

Global Warming Hyperbole (Part 2)

Here are some additional reasons for Climate Change skepticism:

- Carbon footprint. It is the epitome of hypocrisy when the wealthy fly private jets to global warming conferences, eco-conscious celebrities are chauffeured in gas-guzzling limousines to movie openings and award ceremonies, and performing artists fly and truckload staff and equipment from city to city on a worldwide tour, all the while preaching ecological platitudes during their performances. Perhaps when they heat, cool, and light their mansions with genuine renewable energy sources, and walk, ride bikes, or at least carpool to their destinations, skeptics will begin to believe. Whatever happened to leading by example? Imagine a rally to save a local park from development. Celebrities, politicians, and other speakers lament what would be the loss of pristine beauty. They call for the community to come together and do whatever it takes to save the park. After the rally ends, paper bags, empty water bottles, plastic bags, flyers, and other assorted debris litter the park. Would anyone really believe that the speakers and their supporters were serious? And why is it acceptable to exclude the rich and famous from practicing what they preach, simply by virtue of their position?
- Carbon Credits. This brings us to carbon credits. Paying a company to invest in green energy might be a sound investment; using that investment as an excuse to continue a carbon-profligate lifestyle is duplicitous. Many Climate Change leaders claim to be “carbon neutral” simply because they purchased carbon credits. The easiest way to see if this works is by asking a simple question. What if everyone bought carbon credits, technically became carbon neutral, but continued to live in disregard to their lifestyle? Clearly, this would accomplish very little in fighting Climate Change. We do not possess the technology for the entire world or even entire nations to become carbon neutral. Carbon credits are a way for very rich people to “buy” their way out of altering their lifestyles. This gives the impression of real sacrifice for the cause, and allows them to continue to denounce those who remain skeptical of Climate Change. During the American Civil War, the wealthy avoided fighting in the battles by paying a fee or finding a substitute. They may have contributed to the cause but everyone knows they did not participate in the actual fighting.

- Kyoto Treaty. During the Clinton Administration, the Kyoto Treaty failed to secure even a single vote in the US Senate. Among its many proposals, the Kyoto Protocol attempted to set worldwide standard carbon emissions. Not even “environmental senators” voted for it. Nearly all global greenhouse emission proposals exclude China (the largest “carbon polluter” country) and India, the two most populous countries in the world. The argument against their inclusion is primarily economics. Emission cuts will cripple their economies, leading to an increase in poverty. If this is true for China and India’s economies, it is also true for other countries as well. In addition, proponents argue that those two countries, and Third World or Developing countries, should be exempted, because they did not cause the problem. Culpability lies with the Western industrial countries. Even if this is true, exempting countries from emissions only worsens the problem, since they will continue to emit greenhouse gasses. Is the goal to assuage our Western guilt or save the planet?
- Satellite evidence. Large storms recorded from weather satellites are visually impressive. Experts point to video of huge storms and claim that their enormous size reflects the impact of Climate Change. They make a similar argument with Arctic sea ice. Through satellites, we can now accurately measure the summer meltback of ice each year, and science can confirm that the polar ice cap has shrunk in the past few decades. However, while these observations might indicate a change in climate, according to NASA, the first successful Geosynchronous Satellite was launched in 1964. Polar satellites did not exist until the 1970s. We simply do not possess any satellite data before that time. Thus, from a climate perspective, most of this scientific information and observation, while valid, is very recent.
- Al Gore. It certainly does not help a scientific movement when the person most associated with that undertaking is a politician. No doubt, people hold different opinions about the politics and personality of former Vice President Al Gore. But what is not debatable is that he possesses no scientific training. I would also argue that he does not understand scientific argument or method, and it is unparalleled chutzpah when he questions the scientific expertise of those who disagree with him. If having a former politician like Al Gore as the face of fighting Climate

Change does not bother you, then imagine that face is Dick Cheney, Tony Blair, John Howard, Stephen Harper, or even Sarah Palin.

- Transfer of Wealth. It also does not help the cause of Climate Change when there is official discussion at the international level about the transfer of wealth from the wealthy countries to the poorer countries. Remember, the stated objective of Climate Change fighters is to lower carbon emissions worldwide. That goal is sensible and desirable. However, transferring money from one group to another is social engineering, and once again an attempt to placate Western guilt. It certainly has little to do with lowering world carbon emissions.

Previous article: [Global Warming Hyperbole \(Part 1\)](#)

Next article: [Is There a Seven Year Curse on America?](#)