that works."

Even worse, the Washington State governor has put an administrative muzzle on the public by forbidding any discussion of the science. The prevailing paradigm is "the science has spoken" or "The science debate is over". In fact there has been too little debate, and way too much onerous, one-sided assertions, dominated with the belief that computer models actually produce evidence. They don't.

Michael R. Fox, Ph.D., a science and energy reporter for Hawaii Reporter and a science analyst for the Grassroot Institute of Hawaii, is retired and now lives in Eastern Washington. He has nearly 40 years experience in the energy field. He has also taught chemistry and energy at the University level. His interest in the communications of science has led to several communications awards, hundreds of speeches, and many appearances on television and talk shows. He can be reached via email at <mailto:mike@foxreport.org>

HawaiiReporter.com reports the real news, and prints all editorials submitted, even if they do not represent the viewpoint of the editors, as long as they are written clearly. Send editorials to <mailto:Malia@HawaiiReporter.com>

[Fox Energy and Environment Reports...](#)

[Email To a Friend](#)
[Printable version of this story...](#)

Hawaii's Online
Resource for Business
and Government Record

Hawaii Reporter
1314 S. King St., Suite
1163
Honolulu, Hawaii 96814

**Information and
Subscription**
Phone: 808-524-4500
Fax: 808-524-4594
Subscribe@HawaiiReporter.com

City Desk
Phone: 808-306-3161
Fax: 808-524-4594
Tips@HawaiiReporter.com

www.HawaiiReporter.com