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**SYSTEM CHANGE TO REDUCE CLIMATE CHANGE**

Climate Change – Point of No Return


By [Black Agenda Report](http://www.commondreams.org/views/2014/08/07/climate-change-point-no-return)

Time’s up, or so planet earth seems to be telling humanity. Extreme weather conditions around the globe, including rising temperatures, droughts, crop failures, melting sea ice, rising sea levels, disappearing glaciers and the loss of plant and animal species all point in only one direction. The tipping point towards the sixth great extinction is taking place right now.

It is clear that these problems are all human made. Rising carbon dioxide levels caused by fossil fuel emissions are creating a series of catastrophes in ecosystems around the world.
The processes are clear to anyone who pays attention.

Two large craters, one more than 200 feet in diameter, were recently discovered in the remote Yamal peninsula of northern Russia. In an extreme case of irony, Yamal is said to mean “end of the world” in the local Nenets language. Scientists have concluded that the holes were formed when a mixture of salt, water and natural methane gas exploded underground. They theorize that rising temperatures made the permafrost unstable and released methane, the key ingredient in the explosions. A temperature rise of only two degrees centigrade is enough to make permafrost thaw and begin a chain of terrible events.

“The tipping point towards the sixth great extinction is taking place right now.”

All of the bad news is relevant as the United Nations prepares to host a Climate Summit on September 23, 2014 in New York. Past climate conferences haven’t provided much in the way of relief, as the United States and other industrialized nations subverted the 2009 Copenhagen climate accords. The supposedly environmentalist president Barack Obama and his European cohorts forced an agreement that allowed a two degrees increase in temperature. This seemingly small amount will kill humans and other species and brought the giant holes to Siberia and now more dangerously, methane from the sea.

Climatologist Jason Box recently made this pithy comment on Twitter. “If even a small fraction of Arctic sea floor carbon is released to the atmosphere, we're f'd.”

As the situation is dire, so must the solutions be truly radical. The free for all of capitalism is deadly in so many ways as financial collapse, exploitation and wars bring misery to millions of people. Money is the problem and not individual decision making. We may feel useful when recycling trash or driving hybrid vehicles but these are bandages when the
world needs major surgery. “Green capitalism” is doomed because capitalism can’t be green. The imperative to maximize profits is in direct conflict with environmental and human sustainability. The profit motive must be eliminated in favor of managed economies that limit growth, fairly distribute resources, regulate the polluting industries and activities, and end the gross inequalities of this gilded age.

Money is the elephant in the climate change room. Corporations are beholden to no one but themselves, only claiming to be like human beings when they really want to get their way with governments and citizens around the world. “Corporate personhood” is a one way street and everything from income inequality to planetary destruction is the proof. [See Naomi Kline’s This Changes Everything; Lester Brown, The Great Transition; Magdoff and Foster, What Every Environmentalist Needs to Know about Capitalism. –Dick]

“Green capitalism is doomed because capitalism can’t be green.”

Recently residents of Toledo, Ohio and southeast Michigan literally had no water to drink for three days. A combination of sewage, live stock manure, and fertilizer run-off create algae blooms which spread more rapidly because of rising temperatures. If the amount of algae grows enough it contaminates drinking water from lake Erie. The causes of this recurring problem are well known but the obvious solution of regulating the businesses responsible for the problems doesn’t happen and the inaction is a direct result of corporate power flexing political muscle. The Fertilizer Institute is the industry lobby which makes sure that neither federal nor local regulators restrict the use of fertilizers which deprived 500,000 people of drinkable water. Acquiescence to corporate interest makes life itself untenable. Unfortunately, the elites will not suffer in the collapse as much as the rest of us will. Poor
Detroit residents live with the threat of a privatization plan which begins with the loss of access to water, while golf courses and publicly financed stadiums owe the city $30 million in unpaid water bills without facing any loss of this resource. On the very same day that struggling people were forced to accept pension cuts, the wealthy owners of the Detroit Red Wings hockey team unveiled plans for a publicly financed stadium and said nothing about paying the overdue water bill at Joe Louis arena.

The 1% will make the rest of us suffer slowly before suffering at all themselves. They will still get plenty of water, or energy, or land or whatever the rest of us lack. The end will not come as Hollywood tells us, with a sudden cataclysm. It is moving surely but slowly enough to keep some people safe while others suffer."Maintaining the status quo means the end of life on the planet."

The People's Climate March scheduled to take place on September 21 in New York cannot be just a feel good precursor to the United Nations meeting. It must have as part of its agenda a critique of the world financial system. The criminals who must be exposed aren’t just in New York and London either. India and China poison the air and their citizens in a mad dash to catch up with the other industrial polluters of the world.

There are many villains in this story but there is only one important point. Maintaining the status quo means the end of life on the planet. The 1% will limit their exposure for a time but eventually the end will come for them too.

Margaret Kimberley's Freedom Rider column appears weekly in BAR. Ms. Kimberley lives in New York City, and can be reached via e-Mail at Margaret.Kimberley(at)BlackAgendaReport.Com
Naomi Oreskes and Erik M. Conway, *MERCHANTS OF DOUBT*

**FILM SHOWING IN FAYETTEVILLE**

**SPECIAL FEATURE: NAOMI ORESTES’ *MERCHANTS OF DOUBT***

Let’s buy the book and show the film asap! Had this 2010 book received the national attention it deserves, the President, Congress, and the public would have been greatly strengthened in recognizing warming and its causes and effects and in resisting the systematic corporate abuses she exposes in the book…

Also, thanks to Orestes and Conway, later clear-sighted, cutting-edge books like Naomi Klein’s *This Changes Everything* and Lester Brown’s *The Great Transition* that urge “a total restructuring of the global economy” (Brown 17) have received a much wider and numerous readership.

Dear Friends,

Naomi Oreskes’ fine book “Merchants of Doubt” has been made into a film that is now showing in Fayetteville. The book and the film are about how a few scientists obscured the truth about such issues as tobacco smoke, acid rain, ozone, and, especially, global warming. It’s now showing at Fiesta Square. I don’t know how long it will stay. From the previews, it appears to be a well made film that is entertaining as well as enlightening. Here is a preview with several scenes from the film: [http://www.fandango.com/merchantsofdoubt_178329/movieoverview](http://www.fandango.com/merchantsofdoubt_178329/movieoverview).

Peace - Art

Art Hobson, Emeritus Professor of Physics, U Arkansas.
Look for *Tales of the Quantum* Oxford University Press, in 2015.
See my textbook & other stuff [here](http://www.fandango.com/merchantsofdoubt_178329/movieoverview).

Thanks Art!

I phoned the theater for showings and glad I did because times online are not accurate: :

**Tomorrow Sunday 1:55, 4:35, 7:15**

**Monday-Wed; 4:25, 7:25**. Person I spoke to unsure film would continue after Wed., decision made Thurs. Depends upon no. of viewers until then?
These times begin with 10 to 15 minutes of previews.

For additional promotion, go to UTube for a preview, I was told.

Let's advertise this film and the book! Too bad we didn't know the film was coming. This could have offered a useful action for our group.

Dick

---

**Naomi Oreskes and Erik M Conway, MERCHANTS OF DOUBT, BOOK AND FILM**

**BOOK**


**FILM**

Exposed!

Professor **Naomi Oreskes**

<info@forecastthefacts.org>

8:02 AM (14 hours ago)

Dear Dick,

When I wrote the book *Merchants of Doubt* in 2010, I only wanted one thing: to uncover the truth about who was behind the widespread, and sadly effective, campaigns to undermine the established science of climate

*Merchants of Doubt* is about to show viewers nationwide just how ugly climate denial is. Spread the word!
change, and why they were doing what they were doing.

I never imagined that, a few years later, Sony Pictures would release *Merchants of Doubt*, a captivating feature film that exposes the ugly world of climate denial like never before.

Thousands are about to see this movie, and when they do, they'll be fired up and anxious to take action — let's make sure they do. Together, let's create a surge of people power strong enough to bring down climate denial.

**Watch and share the trailer for *Merchants of Doubt*, and then tell your friends to build the buzz!**

Forecast the Facts members were way ahead of the game in recognizing and exposing climate denial. Your very mission speaks to heart of the problem: disinformation. Many Americans still believe that there is "no solid" evidence of global warming — a result of the organized and well-funded campaign to confuse the public on climate. Worse, a powerful portion of our political leadership continues to promote the canard that there’s no consensus, we don’t really know, and therefore we can’t do anything.

*Merchants of Doubt* is about to spread our message wider than ever before. The national premieres begin next week — now’s the time to really build the buzz.

**Make *Merchants of Doubt* a game-changing moment. Click here to watch and share the trailer.**

Sincerely,

Naomi Oreskes

Professor of the History of Science and Affiliated Professor of Earth and Planetary Sciences at Harvard University

MORE ABOUT THE BOOK

Forecast the Facts is a grassroots organization that empowers people to fight climate change denial and promote accurate information about the climate crisis. You can follow us on Twitter, and like us on Facebook. Help us end climate denial once and for all by contributing here.

Fight back!

Robert Kenner &lt;info@forecastthefacts.org&gt; to me 3-17-15

Dick,

Robert here. I produced and directed a documentary called Merchants of Doubt to reveal how climate deniers have misled the American public.

Right now, climate deniers are attacking the film. News just broke that Fred Singer, who’s profiled in the film, lobbied high-profile deniers to bring legal action against the movie.

It’s no surprise that they don’t want this film seen — Merchants of Doubt has shown how the same “playbook” has been used on everything from tobacco to toxic chemicals to climate change. But these climate deniers have lots of fossil fuel money at their disposal — and that means, if we don’t fight back now, they’ll continue to go after the film and distort climate science in the media.

Sign the petition to demand that media outlets stop allowing climate deniers on-air!
Sincerely,

Robert Kenner

P.S. For more information on this campaign, check out the original email below.

MORE INFORMATION

"Climate skeptics attempt to block Merchants of Doubt film," The Guardian, 3-11-2015
http://act.forecastthefacts.org/go/971?t=3&akid=735.194520.EDt7AP

The message below is from Robert Kenner, a producer and director known for films such as “Food Inc.” and “Merchants of Doubt.”

Dear Dick,

People who mislead the public on climate change should not be on TV. Period.

That's one big reason why I produced Merchants of Doubt, a film that lays bare the greedy, shameful world of climate denial and the journalists who broadcast it. That's also why, right now, we're launching a people-powered national campaign that could keep climate deniers out of the news for good.

Merchants of Doubt premiers in U.S. theaters today, and it will invite thousands of energized viewers to sign this petition and join our campaign. Let's lead the charge!

Join me to tell TV network and cable news directors: Stop booking climate deniers on your programs immediately.

In 2013, one-third of the climate coverage on CNN and over a half of the climate coverage on Fox News was misleading. In 2014, every Sunday show except CBS' Face the Nation hosted a climate denier. It's true: our mainstream news networks book fake experts — often paid by the fossil fuel industry — and those "experts" use the opportunity to confuse the public understanding on climate.

Forecast the Facts has successfully held the media accountable before. One year ago, over 100,000 of us pushed The Washington Post to improve its climate reporting, and we won. Now we can do it again with our TV news.

Merchants of Doubt gives this community a special chance to make our issue — climate denial — the national issue it should be. Let's make it count.
Add your name today: Join the campaign to end climate denial in the media.

Sincerely,

Robert Kenner

MORE INFORMATION

"Science or Spin?: Assessing the Accuracy of Cable News Coverage of Climate Science," Union of Concerned Scientists
http://act.forecastthefacts.org/go/962?t=9&akid=735.194520.EDt7AP

"Study: How Broadcast Networks Covered Climate Change in 2014," Media Matters, 1-28-15
http://act.forecastthefacts.org/go/963?t=11&akid=735.194520.EDt7AP

Forecast the Facts is a grassroots organization that empowers people to fight climate change denial and promote accurate information about the climate crisis. You can follow us on Twitter, and like us on Facebook. Help us end climate denial once and for all by contributing here.

INTERVIEW OF NAOMI ORESKES

TheHumanist.com

Search for: 25 APRIL

The Humanist Interview with Naomi Oreskes

Applied Science and the Merchants of Doubt

BY CLAY FARRIS NAFF • 23 APRIL 2015

Naomi Oreskes is a professor of the history of science and an affiliated professor of earth and planetary sciences at Harvard University. She is the coauthor, with Erik M. Conway, of Merchants of Doubt, a book that lays bare the massive disinformation campaign surrounding climate science. The 2010 book has just re-emerged as the basis for a documentary of the same name, now opening in theaters across the nation. Just before its debut, I asked Oreskes about the book and its subject. The
interview, conducted by email, has been lightly edited.

TheHumanist.com: You’re a scientist and a historian of science—how then did you become interested in the relatively recent phenomenon of what you call the “merchandising of doubt”?

Naomi Oreskes: In the early 2000s, I was working on the history of oceanography (a book I am now trying to finish!) and came across the work of oceanographers who were concerned about anthropogenic climate change as far back as the 1950s. I started to learn more about it, and one thing led to another and I wrote my 2004 article on the scientific consensus on climate change. After the 2004 paper came out, I started getting attacked, and, well, one thing led to another and I ended up putting aside oceanography and writing, with Erik Conway, Merchants of Doubt.

TheHumanist.com: The book makes it clear that casting doubt on lifesaving science is not exactly new. What’s changed since the tobacco industry began its stealthy campaign to undermine the Surgeon General’s report on smoking?

Oreskes: The big change is the role of the media, think tanks, and the Internet. When the tobacco industry first began its campaigns of confusion, there was no Internet and few think tanks. Indeed, they invented the Tobacco Institute as a means of hiding their disinformation work under the guise of scientific research. Today, there are dozens of think tanks that do this work, and it is spread far and wide by cable news and the Internet.

TheHumanist.com: Has inducing public doubt of science itself become an applied science?

Oreskes: Yes, indeed. One of the things we discovered in doing our research was the amount of research these folks do! Market research, focus groups, and so on. They are very smart and organized and even scientific in the way they study and apply what works and what doesn’t.

TheHumanist.com: You and your co-author start your book with the story of the slandering of Ben Santer, a government scientist who has done much to establish the human causes of global warming.
Yet, Santer is hardly alone. James Hansen, Michael Mann, and many climate scientists have had their reputations savaged in the media, and, as you point out, the slanders remain just a Google search away. Is there any precedent for these kinds of attacks on scientists?

Oreskes: As we say in the book, science has always had the capacity to disrupt the status quo, and therefore disturb those in power. We all know of Galileo more because of the way the ruling authorities of his day tried to suppress his work more than most of us know what work he actually did. In the 1950s, Robert Oppenheimer was attacked because of his ambivalence about the hydrogen bomb. So this is not new. But again, the Internet, cable TV, and certain aspects of American culture have made it far easier to attack scientists and harder for scientists to undo the damage when it occurs.

TheHumanist.com: Some might argue that there was a time when science had too much authority—that people simply accepted government claims that nuclear bomb tests posed no health threats, or that a Swine flu epidemic was imminent, for example. Do “doubt campaigns” gain traction because of healthy public skepticism?

Oreskes: There are two different issues here. Certainly, it is possible for scientists (or any experts) to have too much authority, and sometimes scientists have lacked humility. Erik and I have never argued that citizens simply have to passively accept what scientists tell us to do. We think there are important distinctions to be made between scientific findings, policy recommendations, and political action.

The first is the domain of science, the last the domain of democratic politics, and in the middle there is a complicated and difficult grey zone. But you also have to remember that just because a warning does not come to pass does not mean it was false. Sometimes people say, “Oh, scientists warned us about the ozone hole, but now everything is fine!” as if this were a reason not to worry about climate change. Things are fine with respect to ozone because we listened to scientific advice and acted upon it.

And as for nuclear bomb tests, while it’s true that government officials and some scientists closely linked to government gave false reassurances, it is also true that other scientists warned us strongly. This is why the issue of consensus is so important. If scientists are divided, or telling us that something might not be right with government or industry assurances, that is something to which we need to pay attention.
TheHumanist.com: Al Gore’s film An Inconvenient Truth was influential in alerting the non-reading portion of the public to climate change, but in the end it became part of the political sorting that grips our nation. Will the documentary Merchants of Doubt have a different trajectory?

Oreskes: We certainly hope so. One reason the film features Bob Ingliss, former Republican congressman from South Carolina, is because he is such a powerful spokesman for why conservatives need to take this issue seriously and not fall into denial. Denying the problem does not make it go away. This is why, at the end of the film I stress that if you want to avoid big government interventions, you should be very concerned to make sure there is no further delay, because the longer we wait to address this problem, the more difficult it gets to solve with individual or private sector initiatives.

TheHumanist.com: Have attacks on you for positions you’ve taken had any deleterious effects on your career or personal life?

Oreskes: The attacks have not hurt me professionally, but they did take up time, and they were personally hurtful, especially at first. At one point I became ill from the stress. But once I started doing the research that led to Merchants of Doubt and understood the situation, that made all the difference. That, and support from colleagues like Sherry Rowland, Stan Glantz, Ben Santer, Mike Mann, and others who have been the target of similar attacks, or Don Kennedy, who has been a witness to this for many years. Indeed, I am in some pretty distinguished company there.

TheHumanist.com: Looking beyond the book and film, recent research suggests that the effects of climate change will soon amplify and make themselves even more apparent. What are your expectations for the response of our nation and others?

Oreskes: It’s very hard to say. We’ve already had several climate-related extreme weather events, but so far those have not moved the political needle very much. I certainly hope that it doesn’t take a disaster to wake us up from our slumber. But only time will tell.

Published in the May / June 2015 *Humanist*

Tags: Climate Change
Clay Farris Naff is a freelance science journalist based in Lincoln, Nebraska, and is the Humanist magazine’s science and religion correspondent. He is the author or editor of numerous books, including his latest, Free God Now!

---

The Anticommunist Origins of Climate Denial

How Cold Warriors Wind Up Heating the Planet

Posted on March 16, 2015 8:30 am by Jonathan Zasloff

The other night, my wife and I saw Merchants of Doubt, Robert Kenner’s new film about the climate denial industry. I thought it was excellent. I was surprised by the high production values and the way in which it did not feel like a documentary, at least until the last 15-20 minutes or so. (Then it began to remind me of a Frontline segment.) Former Republican Congressmember Bob Inglis of South Carolina, a die-hard conservative who lost his seat when he began to advocate for grappling with climate change (as well as the DREAM Act), comes off as particularly thoughtful.

For me, the most interesting part was the discussion of Fred Singer, a physicist who is a leading climate denial rock star, and the late Fred Seitz, another distinguished scientist who was also a climate denier. Why, the movie asks, do the handful of scientists who deny climate science do so? (and it really is no more than handful despite the denial industry’s attempt to show the contrary).

Naomi Oreskes, upon whose book of the same name the movie is based, argues in the film that although they get a certain amount of money from fossil fuel interests, that does not really explain their position, and I agree with her. For Oreskes, it stems from Cold War ideology – an anticommunism that makes them hate, fear, and then deny the existence of any problem that would require government intervention. That is persuasive to me: Seitz began to fall out with the scientific community over his strong advocacy of the Vietnam War. But I think something else might be in order.

You didn’t hear from Singer and Seitz anything about the dangers of government intervention when the Clean Air Act was debated (it passed the Senate nearly unanimously in 1970, and Singer was the deputy assistant administrator for EPA at that time) or even with Montreal Protocol (which as former Secretary of State George Shultz pointed out in a good op-ed on Friday, was negotiated during his
Ironically, this sort of Cold War ideology really erupted after the Cold War ended. If you are a Cold Warrior and your enemy collapses, what do you do? You look for another enemy. If the Soviet Union still exists, then you know where your enemy is. But if it collapses, and if you are of a Cold War bent, you look for other places where the Evil Empire has gone into hiding. There is a thrashing-about quality of old Cold Warriors. Who is the existential Enemy? Is it Russia? China? Iran? Iraq? David Frum (who has since become much more thoughtful) just threw in the kitchen sink with the “axis of evil”. It doesn't matter how poor or how weak the country is: it is a threat on par with Hitler and Stalin. With climate, it is some sort of vague Vast Left-wing Conspiracy designed to rob us of our precious bodily fluids.

I have written before suggesting that the climate issue provides ideological glue to hold together Movement Conservatism’s “three-legged stool.” Anti-communism was the best: 1) billionaires hated it because it threatened their wealth; 2) conservative Christians hated it because it was godless; and 3) neoconservatives hated it because they needed an enemy. With climate, 1) billionaires hate it because it is government regulation (even if it is very light); 2) conservative Christians hate because of their suspicions of modern science; and 3) neoconservatives hate it because grappling with it requires international cooperation anathema to them.

But because climate change isn’t quite as good, that requires crazier and crazier positions to make up for it. I think that this often happens, too: when someone takes a position, and it turns out to be false, they often double down on it to show that they were really right to begin with. This is what happened with torture advocacy: desperate people trying to preserve national security agreed to torture a few select prisoners, and when that didn’t work, they had to show that they were right, and so wound up approving a massive torture program.

Fred Singer and Fred Seitz sort of straddle the billionaire and neoconservative legs of the Movement Conservative stool. That makes sense: ideological schema rarely play out neatly in the real world. And when you spend your time with people on “your side,” you begin to adopt their positions. Thus, conservative Christians are now adopting the plutocratic ideology of billionaire Republicans – even if that is about as far from the New Testament as one can get.

As Michael Shermer of Skeptic Magazine, who is interviewed in Merchants of Doubt, puts it: you buy the package of your team. And I suppose that’s the challenge for everyone involved in academia and public policy, no matter what their ideological priors: how to be a productive member of the team without becoming subsumed by it.

https://youtu.be/j8iiqzGFDtc

COMMENT

More Insight & Analysis from Legal Planet ➤
Think of it as the uncertainty principle. By the nature of things, doubt, the unknown, and uncertainty are naturally part of the big picture in science, especially when it comes to creating “models” of the future. As Naomi Oreskes and Erik Conway showed in their blockbuster book, Merchants of Doubt, the giant oil companies (following the playbook of Big Tobacco) proved adept at taking advantage of the uncertainty principle to protect their positions as the most profitable corporations in history. They funded a small group of scientists to not quite deny the reality of climate change, but to emphasize the element of doubt in its science, as in all science. Major fossil-fuel producers used their money both to create a network of outright climate deniers and a subtler if no less dismissive attitude toward climate change based on uncertainty. Think of them as the Yo-Yo Ma’s of doubt. And proof of their success at this effort is evident in a new Congress in which few self-respecting Republicans would dare claim (“I'm not a scientist...”) that there's any reality to human-produced climate change, while the leading “environmental” figure in the party, Senator Jim Inhofe, dismisses the world’s climate scientists as part of a gigantic plot against the free market.
It hardly matters that climate change is, by now, an obvious reality or that the evidence piling up indicates that it will prove devastating for us and the planet unless the burning of fossil fuels is in some way significantly curtailed and most fossil fuel reserves are somehow kept in the ground. And here’s another point not to remember: uncertainty is actually a two-way street. The oil companies, not surprisingly, placed their bet on the direction that headed toward doubt that climate change was a serious issue for humanity. That part of the street is now largely blocked. However, the other direction is unnervingly open -- and it leads into uncertainty about whether the effects of climate change will be more devastating than presently predicted by, for instance, the consensus science of the U.N.’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.
With that grim uncertainty increasingly possible, the big energy outfits, ever ahead of the rest of us when it comes to keeping themselves in business, are -- as the invaluable Michael Klare, author of *The Race for What's Left*, tells us in his latest dispatch -- polishing up a new pitch for our future confusion. There are so many ways, after all, to foster uncertainty about our world. Until recently, the big energy outfits focused largely on an essentially negative approach to climate change with remarkable success. Now, it looks like they may put their energy (so to speak) into propagating a dazzling dreamscape of life on Earth in the decades to come (in which oil, natural gas, and coal will, of course, play enormous roles and climate change essentially none at all). Those fretting about the future of our children and grandchildren on a planet that could be heated to a crisp for the immediate profits of Big Energy and the oil states that are really just an arm of the same enterprise had better listen up. If their vision really proves to be our future, I offer you one certainty: we're in trouble. Tom

**Carbon Counterattack: How Big Oil Is Responding to the Anti-Carbon Moment** By Michael T. Klare
Around the world, carbon-based fuels are under attack. Increasingly grim economic pressures, growing popular resistance, and the efforts of government regulators have all shocked the energy industry. Oil prices are falling, colleges and universities are divesting from their carbon stocks, voters are instituting curbs on hydro-fracking, and delegates at the U.N. climate conference in Peru have agreed to impose substantial restrictions on global carbon emissions at a conference in Paris later in the year. All this has been accompanied by what might be viewed as a moral assault on the very act of extracting carbon-based fuels from the earth, in which the major oil, gas, and coal companies find themselves portrayed as the enemies of humankind.

Under such pressures, you might assume that Big Energy would react defensively, perhaps apologizing for its role in spurring climate change while assuming a leadership position in planning for the transition to a post-carbon economy. But you would be wrong: instead of retreating, the major companies have gone on the offensive, extolling their contributions to human progress and minimizing the potential for renewables to replace fossil fuels in just about any imaginable future.
That the big carbon outfits would seek to perpetuate their privileged market position in the
global economy is, of course, hardly surprising. After all, oil is the most valuable commodity
in international commerce and major producing firms like ExxonMobil, Chevron, and Shell
regularly top lists of the world's most profitable enterprises. Still, these companies are not just
employing conventional legal and corporate tactics to protect their position, they're mounting
a moral assault of their own, claiming that fossil fuels are an essential factor in eradicating
poverty and achieving a decent life on this planet.

Improbable as such claims may seem, they are being echoed by powerful officials around the
world -- typically, the leaders of carbon-producing nations like Russia and Saudi Arabia or the
representatives of American energy-producing states like Texas and Kentucky. Count on one
thing: this crew of fossil fuel enthusiasts is intent on ensuring that any path to a carbon-free
future will, at best, be long and arduous. While you’re at it, add top Congressional leaders to
this crew, since many of the Republican victors in the 2014 midterm election are from oil and
clad-producing states and regularly laud carbon production for its contribution to local
prosperity, while pocketing contributions by Big Oil and other energy firms.
Unless directly challenged, this pro-carbon offensive -- backed by copious Big Energy advertising -- is likely to attract at least as much favor as the claims of anti-carbon activists. At this point, of course, the moral arguments against carbon consumption are -- or at least should be -- well known. The oil, gas, and coal companies, it is claimed, are selfishly pursuing mega-profits at the expense of the climate, the environment, our children and grandchildren, and even possibly a future of any reasonable sort for humanity as a whole.

“Basically [the big energy companies have] said, we’re going to wreck the planet, we don’t care what you say, we think we can, and we dare you to stop us,” observed climate activist and 350.org cofounder Bill McKibben in a recent interview. This outlook was reflected in many of the signs carried by the estimated 400,000 demonstrators who participated in the People’s Climate March in New York City last September.

The fossil fuel industry is often also portrayed as the nucleus of a global system of wealth and power that drags down democracy and perpetuates grotesque planetary inequalities. “Fossil fuels really do create a hyper-stratified economy,” explained Naomi Klein, author of the bestselling book This Changes Everything: Capitalism vs. The Climate. “It's the nature of the resources that they are concentrated, and you need a huge amount of infrastructure to get them out and to transport them. And that lends itself to huge profits and they’re big enough that you can buy off politicians.”

Michael T. Klare, a TomDispatch regular, is a professor of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College and the author, most recently, of The Race for What's Left.

A documentary film version of his book Blood and Oil is available from the Media Education Foundation. Links to his work can be found at michaelklare.com. Copyright 2015 Michael T. Klare.


CLIMATE CHANGE DENIERS IN THEIR OWN WORDS

NationofChange info@nationofchange.org via mail87.us4.mcsv.net Wednesday, October 29, 2014.

Video: Quotes from Climate Denial Candidates

Connor Gibson, Video Feature

These quotes will make your jaw drop, but the reality is that climate change denial is slowly going extinct as the majority of voters are understanding the problem.

Read the full story...
ZNET: TOP LEVEL CLIMATE CHANGE SKEPTIC—WILLIE SOON-- IN THE PAY OF ENERGY COMPANIES. Moyers & Co., Morning Reads. 2-14-15

We’ve finally found a corrupt climatologist -- Greenpeace obtained documents showing that over the past 14 years, Willie Soon, a researcher at the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics who insists that changes in solar activity are responsible for global warming, received over $1 million from “Exxon Mobil, Southern Company, the American Petroleum Institute (API) and a foundation run by the ultra-conservative Koch brothers,” according to The Guardian’s Suzanne Goldenberg. AND: Justin Gillis and John Schwartz report for the NYT that “Dr. Soon, in correspondence with his corporate funders, described many of his scientific papers as ‘deliverables’ that he completed in exchange for their money. He used the same term to describe testimony he prepared for Congress.”

MORE ON SOON

Willie Soon is a major global warming skeptic, one of the most “prestigious” of the lot. Senator James Inhoff, for example, quotes him all the time. Now a funding scandal is erupting around him and his position as a Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics researcher. He has received major funding from ExxonMobil, the American Petroleum Institute, and the Koch Brothers, and his testimony to Congress and published papers seem to have been done in return for this support. He thinks the sun is responsible for global warming effects, and that the Arctic is not warming. Here is one report about the controversy: http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2015/feb/21/climate-change-denier-willie-soon-funded-energy-industry.

Peace – Art 3-6-15

Charles Pierce, The Drought - A Slow-Motion Meteorological Catastrophe

Charles Pierce, Esquire, July 26, 2012, RSN

Excerpt: "Am I just a slow person, or doesn't knowing what causes something actually help you prevent that thing's happening again, or at least, doesn't it help you prepare yourself
better for when it does? I begin to wonder if climate change is going to be one of those issues like gun-control [D: and WARS] where well-financed paranoia and heavily subsidized ignorance wear the political process down to the point at which people simply give up trying to fight them."

READ MORE  http://readersupportednews.org/opinion2/271-38/12635-the-drought-a-slow-motion-meteorological-catastrophe

DENIAL BECOMES HATRED BECOMES DEATH THREATS:  CO-AUTHOR OF A CLIMATE FOR CHANGE, KATHARINE HAYHOE, THREATENED.

Hate mail threatened HAYHOE with public execution after Rush Limbaugh targeted her and published her email address.

Steve Valk  Become a fan
Communications Director and Regional Manager, Citizens Climate Lobby

·  Email
·  
·  

Climate Deniers Hit New Low With Vicious Attacks on Scientists http://www.huffingtonpost.com/steve-valk/katharine-hayhoe-gingrich_b_1202490.html

Posted: 01/15/2012 3:47 pm EST Updated: 03/16/2012 5:12 am EDT

The climate deniers are kicking puppies now.

That was my reaction when I heard that Katharine Hayhoe was being deluged with hate mail after stories surfaced that she had written a chapter on climate change for Newt Gingrich's upcoming book, a chapter quickly dropped when conservative commentators began making a big fuss about it. Similar attacks have been leveled against MIT scientist Kerry Emanuel following his speech at a forum for Republicans concerned about climate change. The "frenzy of hate" he's received include threats to his wife.

Anyone who has ever listened to Hayhoe would be as sickened as I was over the vitriolic attacks
she has endured in the past week. Being both a climate scientist and an evangelical Christian, Hayhoe speaks to faith communities, explaining the science of climate change in easy-to-understand language and also offering the spiritual perspective on global warming: What would Jesus do about climate change?

"My own faith is the Christian faith and in the Christian faith we are told to love our neighbors as much as ourselves," Hayhoe recently told the *Toronto Globe and Mail*. "And our neighbors, especially the poorer ones, are already harmed by climate change."

She's co-authored a book with her minister husband, Andrew Farley, titled *A Climate for Change: Global Warming Facts for Faith-Based Decisions*.

On our conference call with Citizens Climate Lobby volunteers last November, she came across as one of the sweetest and likable persons you'd ever hope to meet (You can listen to that call [here](#)). The mother of a two-year-old who's married to a minister and works on climate science at Texas Tech University, Hayhoe never has a harsh word to say about anyone, especially those who disagree with her on the science of climate change.

Like a true Christian, she's done an inordinate amount of cheek-turning lately. News that her chapter was being dropped from Gingrich's book came not from the candidate or his staff, but from the media seeking her reaction. She, however, has been more than gracious. I immediately thought to approach her about posting the "missing chapter" on our Website, but she declined our offer, saying she did not want to demonize Newt or be mean-spirited.

Did I mention that Hayhoe put in 100 unpaid hours on that chapter?

I'm sure Gingrich wasn't aware of it. Not that it would matter. The former House Speaker has been too busy backpedaling on the climate issue in order to appease the anti-science wing of the GOP that currently calls the tune. When his presidential campaign started picking up steam in December, Mitt Romney went on the attack over Gingrich's [ad with Nancy Pelosi](#) on climate change. Before the cock had crowed three times, Gingrich vehemently disavowed the commercial ("I tell you, I don't know the woman!").

The trouble with flip-flopping on an issue, though, is that it's hard to cover all your tracks. Four years ago, Terry Maple, who co-authored *A Contract With the Earth* with Gingrich in 2007, approached Hayhoe to write the opening chapter of their next book. Word got out about the collaboration in December, and before you could say "Ditto," Rush Limbaugh was blasting Gingrich for working with a non-denying climate scientist, even if she was a Christian.

The disappointment of being dropped from Gingrich's book, though, is nothing compared to the onslaught of hate mail that Hayhoe has endured. Though she's too polite to repeat the words used in those messages, one gets a sense of it from this quote in the *Globe and Mail*:

"The attacks' virulence, the hatred and the nastiness of the text have escalated exponentially. I've gotten so many hate mails in the last few weeks I can't even count them."

It's been the same for MIT's Emanuel since a [video](#) -- "New Hampshire's GOP Climate Hawks" --
featuring him was posted on Mother Jones' Climate Desk. His remarks were subsequently distorted by right-wing bloggers, some of whom published his email address. He described the emails in a Mother Jones interview:

"What was a little bit new about it was dragging family members into it and feeling that my family might be under threat... I think most of my colleagues and I have received a fair bit of email here and there that you might classify as hate mail, but nothing like what I've got in the last few days."

Are there new depths to plumb in this "debate"? Physical violence?

I certainly hope not. I'm sure that the Republican candidates for president, even the ones who vociferously deny the existence of climate change, are appalled at the turn the discourse has taken. They should be speaking up and calling for a halt to the hate mail, to keep the conversation civil.

It could start with Gingrich stepping up to condemn the attacks on Hayhoe. As his prospects for the Republican nomination rapidly wane, I hope he'll feel less compelled to appease the vocal and volatile climate deniers. I hope he'll reinstate Hayhoe's chapter in his book with a heartfelt, "My apologies. You shouldn't have been treated this way."

If there's anything positive to come from the attacks on Hayhoe and Emanuel, it's the realization, hopefully, that the deniers have bottomed out. As anyone in a 12-step program can tell you, there's nowhere to go from here than up.

Follow Steve Valk on Twitter: www.twitter.com/citizensclimate

MORE:
EnvironmentPoliticsKatharine HayhoeClimate ChangeNewt GingrichClimate ChangeNewt Gingrich Climate ChangeNewt Gingrich Global WarmingGingrich 2012Newt Gingrich Climate ScienceNewt Gingrich Climate ChangeNewt Gingrich Environment

Global Warming Deniers Desperate

Global Warming Deniers Become More Desperate By the...

The Heartland
Institute's recent conference in Las Vegas illustrates climate change deniers' desperate View on ecowatch.com


Suzuki writes: "A who's who of fossil fuel industry supporters and anti-science shills variously argued that global warming is a myth; that it's happening but natural—a result of the sun or 'Pacific Decadal Oscillation;' that it's happening but we shouldn't worry about it; or that global cooling is the real problem."

READ MORE

MORE BOOKS ON CLIMATE CHANGE DENIAL

Naomi Klein, This Changes Everything, 2014

Chap. 1, “The Right Is Right,” which discusses barriers to life-saving climate truth and action, including deniers and their organizations; and other chapters.

Doubt is Their Product: How Industry's Assault on Science Threatens Your Health by David Michaels

In this eye-opening expose, David Michaels reveals how unscrupulous product-defense consultants have increasingly shaped and skewed the scientific literature, manufactured and magnified scientific uncertainty, and influenced policy decisions to the advantage of polluters and the manufacturers of dangerous products. He proves, beyond a doubt, that our regulatory system is broken and offers concrete, workable suggestions for how it can be restored by taking the politics out of science and ensuring that concern for public safety, rather than private profits, guides our regulatory policy.

WHERE DO THESE GREEDY MISOLOGISTS GET THEIR MONEY?

DONORS TRUST

Going through old papers, I found a Free Weekly article that claimed the Donors Trust was the main source of funds for climate denial groups--donating far more than the Koch Foundations or Exxon Mobil put together. (Source: Greenpeace)

DT although a 501 (c) 3 charitable organization gives a lot of $ to political advocacy groups.  http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/DonorsTrust

So it seems the laws supposedly preventing tax-free organizations from political advocacy are toothless. As long as you have the umbrella organization, you can do anything you want except to directly campaign for a candidate.

This should be cried out in letters to newspapers and guest columns. Relates to the IRS "scandal" of last year.

ACTION: FORM A GROUP TO EXPOSE ALL FUNDERS of LIARS. An investigative book—series of books!—is needed to expose this corruption.
DEFENDERS OF REASON AND SCIENCE vs. UNREGULATED GREED, MISOLOGY, MISONEISM, PERVERSITY, AND STUPIDITY

BARACK OBAMA: Stand up for science

Art Hobson 3-6-15 11:33 AM (9 hours ago)

A nice message from President Obama. Go to the suggested web site and type in “Arkansas” for info on two politicians from our state. - Art

Friend --

When it comes to fighting climate change, the single biggest obstacle we face isn't scientific or economic. It's political.

Right now, in Congress and across the country, too many of our elected officials still publicly deny the science of climate change.

That needs to change.

You're part of an important team with OFA, with a mission of holding climate change deniers' feet to the fire. OFA put together a site highlighting deniers across the country, and the impact of climate change on your state.

Every year, the effects of climate change are felt in more of our communities -- consider the consequences of extreme weather like historic droughts and record-breaking storms. It jeopardizes the future we'll leave for our children.

This shouldn't be a controversial opinion.

We need to listen to our friends at NASA and the 97 percent of climate scientists
who agree that climate change is real, man-made, and happening right now. Now is the time for serious action, not excuses or outright denial.

But that requires lawmakers all across the country to face the facts and work together to find smart, science-based solutions.

You can help us get a little closer to that goal today:

http://my.barackobama.com/Learn-About-Climate-Change-Deniers

Thank you for doing your part to make progress possible -- I couldn't do any of it without you.

Barack Obama

PAID FOR BY ORGANIZING FOR ACTION.

A SURVEY OF THE MANY KINDS OF DENIAL

Denialism: How Irrational Thinking Hinders Scientific Progress, Harms the Planet, and Threatens Our Lives. October 29, 2009

by Michael Specter.

In this provocative and headline-making book, Michael Specter confronts the widespread fear of science and its terrible toll on individuals and the planet.

In Denialism, New Yorker staff writer Michael Specter reveals that Americans have come to mistrust institutions and especially the institution of science more today than ever before. For centuries, the general view had been that science is neither good nor bad—that it merely supplies information and that new information is always beneficial. Now, science is viewed as a political constituency that isn’t always in our best interest. We live in a world where the leaders of African nations prefer to let their citizens starve to death rather than import genetically modified grains. Childhood vaccines have proven to be the most effective public health measure in history, yet people march on Washington to protest their use. In the United States a growing series of studies show that dietary supplements and “natural” cures have almost no value, and often cause harm. We still spend billions of dollars on them. In hundreds of the best universities in the world, laboratories are anonymous, unmarked, and surrounded by platoons of security guards—such is the opposition to any research that includes experiments with animals. And pharmaceutical companies that just forty years ago were perhaps the most visible symbol of our remarkable advance against disease have increasingly been seen as callous corporations propelled solely by avarice and greed.

As Michael Specter sees it, this amounts to a war against progress. The issues may be complex but the
choices are not: Are we going to continue to embrace new technologies, along with acknowledging their limitations and threats, or are we ready to slink back into an era of magical thinking? In Denialism, Specter makes an argument for a new Enlightenment, the revival of an approach to the physical world that was stunningly effective for hundreds of years: What can be understood and reliably repeated by experiment is what nature regarded as true. Now, at the time of mankind’s greatest scientific advances—and our greatest need for them—that deal must be renewed.

EXPOSES THE ESCAPISM ENCOURAGED BY THE SYSTEM

http://greedylyingbastards.com/

In the Land of Never Was: The Last, Desperate Hours of Climate Chaos Deniers and Capitalist Rah-Rahs

Phil Rockstroh, Op-Ed, NationofChange, July 27, 2012: “The winners/losers mythos of capitalism renders people sick with shame while its tendency towards class stratification promotes feelings of powerlessness and unfocussed rage; hence, many develop a compulsion to displace their frustrations. Withal, they evince the mindset of embittered slaves who have been told, and worse insist, that the corporatist/militarist boot on their necks is better termed a Liberty Massage.” READ | DISCUSS | SHARE
http://www.nationofchange.org/land-never-was-last-desperate-hours-climate-chaos-deniers-and-capitalist-rah-rahs-1343394544
THE NATION, Earth Day and May 12, 2014.

The Nation celebrated Earth Day 2014 with “wall-to-wall coverage of the climate challenge.” And its May 12 number contains 4 essays on climate change. The following Introduction by Mark Hertsgaard to the May 12 essays presents a quick history of the climate movement, with good and bad news. The essay by Christopher Hayes, “The New Abolitionism,” explains the magnitude of the conflict: the fossil fuel companies must part with at least $10 trillion, the estimated value of slaves at the commencement of the Civil War. In “The Change Within,” Naomi Klein confronts the new way of thinking required by climate change: totally restructuring the global energy economy quickly. And Dan Zegart in “Paying the Price” asks whether the law can hold the “carbon majors” accountable.

JCE Chemical Education Xchange

Hassell, et al. Climate Change Denial in the Classroom

SAT, 05/04/2013. "Climate Change Denial in the Classroom" by Christopher Hassall, Chris A. Hebbern, and Carley J. Centen, Skeptical Inquirer May/June 2013, Committee for Skeptical Inquiry, Saturday, May 4, 2013.

Universities should be and are expected to be sources of truthful and unbiased information about controversial subjects, especially in the sciences. Unfortunately, that is not always the case. Instructors at Carleton University in Ottawa, Canada used "academic freedom" to present an egregiously biased and unscientific course that misrepresented the facts of climate change. This was not a case of missing a few fine points - the authors claim to have recorded 142 instances of equivocal or incorrect scientific claims, from the video of twenty seven hours of the course. Unfortunately, I am sure that this documented instance of professors teaching climate change pseudoscience is not the only such course or university where it has and does occur. it is not easy to find remedies for instances such as this, where a tenured professor abuses the trust implicit in the conferral of academic freedom.

Classroom chemistry teachers are sometimes challenged by students to defend against arguments by climate change "denialists", who claim either that the earth's atmosphere is not...
changing, that it is changing is but the changes are not due to human activity, or even that the changes are beneficial. Since most chemistry teachers are not experts on climate change, they usually do not have convincing, understandable, and science-based responses. I would recommend first that professors and teachers take advantage of the excellent ACS resource, The Climate Science Toolkit, portal.acs.org/portal/acs/corg/content?_nfpb=true&_pageLabel=PP_MULTICOLUMN_T2_50&node_id=819&use_sec=false&sec_url_var=region1&_uuid=8551c3ab-78c8-4909-93dd-8fcc8af2943c, which is clearly-written, comprehensive, and referenced. However, many will also find this May/June issue of Skeptical Inquirer useful, because it includes a short article on pages 5-6, "Battle of the Op-Eds: Scientists Defend Reality of Climate Change" written by Dave Thomas, President of New Mexicans for Science and Reason on behalf of seventeen members of NMSR, and by Kendrick Frazier, a science writer and editor of the Skeptical Inquirer. They reply to some of the most common denialist arguments, which had been published in an op-ed column of the Albuquerque Journal.

Skeptical Inquirer, Pick Attribution:
"Climate Change Denial in the Classroom" by Christopher Hassall, Chris A. Hebbern, and Carley J. Centen, Skeptical Inquirer May/June 2013 37 40  
Committee for Skeptical Inquiry, Saturday, May 4, 2013
LOG IN or REGISTER to post comments

Comments. Related review.

Submitted by Hal Harris on Mon, 05/06/2013 - 11:46


[IN THE SAME MAY/JUNE ISSUE OF SI, see pp. 5-6, “Battle of the Op-Eds: Scientists Defend Reality of Climate Change.” --Dick]
are responsible for nearly two-thirds of the world's CO2 and methane emissions. Just like big tobacco, these companies can be brought to court to be held accountable. Major green legal firms are taking notice. "You really need the science to do anything legally," says Sharon Eubanks, the former head of the Justice Department's "tobacco team," ... [but] "You need a legal theory that fits the facts and can survive attack in a real courtroom."

Big Carbon is thought to be taking this very seriously, too: a federal appeals court found in 2005 that US cities and even individuals suffering damages from climate change had standing to sue under the National Environmental Policy Act. Time to balance those scales of justice! [See Zegart's book on the legal defeat of the tobacco industry: Civil Warriors: The Legal Siege on the Tobacco Industry. The tobacco companies had science against them and were found guilty of bad faith; the same finding may apply to the fossil fuel companies.]

IT’S NOT FREE SPEECH FOR AN ELECTED OR APPOINTED GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL TO SPEAK FALSELY ABOUT WARMING. AT THE VERY LEAST, LET’S EXPOSE THEM.

SHERMAN FREDERICK. “GLOBAL WARMING; HEY, WHAT’S THIS ICE DOING HERE?” Northwest Arkansas Times, Jan. 12, 2014. By Dick Bennett

Apparently some people, when they rise to a position of influence, can be mistaken with impunity. Take columnist Sherman Frederick, formerly publisher of the Las Vegas Review Journal, owned by Stephens Media, which is part-owner of the Northwest Arkansas Times. In the opening paragraphs of a column on global warming (published in the LRRJ and the NWADG) he declares: “I am not a scientist. I admit that without regret.” Oh oh, I suspect there’s a “but” following, that he will express opinions about scientific issues. “I also don’t know Jack about the science of climate change.” Did I read the title correctly? He knows nothing about climate change but he will discuss it? He has been too lazy or too arrogant, or both, to read even one of the numerous authoritative books, or even one of the articles, on the consequences of anthropogenic atmospheric warming? How can a professional newspaperman declare before all the world and his colleagues that he plans to discuss something about which he is utterly ignorant? Lazy, arrogant, and reckless? So let’s ask the newspaper editor, where were you or at least your fact-checker, who might have saved Mr. Frederick from himself?

“But because I’m a fully functioning human being with opposable thumbs and some cognitive reasoning skills, I’m skeptical of those selling the idea of man-caused global
warming, especially those who stand to gain from the fix.” I thought his second sentence was as bad as it could get, but this third sentence reveals a whole new panoply of confusion. Why does he think that a person as ignorant as he loudly proclaims himself to be is “a fully functioning human being,” particularly when the subject is the most urgent issue confronting human beings today? Does he think he is being witty by again exposing himself to ridicule, this time, let’s grant him this, as a fully functioning primate? And how can he think that the scientists are selling anything, or standing to gain from sharing their research with their colleagues and the public? In fact, the scientists, thousands of them in books and peer-reviewed journals, have been telling us for over two decades against well-funded denial that the increasing C02 in the atmosphere was a desperate danger to all species on the planet Earth, if it were not stopped. But this service to human beings and to all species Frederick denigrates as profit-seeking, as though they were executives of the corporations that have created so much of the C02 and warming, and he mocks as though the scientists were no different than business hucksters who are making money and in the fossil fuel industry truck-loads of it.

“But like I say, I’m not a scientist. Take it for what it is worth.”

Frederick continues by making fun of the “warmists” as he calls the climate scientists. But I am not tempted to rewrite my response in similar jocularity, because I know his “Come on, folks. That’s funny,” is the response of someone who doesn’t know what global warming means or the difference between climate and weather, and that ignorance, or call it denial, is not a laughing matter with seas rising and forests burning.

LOCAL OFFICIALS AMONG DENIERS

Hello Amy,

I was glad to read in NAT (“Study Looks at Beaver Lake” by Scarlet Sims, Oct. 27, 2013) about the Beaver Lake climate change impact study, for several reasons, including the revelation that you and other BL officials are informed about CC. The City’s Emergency Management officials don’t believe it, or its human causation, nor do several County QC members. Good for you for knowing the science of CO2 and warming. And it is reassuring, though not surprising, to see UAF scientists applying the facts of warming to study Beaver Lake (Agri. Asst. Prof. Thad Scott and Geosciences Instructor Byron Winston). All of our city, county, and state officials should know the science in order to plan responsibly. Your study will help educate the deniers still on the payroll.

Dick
LETTER TO OMNI’S BOOK FORUM: LET’S STOP TALKING TO OURSELVES AND BE SERIOUS ABOUT CHANGING THE SYSTEM, 2013

We should continue to try to enlarge our audience. We should publicize each book more, for those who cannot attend, or even for those who don’t read books.

OMNI began the Ecology Book Forum 7 years ago, yet officials in responsible positions in the Quorum Court and Emergency Management, and I suspect in other boards and agencies, continue to deny anthropogenic CO2/warming/climate change. Ignorant of the science, they cannot carry out their duty to plan for our future. Let’s try harder to bring them up to speed (that climate change is already a global fact and increasing rapidly). Let’s advertise in every way within our power including spending money for ads, AND send materials and invitations to the members of our governing boards and agencies.

Thanks, Dick

Global warming skeptic's article in NWA Times

Art Hobson  1-16-14

omni cctf [omni-cctf@googlegroups.com] riday, January 10, 2014 11:07 AM

Hi friends - Today, the NWA Times published an opinion-page article titled "Climate change skepticism healthy." It opposes the scientific consensus that global warming is real, caused by humans, and could be a disaster. It was originally published in The Daily Oklahoman, which is published in Oklahoma City and calls itself Oklahoma's biggest newspaper. The article quotes only two sources, John R. Christy and Roger Pielke Jr. Christy is a well known climate skeptic, with a substantial background in climate science. He's on the faculty of the University of Alabama. Pielke is an environmental scientist, and a climate skeptic; he's written a book called “The Climate Fix.” Both are of course in the minority of scientific opinion about global warming. I hope the article will receive some comments from readers. Cheers - Art

Art Hobson, Emeritus Professor of Physics, U Arkansas, Fayetteville.

See my liberal-arts physics textbook.

WHY DOES KRAUTHAMMER ENJOY ACCESS TO OUR STATE NEWSPAPER TO
Climate Change Criticism Falls Flat

KRAUTHAMMER CHERRY-PICKS DATA IN OPINION PIECE

(Washington Post 7-4-2013, reprinted in Arkansas Democrat-Gazette 7-8)

ART HOBSON
ahobson@uark.edu

Award-winning conservative commentator Charles Krauthammer writes a weekly Washington Post column that also appears in the Arkansas Democrat-Gazette. Because I enjoy reading intelligent material with which I disagree, I usually read his articles. He’s interestingly unpredictable and often embraces good science. For example, he dismisses creationism as pseudoscience, opposes the death penalty, supports legalized abortion, and advocates radically higher energy taxes to induce conservation.

I was surprised, then, by his July 8 antiscientific blast titled “Global warming folly.” Offering absolutely no evidence, it castigates climatology as “naive” and “faith, not science.”

The article begins by dismissing global warming as unimportant. Scientists almost uniformly disagree with this. For one recent example, an article in the June 21 issue of Science presents detailed evidence that, during the Pliocene era 3.5 million years ago when there were about 400 carbon dioxide (CO2) molecules in the atmosphere for every million air molecules (400 parts per million, or 400 ppm), summer temperatures were about 15 Fahrenheit degrees warmer than today. Although CO2 levels have stayed below 300 ppm throughout the ice ages (the past 2.4 million years), industrial emissions and forest clearing have now raised that level to 400 ppm. High CO2 levels have generally coincided with high temperatures throughout Earth’s history. So current levels could put us back into Pliocene-like conditions, when temperatures were too high to support large polar ice sheets. If Greenland and West Antarctica melt, sea levels will rise by 50 feet. If the giant East Antarctic ice sheet also melts, sea levels will rise by an additional 213 feet. So global warming will probably bring an entirely different geological era. Unimportant?

Krauthammer’s most egregious, indeed dishonest, mistake is his misleading use of data. He states “global temperatures have been flat for 16 years.” If you consult the graph my editors kindly provided, you’ll note 1998 — 15 years ago — was at that time by far the warmest year since global temperatures were first recorded in 1880. Furthermore, 1997 — 16 years ago — was also a warmest year. Thus, if you look at only the past 16 years, you might convince yourself “temperatures have been flat.” Choosing one’s “starting point” (1997) in this manner is a classic misuse of data. It’s really ironic Krauthammer derives his “flat temperature” conclusion from this misuse of an enormously warm year, 1998. As you can see from the graph, 1998 is still one of the hottest years.
He’s cherry-picking the data in order to “prove” a preconceived opinion. He’s not seeking the truth. Such cherry-picking is characteristic of all pseudoscience.


Here are a few other unbiased statistics: 2001-2010 was the hottest decade on record, and 1.6 degrees warmer than the 1961-1990 average. In fact, each of the four preceding decades was the hottest decade on record. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration tracks daily high and low temperatures at about 5,500 sites. They report the ratio of daily record highs to daily record lows was about 5 to 1 during 2012. If temperatures were “flat,” as Krauthammer claims, this ratio would be about 1 to 1.

Krauthammer slams climate science as unable to explain his fictional “flat temperatures” and as “unsettled.” He slams President Barack Obama, who accepts climate science, as “naive” and a “flat-earther.” Such statements reveal the author as an anti-science extremist, akin to the creationists he has so wisely decried in previous columns. I’ve studied science for more decades than I care to count, and I’ve widely read climate science literature for the past 20 years. An enormous and increasing amount of effort is going into the study of climate change today, and its quality is as high as any science I’ve ever seen. The four previous reports of the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change are among the most impressive scientific documents I’ve ever seen.

It seems to me it is the essence of morality to seek the objective truth, draw rational conclusions from it and act on those conclusions. In other words, trust the universe. By trusting his conservative ideology rather than his brains and his senses, Krauthammer, along with many others who try to mislead us about climate science, are doing us and our descendants a great and immoral disservice.

ART HOBSON IS A PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF PHYSICS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS.

News Flash: Major newspaper won’t publish climate lies

Michael Grenetz, 2013
SierraRise SierraRise.Members@sierraclub.org via uark.edu

2:27 PM (18 hours ago)

VICTORY: The Los Angeles Times will no longer publish lies about the climate.

Tell other major newspapers to follow suit!
Dear J,

There's been a lot of gloom and doom on the horizon lately, but there's good news, too! This could be a major tipping point for how the media covers climate change. With 30,000 signatures by Let's turn up the heat -- will you sign the petition calling on the country's leading newspapers to refuse any letters that deny climate change?

The dangers of smoking are scientific fact, not a matter of opinion. The same is true for the reality and dangers of the coasts. Terrible fires and drought on the plains. Melting icecaps and sinking islands -- climate change is happening.

It's about time our papers started to report the truth and leave out the crazy.

The Times has been getting a lot of attention for the policy -- especially from climate denial activists who have called this new policy 'arrogant,' 'patronizing,' and an attack on freedom.

With your support, we'll share the petition with The New York Times.

Take a minute to sign the petition telling our major newspapers that climate deniers are old news.

In it together,
Michael Grenetz
SierraRise Director

P.S. To keep up with the latest about climate change and other campaigns from SierraRise, visit

References:
1. Thornton, Paul (8 October 2013). ”
2. Irvine, Don (10 October 2013). ”

SEN. WHITEHOUSE CHALLENGES GOP ON WARMING

Here's an excerpt from Sen. Sheldon Whitehouse given on the U.S. Senate floor. The entire speech and video is on the link below: 6-5-13

Madam President, an iron curtain of denial has fallen around the Republican Party. So let me respectfully ask my Republican colleagues: what are you thinking? How do you imagine this ends?

More than 95 percent of climate scientists are convinced that human carbon pollution is causing massive and unprecedented changes to our atmosphere and

...
oceans. You want to go with the five percent, and you think that’s gonna be a winning strategy?

Moreover, it turns out a lot of those five-percenters are on the payroll of the polluters. You know that. It’s public knowledge. Some of those same people who denied acid rain, who denied the dangers of tobacco.

You still like those odds? Those are the folks to whom you really want to hitch your Republican wagons? You’ve got to know that where does this go? What’s the end game?

Our planet has had a run of at least 800,000 years with levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere between 170 and 300 ppm. Eight hundred thousand years. Homo sapiens have only been around for about 200,000 years, so that 800,000 years—8,000 centuries—it takes you back a ways.

Eight hundred thousand years between 170 and 300 ppm, and in just the last 50 years we’ve blown out of that range, and have now hit 400 ppm and climbing.

And you want to be on the side of “nothing’s going on”? Really?

http://newsbusters.org/blogs/tom-blumer/2013/05/21/rhode-island-sen-whitehouse-blames-gop-okla-tornado-increasing

END CLIMATE DENIERS NEWSLETTER #1

GREENWASHING

Adam Gaya, ForestEthics onlineaction@forestethics.org via uark.edu
to jbennet

Greetings Dick,

Thanks in part to pressure from ForestEthics activists, seven new companies have distanced themselves from the “Sustainable” Forestry Initiative’s phony "eco"-label.*
The SFI is definitely feeling the heat. Tuesday our campaign was covered in this New York Times blog.

You helped us get this far, and you can help us bring in two more companies!

Supposedly “eco”-minded clothing companies Sierra Trading Post and Hanna Andersson think SFI’s label on their catalogs boosts their green cred. They need to hear from potential customers like you that SFI’s label on their catalogs makes us think Sierra Trading Post and Hanna Andersson are greenwashers.

Post this news article about SFI’s greenwashing on Sierra Trading Post's and Hanna’s Facebook walls!

>> Copy and paste this text (or write your own) on Hanna Andersson's Facebook wall:
Hanna, if you're really eco-minded, why are you using SFI's forest un-friendly logo on your catalogs? Follow the green leaders and implement a paper policy that really protects forests! http://nyti.ms/KqFse3

>> Copy and paste this text (or write your own) on Sierra Trading Post's Facebook wall:
For a company that sells so many outdoor products, why are you using SFI's forest un-friendly logo on your catalogs? Follow the green leaders and implement a paper policy that really protects forests! http://nyti.ms/KqFse3

If you don’t use Facebook, send an email to Sierra Trading Post and Hanna Andersson customer support teams and let them know SFI’s forest-unfriendly label makes you doubt their commitment to our forests. Tell them to implement a catalog policy that helps, not hurts, our forests.

BOOKS ON CORPORATIONS, REPUBLICANS, RELIGIOUS RIGHT , RIGHT-WING SKULLDUGGERY TO DENY WARMING

LETTER TO ART ET AL.

A book exposing the malicious conspiracies by wealthy people and companies and others to undermine scientific revelations of climate change would be an advance in our succession of books, so I welcome such a book. If the book you propose is at least mainly about that then let’s choose it. But not if it is mainly explaining warming as have our earlier books (unless we all think we need to repeat the reality).

The ideal and mighty significant book needed would recount how all the opponents of the science of warming together prevented the public from understanding the facts and how dire they are—corporations (several books), religious right (Mooney and Kirshenbaum), Republican Party (Mooney), politicians, and more.

--The Hockey Stick and the Climate War. 2012? Art: “I haven't read but which I have perused sufficiently to feel pretty sure it's the right book for our next selection. … It's by an excellent scientist, but it's not hard to read--he writes in a very down-to-earth way, non-technical (unlike James Hansen who gets too detailed in his book). This is a key book about the science and about the distortion of that science by powerful corporate interests. It's important not only because of the global warming issue, but much more broadly--because of the opposition of corporate interests to honest science. This opposition to science, coming from moneyed interests and also (more honestly but also more foolishly) from fundamentalist religion, is killing this country.”


--James Hoggan. Climate Cover-Up: The Crusade to Deny Global Warming. (this sounds comprehensive, I haven’t checked it).


Also consider the following books which discuss the subject more or less, all listed and some
annotated in the bibliography I have sent you all.


LOTS OF GOOD MATERIAL ON CORPORATE DECEIT, GO DOWN TO ABOUT P. 24-6

[My Business as Usual Columns are near the bottom.]

OMNI

ECOLOGY NEWSLETTER #2 ON

CORPORATE (including corporate media) DENIAL OF GLOBAL SCORCHING: GREENWASHING, GREENSCAMMING, BUSINESS AS USUAL, DOUBLETALK, CHICANERY, HYPOCRISY. Compiled by Dick Bennett for a Culture of Peace, Justice, and ECOLOGY.

The oxymoron of sustainable consumption.

My blog:
War Department/Peace Department

http://jamesrichardbennett.blogspot.com/

Newsletters

http://www.omnicenter.org/newsletter-archive/
For a knowledge-based peace, justice, and ecology movement and an informed citizenry as the foundation for change.

Contents #2

OMNI350 Book Forum, *The Hockey Stick*

RESISTING BY EXPOSING CORPORATE CONTROL OF CLIMATE INFORMATION IN USA

**Richard Branson, Businesses Should Stand Up to Climate Change Deniers.**  
*Reader Supported News*, March 8, 2014

Branson writes: "I'm enormously impressed with Apple CEO Tim Cook for his strong words on climate change deniers, and demanding business should have benefits for people and the planet, beyond just profit."

READ MORE


Goldenberg reports: "Confidential memo seen by Guardian calls for climate change sceptics to turn American public against solar and wind power."


**THE HEARTLAND INSTITUTE: FAKE CLIMATE SCIENCE IN THE SCHOOLS**

[Mann lambasts Heartland in *The Hockey Stick*, see Index.  D]
Dear Dick,

Do you think schools should teach our children that climate change isn't real?

Of course not. But the Heartland Institute, an organization known for giving a microphone to climate science deniers, now wants to bring this false message into America's classrooms.

As its President and CEO just admitted, Heartland is writing a "global warming curriculum" that would say climate science isn't settled. Heartland would like to create the appearance of a scientific debate where there is none by having our teachers claim we just don't know if humans are changing our climate.

Fortunately, one brave high school student is asking the Heartland Institute to stop. And I hope you will too.

Tell the Heartland Institute to cease and desist its plan to bring fake science into our schools. And watch our eye-opening video to learn more.

As you know, the science behind climate change is not controversial -- it is reality. It is the height of irresponsibility to urge our schools to teach something known to be untrue -- just as it is wrong to teach our children that gravity is not real or nicotine is not addictive.

As its own budget documents reveal, the Heartland Institute is funded by oil and coal companies with a financial interest in denying climate science. But I think you'll agree this industry-funded propaganda has no place in our schools.

Corey Husic is a high school student who knows there is no place for a climate denial curriculum in school. He and many others are asking that Heartland immediately "cease and desist" its plan to bring climate denial into our schools. And today, I invite you to sign this petition as well.

Scientists know that climate change is happening, and we are beginning to see the impacts with our own eyes. This debate is a distraction. Deniers are trying to prevent us from engaging in a much more fruitful discussion over what we can do to solve the climate crisis.
We've created a short video to help you learn more about this urgent issue. I encourage you to watch this video now, and sign the petition to keep climate reality in America's science classrooms.

Tell the Heartland Institute to end its plans for a climate denial curriculum. And watch our video to learn more.

http://forms.climaterealityproject.org/heartlandinstitute

Thanks for all you do,

Maggie L. Fox, President and CEO
The Climate Reality Project

MORE ON HEARTLAND

Climate Denial Bombshell

A major event in the U.S. political battle over climate change happened this week with the unauthorized release of secret internal documents that reveal the finances and truly Machiavellian strategy of the Heartland Institute, a leading oil-industry-funded disinformation machine designed to spread propaganda and cast doubt on the settled science of anthropogenic global warming.


"There, in black and white in the group's strategy document, is the truly nefarious, unAmerican, bald-faced goal: to dissuade American science teachers from teaching science. The group plans to pay Wojick $100,000 To develop a 20-module curriculum of obfuscation."

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/shawn-lawrence-otto/heartland-institute-leaked-documents_b_1278059.html

DENIAL AND CONTROL OF INFORMATION

From OMNI 350(Feb. 2012)
"Cowards in Our Democracies"

Posted ThinkProgress: 28 Jan 2012 12:40 PM PST, Joe Romm

"Leading climate scientists have given their support to a Freedom of Information request seeking to disclose who is funding the Global Warming Policy Foundation, a London-based climate sceptic thinktank chaired by the former Conservative chancellor Lord Lawson." As the UK Guardian reported earlier this week, "James Hansen, the director of the Nasa Goddard Institute for Space Studies who first warned the world about the dangers of climate change in the 1980s, has joined other scientists in submitting statements to be considered by a judge at the Information Rights Tribunal on Friday." Hansen has posted "Cowards in Our Democracies: Part 1" - his submitted statement and an explanatory intro - which I repost below.

by James Hansen

Global warming due to human-made gases, mainly CO2, is already 0.8°C and deleterious climate impacts are growing worldwide. More warming is "in the pipeline" because Earth is out of energy balance, with absorbed solar energy exceeding planetary heat radiation. Maintaining a climate that resembles the Holocene, the world of stable shorelines in which civilization developed, requires rapidly reducing fossil fuel CO2 emissions. Such a scenario is economically sensible and has multiple benefits for humanity and other species. Yet fossil fuel extraction is expanding, including highly carbon-intensive sources that can push the climate system beyond tipping points such that amplifying feedbacks drive further climate change that is practically out of humanity's control. This situation raises profound moral issues as young people, future generations, and nature, with no possibility of protecting their future well-being, will bear the principal consequences of actions and inactions of today's adults....

The public has the right to know who is supporting the foot soldiers for business-as-usual and to learn about the web of support for the propaganda machine that
serves to keep the public addicted to fossil fuels and destroys the future of their children.

**Figure 1.** CO2 emissions by fossil fuels (1 ppm CO2 ~ 2.12 GtC, where ppm is parts per million of CO2 in air and GtC is gigatons of carbon). Alternative estimates of reserves and potentially recoverable resources are from EIA (2011) and GAC (2011). [JR: Significantly exceeding 450 ppm risks severe, irreversible warming impacts. We are headed toward 800 to 1,000+ ppm, which represents the near-certain destruction of modern civilization as we know it -- as the recent scientific literature makes chillingly clear.]

**Cowards in Our Democracies: Part 1**

The threat of human-made climate change and the urgency of reducing fossil fuel emissions have become increasingly clear to the scientific community during the past few years. Yet, at the same time, the public seems to have become less certain about the situation. Indeed, many people have begun to wonder whether the climate threat has been concocted or exaggerated.

Public doubt about the science is not an accident. People profiting from business-as-usual fossil fuel use are waging a campaign to discredit the science. Their campaign is effective because the profiteers have learned how to manipulate democracies for their advantage.

The scientific method requires objective analysis of all data, stating evidence pro and con, before reaching conclusions. This works well, indeed is necessary, for achieving success in science. But science is now pitted in public debate against the talk-show method, which consists of selective citation of anecdotal bits that support a predetermined position.

Why is the public presented results of the scientific method and the talk-show method as if they deserved equal respect? A few decades ago that did not happen. In 1981, when I wrote a then-controversial paper ([http://pubs.giss.nasa.gov/abs/ha04600x.html](http://pubs.giss.nasa.gov/abs/ha04600x.html)) about the impact of CO2 on climate, the science writer Walter Sullivan contacted several of the top relevant scientific experts in the world for comments. He did not mislead the public by dredging up
and highlighting contrarian opinion for the sake of a forced and unnatural "balance".

Today most media, even publicly-supported media, are pressured to balance every climate story with opinions of contrarians, climate change deniers, as if they had equal scientific credibility. Media are dependent on advertising revenue of the fossil fuel industry, and in some cases are owned by people with an interest in continuing business as usual. Fossil fuel profiteers can readily find a few percent of the scientific community to serve as mouthpieces - all scientists practice skepticism, and it is not hard to find some who are out of their area of expertise, who may enjoy being in the public eye, and who are limited in scientific insight and analytic ability.

Distinguished scientific bodies such as national science academies, using the scientific method, can readily separate charlatans and false interpretations from well-reasoned science. Yet it seems that our governments and the public are not making much use of their authoritative scientific bodies.

Why is that?

I believe that the answer, and the difficulty in communicating science to the public, is related to the corrosive influence of money in politics and to increased corporate influence on the media.

It is a tragic and frustrating situation, because when all the dots in the climate-energy story are connected it becomes clear that a common-sense pathway exists that would solve energy needs, stimulate the economy, and protect the future of young people. As I discussed in "Storms of My Grandchildren," a gradually rising carbon fee should be collected from fossil fuel companies, with the money distributed uniformly to legal residents. This would stimulate the economy, making it more efficient by putting an honest price on fuels, incorporating their costs to society.

"Captains of industry" told me they would prefer such a course with knowledge of a steadily
rising carbon price, which would stimulate innovations in efficiency and clean energies.

Despite the obstacles presented by the role of money in politics and by the huge advertising campaigns of the fossil fuel industry, the urgency of addressing the climate-energy issue demands that we do the best that we can to inform the public. One of the things we can do is try to expose how the public and our democracies are being manipulated for the benefit of those profiting from the public's fossil fuel addiction.

For that purpose I provided the witness statement below in support of an effort to reveal the name of the seed funder of the Global Warming Policy Foundation (GWPF) in the UK. GWPF is "successful" in casting doubt on the reality and significance of human-made climate change.

The newsletters of Benny Peiser, Director of GWPF, can be quite entertaining and sometimes include useful references. He pings the impracticality and costliness of an energy approach that relies excessively on renewable energies. But ultimately his purpose seems to be to persuade the public that climate science is flawed. I don't know if GWPF is supported by the fossil fuel industry, but it seems to me that the public has the right to know. Ultimately, I hope and believe, the public will be able to appreciate how our democracies are being twisted by people with money for their own purposes. But that requires freedom of information.

Jim Hansen

Some clarification of what this is about, the secret efforts of Lords, the wealthy, the privileged, to dupe the public in our democracies into supporting their continued and growing privileges, is provided by this news article and press release:

http://requestinitiative.org/2012/01/lord-lawson-should-name-funder-of-climate-sceptic-think- tank-judge-told/
WARMING ARTICLE IN ROLLING STONE

AL GORE “CLIMATE OF DENIAL”

I've just read the best article for the general public on global warming I've seen in a long while. It's also an excellent commentary on U.S. journalism, politics, and culture. It's from the coming July 7, 2011 issue of "Rolling Stone," which goes on the news stands today (June 24, 2011). You can read the main article by clicking on the URL given below, although you should try to pick up the printed version in Rolling Stone because it includes four additional related articles: 11 signs that global warming is real, how Obama gave up on climate legislation, 12 politicians and execs blocking progress, and how fossil fuels companies have blocked progress. You can see the main article at:

http://acp.repoweramerica.org/rollingstone

AUTO ADS TODAY AND FROM THE BEGINNING

Everything is employed for profit, everything commodified.


EDF MEMBERSHIP FOR KIDS?

The Environmental Defense Fund solicited my contribution the other day, enclosing a flyer entitled "10 Things You Can Do to Fight Global Warming!" I was astonished: "1. Recycle and buy minimally packed goods as much as possible." "9 Adjust your thermostat--lower in winter, higher in summer." EDF has donned the role of Superman with green hair speaking to kids, "Follow These Easy Steps to Fight Global Warming." But these efficiencies will not end the use of coal. We need significant economic changes, and they won't be easy. Dick 4-28-10.
SOME ENVIRONMENT ORGANIZATIONS COOPERATE WITH GREENSCAMMING CORPORATIONS

The Wrong Kind of Green By Johann Hari

- This article appeared in the March 22, 2010 edition of The Nation.

Why did America's leading environmental groups jet to Copenhagen and lobby for policies that will lead to the faster death of the rainforests--and runaway global warming? Why are their lobbyists on Capitol Hill dismissing the only real solutions to climate change as "unworkable" and "unrealistic," as though they were just another sooty tentacle of Big Coal? ……..

Also By

- Slide Show: The Wrong Kind of Green
  Environment
  A look at the most questionable 'green' organizations that are busy shoveling up hard cash from the world's worst polluters.

- Swords Into Solar Panels
  Clean Energy Technology
  Miriam Pemberton: The Obama administration wants to push holistic solutions to national problems--and retooling manufacturers of military hardware into purveyors of solar technology is one.

» More

- The Wrong Kind of Green
  Environment
  Johann Hari: How conservation groups are bargaining away our future.

At first glance, these questions will seem bizarre. Groups like Conservation International are among the most trusted "brands" in America, pledged to protect and defend nature. Yet as we confront the biggest ecological crisis in human history, many of the green organizations meant to be leading the fight are busy shoveling up hard cash from the world's worst polluters--and burying science-based environmentalism in return. Sometimes the corruption is subtle; sometimes it is blatant. In the middle of a swirl of bogus climate scandals trumped up by deniers, here is the real Climategate, waiting to be exposed…….
Pink ribbons, red dresses, and greenwashing—American corporations are scrambling to tug at consumer heartstrings through cause-related marketing, corporate social responsibility, and ethical branding, tactics that can increase sales by as much as 74%. Harmless? Marketing insider Mara Einstein demonstrates in this penetrating analysis why the answer is a resounding “No!” In Compassion, Inc. she outlines how cause-related marketing desensitizes the public by putting a pleasant face on complex problems. She takes us through the unseen ways in which large sums of consumer dollars go into corporate coffers rather than helping the less fortunate. She also discusses companies that truly do make the world a better place, and those that just pretend to.

BUSH’S AUTHORITY THE NOVELIST CRIGHTON

“People tend to focus on the here and now. The problem is that, once global warming is something that most people can feel in the course of their daily lives, it will be too late to prevent much larger, potentially catastrophic changes.”

ELIZABETH KOLBERT, The New Yorker, Apr. 25, 2005. [See Index Of The Hockey Stick on Crighton. D]
WASHINGTON, Feb. 18 — One of the perquisites of being president is the ability to have the author of a book you enjoyed pop into the White House for a chat.

Over the years, a number of writers have visited President Bush, including Natan Sharansky, Bernard Lewis and John Lewis Gaddis. And while the meetings are usually private, they rarely ruffle feathers.

Now, one has.


Mr. Barnes, who describes Mr. Bush as "a dissenter on the theory of global warming," writes that the president "avidly read" the novel and met the author after Karl Rove, his chief political adviser, arranged it. He says Mr. Bush and his guest "talked for an hour and were in near-total agreement."

"The visit was not made public for fear of outraging environmentalists all the more," he adds.

And so it has, fueling a common perception among environmental groups that Mr. Crichton's dismissal of global warming, coupled with his popularity as a novelist and screenwriter, has undermined efforts to pass legislation intended to reduce emissions of carbon dioxide, a gas that leading scientists say causes climate change.

Mr. Crichton, whose views in "State of Fear" helped him win the American Association of Petroleum Geologists' annual journalism award this month, has been a leading doubter of global warming and last September appeared before a Senate committee to argue that the supporting science was mixed, at best.

"This shows the president is more interested in science fiction than science," Frank O'Donnell, president of Clean Air Watch, said after learning of the White House meeting. Mr. O'Donnell's group monitors environmental policy.

"This administration has put no limit on global warming pollution and has consistently rebuffed any suggestion to do so," he said.

Not so, according to the White House, which said Mr. Barnes's book left a false impression of Mr. Bush's views on global warming.

Michele St. Martin, a spokeswoman for the Council on Environmental Quality, a White House advisory agency, pointed to several speeches in which Mr. Bush had acknowledged the impact of global warming and the need to confront it, even if he questioned the degree to which humans contribute to it.
SOME OF THE CORRESPONDENCE AMONG CC BOOK CLUB PARTICIPANTS, FOR THE RECORD

WILL THE INSURANCE COMPANIES SPEAK UP!

>Robert--

>I really enjoyed your presentation at Nightbird Books the other night.

>Or rather, it was gut wrenching and very effective.

>

>I like the way you brought up the tobacco industry and PR campaigns. I

>have long thought that if tobacco could be brought to its knees by

>insurance companies who got tired of covering all those lung cancer

>victims because nobody would admit tobacco was a leading cause, then the

>climate change deniers could also be humbled by an insurance industry

>that finds the natural disaster arena to be far more intense than their

>business plan anticipated.

>

>This article suggests that this may be beginning.

>


Louise G. Mann

Waste Reduction Resources, LLC

www.WasteReductionResources.com

I am glad to have this Louise. The brave whistleblower Wendell Potter follows similar reasoning re.
tobacco lies and health insurance co. lies in *Deadly Spin: An Insurance Company Insider Speaks Out on How Corporate PR is Killing Health Care and Deceiving Americans.* See Index on tobacco. Potter was interviewed twice by the great Bill Moyers on Moyers' Journal on PBS.

Dick

9-4-11

Dick, Below is the description of the Power Point presentation I will present at the 40th annual NAAEE (North American Association for Environmental Education) conference in Raleigh, NC, Oct. 12 – 16th.

Robert

“Choose Reality: Revealing the Truth About the Climate Crisis” Bob McAfee, Co-Chair, Climate Change Task Force, OMNI Center for Peace Justice and Ecology. This presentation will focus the world’s attention on the full truth, scope, scale and impact of the climate crisis. To remove the doubt. Reveal the deniers. And catalyze urgency around an issue that affects every one of us.

The latest information from one of VP Gore’s Climate Presenters. Robert McAfee, Global Warming Messenger & Editor 350PPM Newsletter & News: Climate Change Task Force Web: [http://www.omnicenter.org/350-ppm-home](http://www.omnicenter.org/350-ppm-home) Email: robertjmca1@gmail.com

ART’S COLUMN ON WARMING, CRITICISM FROM A DENIER, ANALYSES OF DENIER’S ARGUMENTS BY STEVE BOSS, DARRELL HENSCHELL, DOUG KRUEGER, AND REBUTTAL OF DENIERS (from Robert McAfee), WITH A RELATED LETTER BY PROF. SLOAN. THIS IS A SMALL SAMPLE OF THE ACTIVE EFFORTS OF LOCAL FAYETTEVILLE CITIZENS TO TELL THE TRUTH AND EXPOSE THE CONTRARIANS.

The following exchange began with Prof. Art Hobson’s newspaper column in *The Northwest Arkansas Times* on atmospheric warming (his third in a series). A local citizen, wrote a criticism. Prof. Steve Boss, Darrell Henschell, and Doug Krueger analyzed the criticism. And Dr. Robert
McAfee sent a link to an essay on warming deniers. The local context for the arguments was the Book Forum on Climate Change, May 20, 2011 at OMNI, sponsored by OMNI’s Climate Change Task Force, Dick Bennett, Coordinator.

ART’S COLUMN EXPLAINING WARMING

MODERN TIMES

Art Hobson

ahobson@uark.edu

NWA Times, 15 May 2011

Possible energy futures, part 3

Part 1 outlined an energy future that would, by 2050, be based nearly entirely on efficiency and renewables such as solar. It's doable, and it's cheapest, but it's probably too smart for our anti-intellectual nation. So part 2 outlined a dumber plan that would still work: get dirtier energy from nuclear power plants and fossil fuel plants that utilize carbon dioxide (CO2) capture and storage. Here, I'll discuss what happens if we can't get our brains and our politics around some combination of energy futures 1 and 2.

[D: Art’s 3 columns: All three on energy:
http://physics.uark.edu/hobson/NWAT/11.04.03.html
http://physics.uark.edu/hobson/NWAT/11.05.15.html]

Under this "business as usual" case, global warming will probably be sufficient to usher in a new geological age by 2100. I'll present three arguments for this conclusion, any one of which should persuade a rational person that global warming is real, caused by humans, and likely to produce massive effects.

First, a common sense argument: Even most "climate skeptics" who think global warming is a hoax agree that fossil fuels have raised the atmospheric CO2 content by 40 percent since 1800. As you can see from the sharp spike in the graph that accompanies
this article, this increase has been large, sudden, and unprecedented during the past 10,000 years. The longer geological record shows the present CO2 level to be unprecedented during 800,000 years. And everybody agrees that CO2 is one of the "greenhouse gases" that absorb infrared energy, warming the planet. So why, as Nobel-prize-winning physicist Burton Richter asks in his book "Beyond Smoke and Mirrors," wouldn't you expect the temperature to increase?

And sure enough, the planet's temperature has increased by 1.4 Fahrenheit degrees since 1860. Ice is melting in the Arctic ocean, in Greenland, and in mountain glaciers. Sea levels are rising, and accelerating. Just as one would expect from the additional atmospheric energy, there's been an increase in extreme weather such as we've recently experienced here: downpours, floods, tornadoes, hurricanes, heat strokes, droughts, and accompanying forest fires.

Second, an argument from the standard scientific process: Scientists are able to use well tested scientific theories together with powerful computers to predict future climate patterns and understand past patterns. When we apply these computer models to the past century, we find that the models agree with observed temperature trends and other data if human CO2 emissions are included in the input to the models, but do not agree with observations if these human emissions are not included in the models. The scientific conclusion is that, with high probability, human CO2 emissions are at least a partial cause of the observed temperature increase.

Third, and most ominously, an argument from geological history: Two excellent books--James Hansen's "Storms of my Grandchildren" and Bryan Lovell's "Challenged by Carbon"--have emphasized the relevance of the "Paleocene-Eocene Thermal Maximum" (PETM) to the recent warming. The PETM is a global temperature rise of 8 degrees occurring 55 million years ago that ended the Paleocene geological era and initiated the Eocene era. Studies of underwater rock layers show that the PETM was caused by 1000 billion tons of carbon released from the ocean floor into the atmosphere. This natural, but geologically unique, release was probably triggered by a slight natural warming of a portion of the ocean that in turn warmed the methane-containing ices that can form on the ocean floor. This would cause the ices to suddenly emit their methane (a greenhouse gas), which entered, and warmed, the atmosphere. This caused the release of CO2, just as a warmed carbonated drink emits CO2 bubbles, causing further warming, and so forth in a vicious circle.
Today we're well on the way to a repeat of the PETM event, caused this time by humans. Since 1900 AD, we have managed to inject 300 billion tons of carbon into the atmosphere. That's one-third of the way toward the level that caused the PETM. Under business as usual, we will have injected the amount that caused the PETM by 2100. But long before then, warming could melt the methane ices residing on the ocean floor, initiating the vicious circle that triggered the PETM.

The PETM raised ocean levels by 18 feet, acidified all the oceans, drastically changed animal life, and initiated a new and distinctively different geological age. CO2 levels remained significantly above normal for 170,000 years.

We're playing with fire, folks. To help us think about this problem, come to a discussion of books about global warming, at Fayetteville's Omni Center, 3274 Lee Avenue (off College Avenue, near Liquor World) this Friday, May 20, at 6:30 pm.

DENIER’S CRITICISM

By Bill Orton: My latest letter to the editor, to the NWA Times:
Art Hobson is doing his Chicken Little routine again. Let’s look at his three arguments that global warming will be catastrophic to mankind unless something drastic is done (“Possible Energy Futures, Part 3 5/15/2011).

First he notes that there’s more CO2 in the atmosphere since 1800.
So what?
CO2 in the atmosphere has soaked up just about all the heat it can.

If you throw sponges in a bucket of water, after so many sponges the water is already absorbed. Throwing in more sponges makes virtually no difference. Similarly, as carbon dioxide increases it has less
warming effect. Despite the climate alarmists’ shrieks, CO2 could double or triple in the atmosphere with little effect on global temperature. Even the alarmist IPCC agrees; the claimed drastic increases in temperature are due to “feedback” based on unproved and dubious assumptions in their computer models.

Hobson’s second point is that the 20 odd IPCC computer models predict catastrophic warming. First we should note that computer model predictions are not scientific evidence as normally defined. They are not observations, they are models based on many assumptions - assumptions biased toward climate alarmism. For example, the model makers admit that they know next to nothing about the effect of CO2 on clouds, yet assume that feedback from clouds and humidity accounts for more than half of carbon’s alleged ‘effect’. Do these IPCC models make accurate predictions? No. Not one of the 20 plus models predicted the flat trend in global temperature since 1998. Not a single one. Appealing to models with a track record of failure is disingenuous.

The third argument Hobson gives is really reaching - reaching back 55 million years to what he admits was a “geologically unique” event. He also admits that the massive CO2 emission was the result, not the cause, of temperature warming.

I think the climate alarmists, with their ridiculous crisis-mongering, are doing a disservice to environmentalism. There are legitimate reasons to reduce pollution (which CO2 is not, contrary to political decrees.) There are strong reasons to reduce coal consumption and move to Sustainable energy. Crying “the sky is falling” is not a constructive way to seek solutions.
REBUTTAL BY STEVE BOSS

This letter is replete with misconceptions and the rhetoric of anti-science and shows a fundamental lack of understanding of climate dynamics. "CO2 in the atmosphere has soaked up just about all the heat it can" and “CO2 could double or triple in the atmosphere with little effect on global temperature” are wholly incorrect assertions with no basis in fundamental physics. At the present time, much of the outgoing long-wave radiation (what lay persons incorrectly term ‘heat’) still escapes to space because greenhouse gases in our atmosphere are not sufficiently abundant to absorb it all and thankfully so or our planet would be a searing Hell like Venus. However, greenhouse gases are demonstrably and irrefutably increasing in our atmosphere. Most of these additional greenhouse gases derive from activities of our technological society and addition of those greenhouse gases does, in fact, raise global atmospheric temperatures. The fundamental physics of the outgoing long-wave radiation is not deniable. Increasing the concentration of CO2 and other greenhouse gases results in additional absorption of outgoing long-wave radiation and additional atmospheric heating – average global temperatures rise. This is a result required by simple physics and can be rigorously derived and defended mathematically. It is not a disputable opinion.

General Circulation Models (GCMs or ‘climate models’) are the most sophisticated computer programs climate scientists have and are not founded in assumptions. They are founded in the current state-of-knowledge regarding our mathematical understanding of atmospheric and oceanic physics. Our knowledge of the mathematics governing these complicated environmental systems is not complete, however, and this is the source of much of the uncertainty in climate models. In addition, the computational power to render these models at sufficiently high resolution is somewhat limited. This is another source of significant uncertainty. Climate scientists understand these limitations and are perfectly honest about them.

Despite the well-known limitations of GCMs, their output does a rather good job of rendering current Earth climate when current data are input into the models. For this reason, climate scientists give credence to the output of models using scenarios with increased atmospheric CO2. Climate scientists do not, as a group, claim model outputs are scientific evidence of climate change or global warming. There are abundant observational data demonstrating that.

Finally, we all agree with the author that society must begin transitioning away from reliance on fossil fuels to more sustainable energy sources for many reasons, and doing so will have many benefits to humanity and our environment.
HENSCHELL’S REBUTTAL OF THE CRITICISM

On Sun, May 15, 2011 at 8:27 PM, Darrel Henschell <pianodarr@yahoo.com> wrote:

Hello,

This is Darrel Henschell with the Fayetteville Freethinkers.

Today [a warming denier] emailed a letter he wrote regarding global warming and I see you are one of the lucky 18 folks who received an unblinded copy. He wrote it in response to Art Hobson's latest column on energy (part three of three), that was published in the paper yesterday.


In the following I cite and respond to each of [the points] points directly. Perhaps you will find this of interest.

*****

DENIER

[Art Hobson]... notes that there’s more CO2 in the atmosphere since 1800. So what?"}>>
Co2, while only representing a tiny .04% of our atmosphere, provides 60 degrees of warming. Without it, the average earth temperature would be below freezing. This makes it a profoundly powerful greenhouse gas. This was understood almost two centuries ago.

"CO2 in the atmosphere has soaked up just about all the heat it can." >>>

That you have to use the weasel words "just about" suggest that even you are aware that the doubling of C02 will have profound implications for the planet's temperature. This was understood in 1896.

Let's review the history:

1) Greenhouse gasses absorb infrared radiation in the atmosphere and re-emit much of it back toward the surface, thus warming the planet (less heat escapes; Fourier, 1824).

1824 - French physicist Joseph Fourier describes the Earth's natural "greenhouse effect". He writes: "The temperature [of the Earth] can be augmented by the interposition of the atmosphere, because heat in the state of light finds less resistance in penetrating the air, than in re-passing into the air when converted into non-luminous heat."

2) CO2 is a greenhouse gas and thus has the capacity to warm the planet (Tyndall, 1858).

3) By burning fossil fuels, humans activities are increasing the greenhouse gas concentration of the Earth (Arrhenius, 1896).

4) Increased greenhouse gas concentrations lead to more heat being trapped, warming the planet further (Arrhenius, 1896).

For the rest of the timeline see:

http://www.aip.org/history/climate/co2.htm
DENIER

If you throw sponges in a bucket of water, after so many sponges the water is already absorbed.">>

DAR

Except that, Co2 is now a "forcing" and also "feedback" whereas at the times in the distant past, the warming was started by long term cycles such as the Milankovitch cycle, and then causing a feedback effect of more CO2 release. This has been explained to you many times before. Note:

"The CO2 amplifies the warming and mixes through the atmosphere, spreading warming throughout the planet. So CO2 causes warming AND rising temperature causes CO2 rise."

http://www.skepticalscience.com/co2-lags-temperature-intermediate.htm

DENIER

"Throwing in more sponges makes virtually no difference.">>

DAR

Again, the weasel word "virtually." That it does make a difference, even a small difference, is indeed the problem ("Climate sensitivity is around 3°C for a doubling of CO2"). And the problem compounds yearly as we dump trillions of tons of Co2 and other gases into the air, which most likely will lead to further tipping point releases and acceleration from natural sources.

DENIER

CO2 could double or triple in the atmosphere with little effect on global temperature.">>

DAR

It takes little effect, compounded over a few decades/centuries, along with methane and other tipping point gas releases, to initiate profound effects for the planet. And we are seeing the result already. The main concern is what is in the pipeline.
"the 20 odd IPCC computer models predict catastrophic warming.">>

Dr. Hobson never said "catastrophic," that's your word. But the best science certainly tells us catastrophic warming is possible, if not likely over a century or two. As the National Academy of Science found, agreement with the IPCC's findings practically unanimous:

"97–98% of the climate researchers most actively publishing in the field support the tenets of ACC outlined by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change,..."

http://www.pnas.org/content/early/2010/06/04/1003187107.abstract

"...computer model predictions are not scientific evidence as normally defined.">>

This is climate science denier canard #6:

"While there are uncertainties with climate models, they successfully reproduce the past and have made predictions that have been subsequently confirmed by observations."

http://www.skepticalscience.com/climate-models-intermediate.htm

Successfully reproducing past and present conditions and making correct, testable predictions, is indeed science. And importantly, your point is false anyway because these things can be shown without relying upon computer models. See link directly below.

"They are not observations, they are models based on many assumptions">>
They mostly certainly do make predictions which have now been directly observed. All claims have assumptions.

DENIER
"model makers admit that they know next to nothing about the effect of CO2 on clouds;" 

DAR
This is false. Learn about this here:


DENIER
Do these IPCC models make accurate predictions? No." 

DAR
Absolutely they do. Again, see denier canard #6:

http://www.skepticalscience.com/climate-models-intermediate.htm

DENIER
Not one of the 20 plus models predicted the flat trend in global temperature since 1998." 

DAR
This is absurd. Still playing the ludicrous game of cherry picking a single outlier year I see.

Scientists know, and state plainly, that twelve years is not considered statistically significant anyway.

Global warming is a general increase in temperature around an ever-increasing statistical mean, which is precisely what we are observing. Cherry picking a single year to find a false short term trend is ridiculous. No one has predicted, or ever would predict, each year to heat up in perfect stair step order.
Incidentally, 2005 was as hot as 1998, as was 2009, and 2010 was even hotter. Last year was the hottest year ever measured (and likely the hottest year in 2,000 years). Our current decade was hotter than the previous, and the one previous, and the one previous. That *is* statistically significant and exactly what was being predicted 35 years ago.

"20 warmest years having occurred since 1981 and with all 10 of the warmest years occurring in the past 12 years."

http://climate.nasa.gov/evidence/

DENIER

Appealing to models with a track record of failure is disingenuous.">>

DAR

You forgot to show a track record of failure, and this is because the record is quite against you. In the 1970's, climatologists were overwhelmingly (6 to 1) predicting warming. And they have now been shown to be right.

DENIER

[Hobson] admits that the massive CO2 emission was the result, not the cause, of temperature warming.">>

DAR

And that's why your objection is not irrelevant to the claim of currently observed, human caused, rapid warming. In this instance, humans are releasing the CO2 (also methane and nitrous oxide) and causing the forcing. Warming now follows. Again, the science of how this works was understood in the 1800's (including, incredibly, a very close approximation of what doubling would entail).

See again, denier canard #12:

http://www.skepticalscience.com/co2-lags-temperature-intermediate.htm

And note:
"The industrial activities that our modern civilization depends upon have raised atmospheric carbon dioxide levels from 280 parts per million to 379 parts per million in the last 150 years. The panel also concluded there's a better than 90 percent probability that human-produced greenhouse gases such as carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxide have caused much of the observed increase in Earth's temperatures over the past 50 years.

...the rate of increase in global warming due to these gases is very likely to be unprecedented within the past 10,000 years or more."

http://climate.nasa.gov/causes/

DENIER
"Crying "the sky is falling" is not a constructive way to seek solutions."

[DENIER] didn't bother to give an example of anyone claiming the "sky is falling." The best science, and at least 97% of the experts with the proper training and expertise in this field say there is the potential for very great harm to the planet if we stay the course.

And unlike the climate science denial position, they have decades of peer reviewed science to support their claims.

One is left to wonder, are there are any other areas of science where Bill thinks he knows more than 97% of the experts in an extremely complex area of science? Or is it perhaps for political reasons and his devotion to the extreme positions of anarcho-capitalism and Ayn Rand objectivism that he finds it necessary to make this extraordinary and unscientific exception for the field of climate science?

Darrel.
-------------
What can climate science deniers say in response to such overwhelming evidence against them?

"Their only recourse is to just deny everything - deny the universally accepted temperature record that shows accelerating warming... deny the very clear attribution of that warming to human causes... deny that the ice is melting all over the planet... deny that the warmer, moister atmosphere is causing demonstrably more extreme weather... deny that the seasons are changing, that climate zones are shifting polewards and uphill, that sea level rise is accelerating, that drought is increasing, that permafrost is thawing and that literally thousands of other physical and biological metrics indicate a warming world.
Only by denying the truth, rejecting the overwhelming evidence and slandering decent, honest climate scientists do these sociopathic anti-science individuals hope to deceive the public and thereby protect the billions of dollars in profits of the fossil fuel industry." --Icarus62, Huffington Post

[DENIER’S] REPLY AND DARRELL’S REPLY TO HIM  5-19-11

So [DENIER] is still kicking in defense of his ridiculous letter to the paper regarding Art's article on energy. He's posted it all here, including our rebuttals:

http://www.ozarkia.net/bill/anarchism/rants/GlobalWarmingAlarmismDebate.html

This is just a heads up to save time if you are thinking of responding to it (we may make a thread for this in our freethinker forum, DENIER is currently banned for bad behavior).

I want to draw your attention to this in his latest:

"Most of this information, including the graphic above, can be seen in The Skeptic's Handbook, which besides being a trove of information about climate change, is a model of critical thinking." -- [DENIER]


One stop shopping, no need to reinvent the wheel here folks. So this latest is basically all warmed over junk from that tract, which is being widely produced and distributed, by the hundreds of thousands of copies, by The Heartland Institute. It has been thoroughly ripped to shreds, from top to bottom, here:

DOUG KRUEGER’S REBUTTAL

[The] letter of 5/21 makes three main points contesting the overwhelming scientific consensus that
global warming is real, and that it’s a danger. All three points are flawed.

First, [Denier] says that the CO2 in the atmosphere has absorbed “just about” all the heat it can, so additional CO2 makes little or no difference in global temperature. In other words, global warming can’t get any worse than it already is, so all the dire predictions are wrong. Unfortunately, Orton’s conclusion is based on experiments done in 1896. Subsequent research by Hulbert in 1931 showed that CO2 saturation in the lower troposphere is as [Denier] describes, but in the upper troposphere the CO2 amounts still make a difference. Additional CO2 can and will make the effects of global warming worse. [] research is eighty years obsolete.

[] second point is that computer model predictions are not scientific evidence and they are inaccurate because they didn’t predict the “flat trend” in the global temperature since 1998. Computer models can be significant evidence, but [] should be aware that scientists use real, hard data of global warming in addition to computer models. And since 1998 was an unusually hot year, climate change critics often point to that year and pretend that there is no warming trend since later years were not as hot—except 2005, which was hotter than 1998. So was 2010. The warming trend has not flattened out. Orton’s research here is at least six years obsolete. Besides, reaching conclusions about climate trends over only a 13-year period is absurd. Over many decades, the global warming trend is undeniable.

[] last point is that Art Hobson admits in a recent column that CO2 emissions 55 million years ago resulted from warm temperatures, and hence were not the cause of them. Presumably [] thinks we should conclude that CO2 emissions today are likewise not the cause of warming temperatures. But the conclusion does not follow. Just because CO2 was released from the ocean because of warming millions of years ago (because of a variation in earth’s orbit), it does not follow that CO2 cannot cause warming today. That would be like arguing that since heat can cause a fire, therefore fires cannot cause heat. The logic is erroneous. In any case, it is known that once the CO2 was released, it became a cause of warming, which is one of the climate change mechanisms at work today.

We should remember that science is a cutthroat business. Scientists win prizes and prestige by showing that the prevailing view is incorrect. If global warming were a hoax, a scientist could win the Nobel Prize exposing it as a fraud. If climate change could be disproven, scientists would have done so by now. [] arguments are refuted many places online. The science is settled, and fortunately climatologists long ago moved from debating whether climate change is real and human-caused to discussing how fast it is happening and what we can do about it.

REBUTTAL TO DENIERS (from Robert McAfee)

350PPM, 11.3 I provided a link to a great source of rebuttal of most denier’s arguments. Here it is:

http://www.grist.org/article/series/skeptics/

Robert
GERRY SLOAN TO ?? EDITOR OF UA’S Research Frontiers. 4-28-11

As a longtime professor on this campus, I was more than a little appalled by the spring issue of "Research Frontiers," featuring a rear cover devoted to a full-page green-washed ad for an energy company which is heavily involved in degrading the roads, bridges, and freshwater eco-systems of Arkansas. As usual, the cost of this wholesale pollution and abuse will fall to the landowners and taxpayers of the state, not to the big energy companies who profit at our expense. While I am reluctantly preparing myself for the new frontier of "entrepreneurship" announced by Jim Rankin on the "Perspectives" page, I don't think higher education needs to compromise its integrity to this extent and should resist such blatant "embedding" with corporate America. If you want to do some real research, interview Joyce Hale of the League of Women Voters about the damage being done across Arkansas by the process known as hydraulic fracturing, or get someone to review Josh Fox's Oscar-nominated documentary "Gasland," about the true toll of natural gas extraction. Perhaps I should view that back cover as a blank billboard, up-for-grabs to the highest bidder. But let's not pretend or give the impression that such jingoistic huckstering has anything to do with academic research. That should be an embarrassment to the entire University community.

Sincerely,

Gerald Sloan

Professor of Music

END CORPORATE CONTROL OF CLIMATE INFORMATION
NEWSLETTER #2
NEWSLETTER #1??????

ECOLOGY

CORPORATE: ADVERTISING AND GLOBAL SCORCHING: GREENWASHING, BUSINESS AS USUAL, SCAMS, DOUBLETALK, CHICANERY, HYPOCRISY

BUSINESS AS USUAL, MARCH 2009

Environment

A 2006 report by the Connecticut-based Container Recycling Institute which is a nonprofit dedicated to increasing recovery and recycling of beverage containers and San Francisco-based nonprofit As You Sow which aims to promote corporate accountability, grades America’s top beverage companies on their efforts to use recycled content, increase recovery and recycling, and reduce the amount of material used in beverage containers. Starbucks earned F’s in every area surveyed except recycled content. The company received a D in that category for incorporating 10 percent post-consumer recycled paper in its hot drink cups. Starbucks scored an F grade overall, with a GPA of 0.3 (on a 4.0 scale).

-- Container Recycling Institute, 10/01/2006

Source URL: container-recycling.org/assets/pdfs/reports/2006-scorecard.pdf

Democracy Now (3-2-09)told about the Capitol’s 35% dependence upon coal, and Reid
and Pelosi’s advocacy for change to gas completely. Bill McKibben spoke out against coal and would abolish all the 600 coal plants. Van Jones stated that clean coal was as ludicrous as unicorns and tooth fairies. McKibben wore a tie emblazoned with “350.” The program celebrated the Powershift ’09 rally in DC, where 12,000 students were gathering this weekend for the largest civil disobedience event in US history (I think McKibben said this).

EVALUATE THIS “GREEN” REPOWER AMERICA MEETING, CHECK OUT THE COMPANIES, CHECK ALL CLAIMS—7000?

The Details

Made in America Town Hall (Repower America Event)

Repower Arkansas, a project of the Alliance for Climate Protection, will be hosting a roundtable discussion highlighting the benefits to Arkansas families and businesses of transitioning to a clean energy economy.

In the last year, Repower America has drawn together a membership of over 7,800 Arkansans in support of strengthening Arkansas’s booming clean energy economy.

WHO: Mary Ann Shope - VP for Economic Development, Pulaski Technical College
Stephen Walker - Director of Development, Phoenix Renewable Energy
April Ambrose - Sustainability Coordinator for Viridian
JD Lowery - Sustainability Project Manager for Viridian
Christopher Charlton - Greenway Equipment/ John Deere, Wind Energy Associate
Bill Ball - CEO of Steller Sun Solar

Time: Tuesday, September 8 from 4:30 PM - 7:30 PM
Host: Brendan Bea
Contact Phone: 501.813.7031
Location: Pulaski Technical College - Campus Center: Grand Hall B (North Little Rock, AR)

3000 West Scenic Drive
North Little Rock, AR 72118
THE FOLLOWING WAS NOT PUBL., ROBERT NEVER FINISHED OR SENT HIS FEB. 09 NO., SO IT COULD SERVE AS BEGINNING OF NEW NEWSLETTER ON GREEN SCAMS


BUSINESS AS USUAL, FEBRUARY 2009

By Dick Bennett

“Carbon emissions have been growing at 3.5 percent per year since 2000, up sharply from the 0.9 percent per year in the 1990s.”

Whitewash: to gloss over faults or absolve one from blame.

Greenwash: to claim to be a “green” company or industry when it is actually increasing CO2 in the atmosphere, or at best only decreasing the rate of increase.

Why does greenwashing matter? Every misleading word and statement prevents understanding and solution of problems. Prevarication especially is damaging to public discourse.

REDUCE, REUSE, RECYCLE. This triad of injunctions have become the mantra of the sustainable energy movement. But each is susceptible to deceptive manipulation. Consider “REDUCE.” “Reducing” is a powerful word for industry chicanery today, for it identifies companies with a popular slogan without requiring much or any financial pain. Consider this auto ad.

Many newspapers print an advertising supplement on cars weekly, usually on Fridays. The articles look like news reports, but they are paid for by the industry and newspaper.

On Feb. 6, 2009, in The Morning News, the lead article of “Wheel Deals” announced: “Greener—But No Less Meaner SUVs.” “A new generation of ‘clean diesel’ SUVs get stellar fuel economy with strong performance and reduced emissions.” Greener? Reduced emissions? Arguing that something is better requires comprehensive application of criteria and evidence. How much greener, reduced? 00001%? “Clean diesel”? What do the quotation marks mean? Consider the effect of quotation marks at a grocery store: “Fresh” asparagus. If fresh then why add the q.m.? And quotation marks often signal irony (use of words to convey a meaning opposite of its literal meaning). Is the writer trying to protect himself from accusation of lying?

So, how clean? “…old-school diesels….were also dirty, spewing insidiously smoky exhaust fumes wherever they went.” New diesels “will open up a big blue-sky horizon….And ‘blue’ is definitely the
operative word.” Well, no, “blue” is cotton candy for the eye. Can you be more specific? Reading down (another misleading comparative): The “Blue” diesel will “run as clean as its gasoline counterpart.” That’s clean?!

But this is a fool-the-public ad for the auto industry. We would not expect them to tell the truth about CO2 from auto emissions; for example, that humans, partly through cars, are adding carbon to the atmosphere even faster than in the 1990s.

Many companies are embracing “reducing” for sustainability today. It’s fun to ride the bandwagon (another old propaganda device), and it makes money. (Is there anything for-profit companies have not turned into a commodity?) For example, the Switzerland-based Nestle claims to be a leader for the environment by establishing “goals to reduce [its] impact on the environment.” Nestle factories in Jonesboro and Fort Smith “have made strides to reduce waste and water consumption.” “Strides”? These “strides” makes Nestle, claims the company, a “leader” in creating a “greener” planet? These claimed “strides” will reduce CO2, the whole purpose of being “green”? And how much a reduction?

Wal-Mart has been trumpeting its greenness for two years at least, but mainly citing very minor reducing, reusing, and recycling, compared to their long-distance hauling (from China!) and big box stores, both immense causes of CO2. But recently the company announced it would “scale back on U.S. store growth.” Now that could be significant. Down from 218 new stores in the previous fiscal year, W-M will build only “191 stores this fiscal year” and trim “even further in fiscal 2010 with 142 to 157 new stores.” Let’s thank W-M for these reductions, but do they allow them to wrap in the green flag? The reductions are not reducing CO2. They are only reducing the rate of CO2 production. And maybe not even that, since “Wal-Mart also plans to accelerate growth of smaller-format stores.”

But all of these “strides” toward “green” reductions pale to white by the use of black—the continued increase of coal as the main “source of electricity for the foreseeable future.” Some individuals are making truly great strides in coloring green. One couple turned from white to green for their wedding. They created compostable utensils made from potatoes, served only locally grown food, bought 100% recycled white gold wedding rings, and employed solar power to make popcorn, and many other reducing, recycling, reusing innovations. They are true environmental heroes. But coal will kill our planet. According to the Energy Dept., coal-use will rise to “54 percent of electricity generation by 2030 from 50 percent now,” because coal is “abundant and easy to turn into power.” And even though the price of coal has “more than doubled since the beginning of 2007 to nearly $116 per ton, it is cheaper to burn coal to generate steam to turn turbines than to use virtually any other method of generation.” Coal, therefore, despite “three million tons [of] annual CO2 emissions released by a typical 500-watt coal-fired power plant” and the piling up of “millions of tons of toxic coal ash…in power plant ponds,” “will remain the nation’s preferred source of electricity.”

Conclusion:
Environmental scientists have hoped Antarctica was not melting. But the director of the Norwegian Polar Institute, citing their studies and a recent study in the journal *Nature*, announced troubling evidence to the contrary. "'This new analysis shows us actually the whole of Antarctica has been warming,' Kim Holmen said.” But we might be cheered by the less pessimistic assessment by U.S. glaciologist Ted Scambos, who declared that “there’s a slight warming trend in East Antarctica.”

We need a new slogan. You have seen the ubiquitous and highly misleading message, “Keep Arkansas Beautiful! Report Littering. 1-866-811-1222.” Misleading because it distracts us from the real danger of car emissions and a melting Antarctica. Stopping warming will require major effort and expense. Not throwing a cup from your car costs nobody and is irrelevant to a warming planet. So here is the slogan we need: “Keep Arkansas! Report CO2. 1-866-811-1222.”
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*Rural Arkansas*, the Magazine of the Electric Cooperatives of Arkansas

By Dick Bennett

Every number of *Rural Arkansas* contains explicit or disguised defenses of fossil fuels. Of course, the writers claim they are responsibly greening. But the best they can suggest in the little time left us to turn warming around is to reduce the rate of increase of CO2.

Defenders of increasing CO2 while claiming to be *greening* are in a difficult bind. For they might seem ignorant, which is a shaky foundation for a corporate leader; or be guilty of *cant*—defined by one dictionary as insincerity, of pretending to have certain beliefs; or seem to be lying, deliberately ravaging the planet while claiming to be defending it; or criminally—that is, knowingly and willfully--increasing the atmosphere’s carbon content that will inflict on the planet and its inhabitants a dangerous climate.

A strong case for ignorance can be drawn from each number of *Rural Arkansas*. Its writers give little indication that they have read substantial studies of recent and projected climate changes. I suppose it’s too much to expect the editor of *Rural Arkansas* and his contributors to have read the definitive reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), but they could have read the books based upon the research of over a thousand of the world’s best scientists; such as George Monbiot’s *Heat*, Mark Lynas’s *Six Degrees: Our Future on a Hotter Planet*, Eric Roston’s *The Carbon Age: How Life’s Core Element Has Become Civilization’s Greatest Threat*, or James Gustave Speth’s *The Bridges at the Edge of the World: Capitalism, the Environment, and Crossing from Crisis to Sustainability.*

Examination of the contents of *Rural Arkansas*, to follow, reinforce the ignorance these absences suggest.

An equally strong case can be made that the editor and some writers are deliberately deceiving readers. The “GreenPOWER” program hides the major use of coal. And it is hypocritical--falsely professing desirable or publicly approved qualities, pretending to have virtues it does not really possess (*green!*).

Here’s how they do it in the April 2008 number. This one number contains six “green” items.

1. Two sections of the April 2008 magazine focus on Ozarks Electric’s “GreenPOWER” initiative.
A “GreenPOWER” (“green” colored green) insert from Ozarks Electric Cooperative Corporation (OECC) claims: The Electric Cooperatives of Arkansas have been “green for more than 20 years,” because the co-ops have “always taken our role as environmental stewards seriously.” How? By spending some $330 million “to develop renewable energy sources in the form of hydropower plants on the Arkansas River.” Congratulations? After all, that money is “more than one-third of our capital investment in generation capacity.” But just a minute. One-third means that $660 million was spent on other energy—power lines, switching stations, and do you think? fossil fuel plants, and those include coal plants? So what would be the truthful claim? Electric co-ops of Arkansas have taken their role as environmental stewards seriously by choosing one-third hydro-electric and two-thirds fossil-fuels for more than 20 years.

Later in the magazine Ozarks Electric does admit the truth, but reluctantly. Two pages summarize the origin and mission of electric co-ops, praise the new “GreenPower” fund for “the development of renewable energy sources and energy conservation in Arkansas,” and solicit investment in the fund. “Green power” is defined as “electricity that is partially or entirely generated from environmentally preferable renewable energy sources, such as solar, wind, biomass, methane gas—and, in the case of cooperatives in Arkansas-hydropower.” That is, the 17 Ark. Co-ops and their “wholesale supplier, Arkansas Electric Cooperative Corporation,” as the insert said, provide “green power” by three hydro-electric generation stations on the Arkansas River at a cost of $330 million. What will investors in the GreenPower fund gain? “Safe, reliable, reasonably priced electricity…the opportunity to assist in increasing the use of renewable energy [in fact very little], which is very costly to develop [and] to invest in protecting the environment [not by coal] and ensuring that Arkansas’ natural resources are preserved.” Not until the end does the obfuscating advertorial confront the issue of coal. “Will green power replace the use of coal-fired generation? Not any time soon. For the time being….” To summarize: because the co-ops cannot turn to alternative energy sources because they are “intermittent” and electricity cannot be stored, “coal remains the best choice for the bulk of our electricity production. About 70 percent of the cooperatives’ generation comes from coal fired power planets” (my italics). Translation: the horn tooting about “GreenPOWER” is two-thirds deception. But if you will start giving the co-ops money, some day all will be well, because co-ops “are committed to the development of new technology that will make coal plants even cleaner in the future.” (Cleaner than now? They are not clean now, but are the chief source of CO2, and they will probably never be made “clean.”)

Ozarks Electric’s insert especially and its advertorial not so cleverly attempt to blind us to the truth that because “humans have sped up the global carbon cycle at least one hundred times faster than usual,” the planet is in peril (Roston). What is necessary is a 60% to 80% cut in greenhouse gas emissions, and the co-ops officers and board have known this at least since the 2005 Millenial Ecosystem Assessment, the fourth Of the
Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (2007), and known dramatically since *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* moved its Doomsday Clock closer to midnight, citing environmental threats (Speth). Instead of a comprehensive program to make the necessary reductions, Ozarks Electric and the Electric Cooperatives of Arkansas give us greenwashing.

2. And how does “GreenPOWER” respond to congressional efforts to change business as usual, even mild reductions in fossil fuel energy? Well, you know the answer already. The electric cooperatives lobbied to defeat the Lieberman-Warner Act and to maintain federal subsidies to their own business as usual. In “Capitol Buzz” Carmie Henry describes a) the upcoming National Rural Electric Cooperative Association Legislative conference in D.C., the function of which is to lobby, b) the “disastrous” Lieberman-Warner Climate Security Act, S. 2191, and c) threats to funding of Rural Utilities Services (RUS) administration. Raising fears of power rationing and rolling brown out, of destroying Arkansas’ economy, and sending jobs “to China and India,” Henry urges readers to contact Senators Pryor and Lincoln to support funding for the RUS rural electric loan program (with “more than $36 billion in loans outstanding”) and to oppose the “disastrous climate legislation” of the Lieberman-Warner Act “We need climate legislation that emphasizes research and technology to address climate problems without taking away the American dream.” (The American Dream! the old self-regarding way of personal success, material comfort, consumption, and growth, the quintessential business as usual that produced the crisis.) To the contrary, we need a truly responsible approach if we are to avoid flooded coasts, wiped out species, and disrupted agriculture worldwide.

3. Henry’s attack in April 2008 on the Lieberman-Warner Act was part of a national utilities mobilization against the legislation, which was coming up for debate in June. The NRDC explains its importance to the world—and to the utilities: “The upcoming floor debate on the Climate Security Act represents a historic moment in the move toward comprehensive limits on U.S. global warming emissions. The Climate Security Act Substitute Amendment [Senator Boxer had joined Lieberman and Warner] is a strong start on cutting global warming pollution and investing in America’s clean and independent energy future. If enacted, this bill would put the United States, and the world, on a path to avoiding the worst impacts of global warming. It’s time for Congress to strengthen and pass the Climate Security Act.”

Defeating the Act was so important to Arkansas’ utilities that *Rural Arkansas* in this April number alone published a second, detailed attack, this one by the CEO of Electric Cooperatives of Arkansas, Gary Voigt, “Study Shows Economic Costs of
Lieberman/Warner Bill.” Voigt based his discussion of the evils of the Act on a study by a Washington think tank, the American Council for Capital Formation. The study argued that the L-W Act would “raise energy prices, resulting in job loss, a fall in household income, slow economic growth and production losses in most industries.” The Act established a “cap and trade” program to limit fossil fuels uses by raising the cost of using them—that is, a tax on CO2. Then he describes why and how electricity prices would rise in Arkansas by 118% as the result of this legislation. And its total cost would reach $5 to $8 trillion to 2050. Furthermore, no technology exists that would allow capping and pricing carbon emissions. Despite the vagueness and generality of these arguments, Voigt appeals to readers to contact Arkansas Senators and Congressmen to vote against the Act.

What does he propose in its place? He would support “the existing research and development roadmap that, properly funded, will develop clean energy alternatives using domestic energy sources while protecting our economy, security, and the environment.” That is, he offers no alternative program, but we can assume he agrees with Henry that the government should continue to loan RUS money.

Voigt, Henry, Ozarks Electric were successful. As the result of energy company lobbying, the Act never reached the floor of the Senate.

4. But Rural Arkansas was not through with its defense of business as usual. A fourth article continued the drumbeat: “A Sound Approach to Climate Change” by Jennifer Taylor and Scott Gates, employees of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. They describe a plan by utility companies that would meet growing demand for electricity at an affordable price while reducing CO2 by 45% “over the next 22 years,” or 2030. Of course, the plan must operate within the realities of an 18% rise in demand for electricity during the next decade. So the task of maintaining adequate electricity at affordable prices will require aggressive action in seven areas, from efficiency to improved coal-fired plants, to sequestration and electric vehicles. And enormous public expenditures. Energy efficiency is the most cost-effective, and could reduce electricity consumption by 9% in 22 years. Renewable energy or “green power” led by wind energy could rise to 6.7% of kilowatt hours in 2030. New nuclear plants are needed, 12 by 2020 and more each year through 2030. Sounds like, and was meant to seem a reasonable mix. But is it? Their treatment of coal plants discusses only improvement in plant efficiency and reducing “carbon emission.” Coal may still provide half of the power. Carbon capture and storage “will likely take years, if not decades, to come online—assuming the federal government provides sufficient funding.”

In general then, the utilities have their eye on their profits foremost, and the urgency of CO2 reduction is secondary. A statement at the beginning of the article offers a clue: “As the climate change debate takes aim at power generation, electric cooperatives have a responsibility to keep policy makers in check” (my italics). The title of the article should
be “A Sound Approach to Controlling Change.”

5. And another article, “Sustainable Design = Environmental Accountability” by Penny Storms praises Wal-Mart’s new stores for their electricity efficiency, water-saving and distribution, recycling, and other savings. The author properly admires Wal-Mart for reducing greenhouse gases. “The company is working diligently towards their own sustainability goals…” The flaw in the article is its admission that the goals are Wal-Mart’s not the planet’s needs, and its overlooking the huge amount of energy wasted by the big box and the enormous quantity of CO2 produced by the long-distance transportation.

6. Finally, Rural Arkansas gives one more argument for efficiency. “Doug Rye Says… Green Is the Word,” a regular column on energy efficiency. Rye “works as a consultant for the Electric Cooperatives of Arkansas.” This column discusses two items in “green construction”: recycled cellulose insulation and geothermal heat pumps, both receiving “a lot of green points.” The point? Explicit: Individuals can make a difference in stopping CO2. Unstated: Grassroots home efficiency is an excellent way to distract people from business as usual.

This one number of Rural Arkansas reveals why our planet is in danger. The co-ops laudably support energy efficiency and renewables, but Taylor and Gates estimated both together—the “GreenPOWER” program—would constitute only 16% in 2030, and even with addition of nuclear power their primary reliance will continue to be coal power.

NASA’s best scientist, James Hansen, believes we have “perhaps 10 years to get a grip on our carbon emissions or else face a tipping point beyond which climate warming spirals irreversibly out of control.” The atmosphere is already filled with too much CO2; the planned construction of 150 more coal-fired plants (their technology “hardly more advanced than a log fire”) will release billions of tons of additional carbon during their existence; and carbon capture and storage is untested and possibly unworkable. The effect of these coal-fired plants would be “to accelerate the arrival of Hansen’s tipping point” (Prugh).

Given these realities, the electric co-ops in their venal clutching at short-term profit seem worse than ignorant, worse even than cant, as in their scam of “GreenPOWER” public service. Whether they are liars and criminals, I’ll leave to readers. And, if Hansen is right, we might consider lunacy.

References

JAMES HANSEN’S STATEMENT TO CONGRESS

James Hansen, one of the world's leading climate scientists, will today call for the chief executives of large fossil fuel companies to be put on trial for high crimes against humanity and nature, accusing them of actively spreading doubt about global warming in the same way that tobacco companies blurred the links between smoking and cancer.

Hansen will use the symbolically charged 20th anniversary of his groundbreaking speech (pdf) to the US Congress - in which he was among the first to sound the alarm over the reality of global warming - to argue that radical steps need to be taken immediately if the "perfect storm" of irreversible climate change is not to become inevitable.

Speaking before Congress again, he will accuse the chief executive officers of companies such as ExxonMobil and Peabody Energy of being fully aware of the disinformation about climate change they are spreading.

In an interview with the Guardian he said: "When you are in that kind of position, as the CEO of one the primary players who have been putting out misinformation even via organisations that affect what gets into school textbooks, then I think that's a crime."

He is also considering personally targeting members of Congress who have a poor track record on climate change in the coming November elections. He will campaign to have several of them unseated. Hansen's speech to Congress on June 23 1988 is seen as a seminal moment in bringing the threat of global warming to the public's attention. At a time when most scientists were still hesitant to speak out, he said the evidence of the greenhouse gas effect was 99% certain, adding "it is time to stop waffling".

He will tell the House select committee on energy independence and global warming this afternoon that he is now 99% certain that the concentration of CO2 in the atmosphere has already risen beyond the safe level.

The current concentration is 385 parts per million and is rising by 2ppm a year. Hansen, who heads Nasa's Goddard Institute for Space Studies in New York, says 2009 will be a crucial year, with a new US president and talks on how to follow the Kyoto agreement.

He wants to see a moratorium on new coal-fired power plants, coupled with the creation of a huge grid of low-loss electric power lines buried under ground and spread across America, in order to give wind and solar power a chance of competing. "The new US president would have to take the initiative analogous to Kennedy's decision to go to the moon."
His sharpest words are reserved for the special interests he blames for public confusion about the nature of the global warming threat. "The problem is not political will, it's the alligator shoes - the lobbyists. It's the fact that money talks in Washington, and that democracy is not working the way it's intended to work."

A group seeking to increase pressure on international leaders is launching a campaign today called 350.org. It is taking out full-page adverts in papers such as the New York Times and the Swedish Falukuriren calling for the target level of CO2 to be lowered to 350ppm. The advert has been backed by 150 signatories, including Hansen.

BUSINESS AS USUAL NOVEMBER 2008
By Dick Bennett

I feel heartened by the many initiatives imagined and performed for reducing CO2 and methane reported in our daily newspapers. Locally: “UA Hosts Sustainability Contest for Campus” (The Arkansas Traveler, 11-14-08). Arkansas: “LR Event Stresses Energy Efficiency” (Weatherization Day)(ADG 10-31-08). “LM Glasfiber Touts Plant” (wind turbine blade company in LR has 630 employees, 10-29-08). USA: “Winery Sees Clear Benefits in Lighter Bottles”)(trimming packaging cuts costs and environmental impact) (ADG 11-1-08)

Unfortunately, sadly and then indignantly (don’t mourn, organize) we see simultaneously gigantic enterprises making $billions from fossil fuels (“Exxon’s $14.83 Billion in Quarter Sets Record,” ADG 10-31-08).

NATION

COAL INDUSTRY CHICANERY
Dear Dick,

The coal industry just doesn’t get it.

They have spent over $40 million on slick advertising to mask the truth about coal. They think we can be fooled, that we will simply ignore things like ‘science’ or ‘facts.’

Don't Let the Coal Industry Con You!

Watch the video, spread the truth about dirty coal.

But we know better than to simply believe whatever they say. Check out our video that cuts through the spin from the coal industry and lays down the facts on some of their most recent ads.

They claim coal is clean—the truth is it’s the dirtiest source of energy there is.

They claim coal is cheap—when in reality coal has caused electricity costs to spike across the country.

They claim coal is abundant—we know coal resources will start to permanently decline in just 20 years.

Go to www.CoalIsNotTheAnswer.org to learn the truth.

The litany of misinformation just goes on and on.

Watch the video and then comment on what you think about coal. See a bogus local TV and newspaper ad on coal? Let us know on the website and we’ll make sure it gets a thorough fact check.

Together, we can make sure the coal industry is held accountable for their lies. Instead of spending millions to convince us that we need a dirty technology of the past, let’s tell them to start investing in clean, renewable technologies that are ready to go today, such as wind, solar and geothermal.

Thanks for protecting the planet.

Bruce Nilles
National Director

CONGRESS HO HUM

“Global Warming Not a Priority for Congress, Senator Says” (ADG 11-13-08). “Congress will not act until 2010 on a bill to limit greenhouse gases, despite President-elect Obama’s declaration that he will move quickly to address climate change.” Obama can?

ARKANSAS
“A new group comprised largely of energy companies announced…it will advocate for energy, environmental and economic development policies in the state, some of which could be contrary to those of the state’s global warming panel. Bob Lamb, chairman of the newly formed group Progress Arkansas, said recommendations made by the Governor’s Commission on Global Warming would provide fodder for analysis….”

Progress? Are these people so ignorant of the facts of warming that they could continue to perceive progress as opposition to the Governor’s Commission, whose recommendations already fell short of reversing CO2 to 350 PPM. CO2 is increasing each year, and “Progress Arkansas” supports it. Rather, let’s call it “Destroy Arkansas.”

GOVERNOR BEEBE

“I can tell you that I am for alternative fuels. We have been pushing alternative, renewable, sustainable energy in virtually every fashion that we know how to do.” TMN (10-4-08). Is this a lie, or only cant? Is this cant, or only a lie?

NORTHWEST ARKANSAS

OMNI AWARD for Best Ironical Headline to the Northwest Arkansas Times (11-2-08) for “Regional Mobility Authority Paving the Way to Future.”

This could appear under National. Every Friday every newspaper in the USA (well, I haven’t checked them all) prints a special advert. section promoting cars. Been happening every since I began studying them 30 years ago. The one in TMN at present is entitled “Wheel Deals.” On Nov. 7, 2008, the lead article a pretty blonde asks, “Why Buy an SUV?” Reply: “there are still plenty of good reasons to own an SUV.” And the Oct. 31 first page shows a pretty brunette between two cars, a larger and a smaller (not small) wondering: “Summer Fling…or the Real Thing?” Sex and power. Back to the future.

SPECIAL SECTION ON AUTO/OIL ADVERTISING

One of my favorite magazines is Harper’s Magazine. But it is cursed by its attraction to
extraordinarily well-financed or desperate companies that have hired highly expensive print advertisers in the country to deceive us. Should we feel flattered they cared enough? Here are the six ads mainly on autos in the December 2008 number.

Inside the front cover and page 1 is a gorgeous ad showing three large Mercedes-Benz cars parked in a flower-packed meadow surrounded by a forest. Title: “Introducing the cleaner, more fuel-efficient BlueTEC SUVs. LIVE GREEN. SAVE GREEN.” Do they think we are idiots and will transfer flowers and trees to steel and engines, even though (they claim) the burners get 27.5 mpg? (I forgot to tell you to take your nausea medicine.)

Page 3 from Chevron, take courage, sit up straight. A young, pretty black girl says” I will leave the car at home more.” And Chevron replies: “And We will too. The world is changing. How we use energy today cannot be how we’ll use it tomorrow. It’s time we all took action.” There’s another paragraph just like this. And this IS cant. The advertising company (and Chevron bosses) DO think we are idiots.

The Shell Oil Company, much more than Mercedes B and Chevron, must think the readers of Harper’s like to read, for their ad is eight pages long! It’s a panel discussion by an executive of Shell, an executive of Citigroup, and for balance the CEO of the Climate Institute and editor of two books on climate change; the moderator is an executive of a management firm. Time and space prohibit analysis of the “Thought Leadership panel discussion,” but the final page offers a summary. It’s so rich a mine of chicanery that I will be able only to touch upon a few statements. (For the full argument see “The Shell Sustainability Report 2007, www.shell.com/responsibleenergy)

The argument begins knowledgably: “climate change” is “real”; “greenhouse gas emissions need to be dramatically reduced.” BUT “the world demand for energy could rise by half by 2030, and double by 2050.” Therefore, Shell must quadruple the rate of investment in second-generation biofuels” (the rate?); provide “cleaner fuel for power, like natural gas, advanced coal technologies and wind power” (how much cleaner? by what date? Moratorium on coal plants until the technology is ready? How much wind power?); encourage governments “to put a price on C02 emissions” (encourage? what price? How soon?). Shell

“Thinking about tomorrow. Delivering today.” No, not today, not next year, not next decade, but when the oil runs out completely, after “the more difficult sources of oil” have been exhausted.
“Can the world meet the fundamental challenge of our age: to secure more energy but with less CO2.” No, that’s not the challenge. Of course we can secure “more” energy with “less” CO2. (More? Less? .0000000001?) The challenge is the one posed by this enewsletter: to return the planet to 350PPM within three decades.

The next ad, from Toyota, covers two striking pages with this theme: “Can Building Hybrids Inspire Hybrid Buildings? Why Not?” One full page shows a female and a black male, apparently managers or engineers, discussing the building under construction in the background (Toyota believes in diversity, yes? Women and blacks are well-employed by Toyota?). Another photo announces “Prius: Hybrid Synergy Drive,” a third is a panorama of a farm field, and the fourth a photo of some people standing before a sign, “Welcome to Blue Springs Mississippi” (yes, Blue! The same ad agency prepared all these ads?). Back to the text: “Why Not? Our environmental thinking runs deeper than just building hybrid vehicles: A growing number of our plants, offices and dealerships are environmentally sensitive.” (“Sensitive” means what? When did the growing begin? How many now are “sensitive”?) “Not only are recycled materials used in their construction, they also consume less water, and draw on alternative energy like wind and solar.” (How much recycled materials? How much less water? How much draw on wind and sun? These claims are so feeble they make us say, Yes, they do think we are idiots.) There’s more but I’m running out of space and impatience.

BMW bought two separate ads.

The first, only a quarter of a page, boasts of the BMW Hydrogen 7 “12-cylinder engine [!] with a top speed of over 140 mph” but producing “near-zero emissions.” Now that is a great innovation, and all of us with $100,000 should rush out to buy one. You’ll have all the old power traditionally promised by auto hucksters but without hurting our beloved environment, have it both ways, if….

On the back cover BMW makes trumpets its new diesel “coming to America” that will “go up to 585 miles on a single tank.” Once their diesel was loud and smoky, now it is “truly fuel-efficient” and with reduced emissions, “less CO2 than any other diesel in your class”: “our most powerful, cleanest-burning six-cylinder diesel ever.” I am growing tired. “Truly” is measurable? How much less CO2? It may be BMW’s cleanest burning engine (in one class), but will it significantly contribute to our reaching 350 PPM within 30 years? By the way, this engine has “BluePerformance.” And Mercedes Benz has “BlueTec.” But, oddly (how obvious for ad agencies), neither ad
shows blueskies.


Conclusion:

“How TO MEASURE CARBON FOOTPRINT” (Free Weekly, 9-18-08). Cool Climate Calculator: http://bie.berkeley.edu/calculator.html; EarthLab: www.earthlab.com; CarbonFootprint.com: www.carbonfootprint.com These are excellent aids to curbing our individual footprint. The trouble is they imply our responsibility is exclusively individual, when the great CO2 and methane producers are coal plants, cars, cattle. We should demand from these Carbon Footprinters at least equal attention to the corporate malefactors. We musn’t allow the enforcers of business as usual make us think our own little footprint is our only responsibility and we are powerless to do anything about the REAL BIGFOOTS.

BUSINESS AS USUAL OCTOBER 2008

350 PPM: The Most Important Number YOU Need to Remember! Cap & Reverse CO2 Emissions Now.

... unless we advance beyond thinking only in terms of conservation and alternate sources (of energy) and begin to think in terms of a carbon pie, we will have no chance to stop the rise in atmospheric CO2. Wallace S. Broecker

NATION

Much more business as usual: no time for complacency.

BUSINESS AS USUAL: Analysis of Corporate Energy Advertisements By Dick Bennett

USA

BRITISH PETROLEUM AD IN THE NATION OCTOBER 6, 2008

“Offshore. Onshore. To be sure.” This full-page ad apparently depicts a family with apparently the father holding a crying baby while the mother drinks from a cup, and the text uses familiar buzz words to convince us that BP is a family-oriented company, and the public should support “all energy options.” Why? “To secure America’s energy future.” We must invest in alternatives (no figures given: how much energy does BP produce from solar and wind, compared to oil and gas?), but we are told BP operates “the latest fully integrated solar plant in the US” (fully integrated means what?). We must discover “new U.S. oil and gas resources”; that is, drill drill drill. Why? “Because energy security is something we should all be sure of.” Oh by the way, it’s not British Petroleum, its “Beyond Petroleum.” The same Nation includes an article by James G. Speth, urging environmentalists to “join forces with other movements for change,” since “Working only within the system will…not succeed. Transformative change in the system itself is needed.” BP bought the ad to try to counteract Speth and similar environmentalists?

TIME MAGAZINE (June 30, 2008)

Time gave us four ads related to energy, two from fuel industries, one from ExxonMobil, and one from an automobile company. The Lincoln and Exxon/Mobil ads utterly disregard CO2 and global warming.

The Lincoln ad is pure, old-fashioned, image and illusion, beginning with a picture of an intimidating nose view of the “All New 2009 Lincoln MKS,” accompanied by the texts: “Starships Don’t Need Keys” and “Lincoln Reach Higher.” Step into a Lincoln MKS, and be automatically transformed into an astronaut in your spaceship speeding into galactic space utterly free of concern about carbon emission! I’m only surprised by the lack of a long-legged model entering spaceship MKS.

Whereas the Lincoln ad is merely silly for power, the Exxon Mobil chooses the brazen
mode. Picture: an atom (EM knows science), perhaps the carbon atom. Message: Point one: plenty of oil remains, only “one quarter” used up. Point two: Enabled by new sonic devices oil companies can locate “previously undetectable energy reserves.” Why is this important? Fewer wells need to be drilled. Why does this matter? It reduces “environment impact”! You are wondering if maybe ExxonMobil has strayed from the issue? Global warming, need to reduce CO2? What are they?

The two industry ads at least have some grasp on reality.

The Ethanol Promotion and Information Council ad depicts at top and bottom images of oil and in the middle white space where the message appears: “In the middle of this whole oil mess, ethanol is a bright spot.” Imported oil costs “more than $1 billion a day…wreaking havoc on the economy and driving up the price of everything,” while ethanol saves us money, is clean, renewable, “keeping billions of dollars right here in America.” “Ethanol: fueling America’s future.” Sounds good? Of course the EPIC doesn’t mention that ethanol can contribute very little to the urgently needed replacement of fossil fuels and that ethanol caused corn prices to rise about 80 percent during 2007.

And finally “The People of America’s Oil and Natural Gas Industry” (not the egregiously well-paid managers or stockholders, oh no) ask us, “Is Tomorrow’s Energy Right in Front of Us?” Although a laughing woman and child appear in two inches at the top of the page, this ad, the opposite of the visual Lincoln ad, is composed mainly of text. Its disinformation is widespread among the industry: there’s plenty of oil and gas in the US, but government interferes with its development, even though new technology will protect the environment. The US will need “19 percent more energy in 2030.” Oil and gas provide a multitude of uses for “our unequaled quality of life.” Therefore we should drill drill drill. The writers of this ad count on readers not knowing the connection between fossil fuels, CO2, global warming, and the end of our quality of life.

These four ads from one number of Time Magazine offer us an excellent range for use in public school classes studying disinformation.

ARKANSAS

OZARKS ELECTRIC
This energy company marches arm in arm with its trickster industry. Examine its publications.

“Co-op Connection” 4th Qtr. 2008

“Are You Thinking Green?” This third of a page urges us to buy Compact Fluorescent Light Bulbs/CFL

“A Penny Saved is a Penny Earned,” a full-page article, offers energy and water conservation tips: fix leaky faucets etc., adjust your thermostat, add insulation, etc.

RURAL ARKANSAS, the Magazine of Arkansas Electric Cooperatives (Oct. 2008)

The magazine presents several short and long articles on reducing our footprint: turn off and unplug appliances, use a convection oven, use LEDs outside, plant trees around your house. A full article discusses how to make over your home for energy efficiency. Another explains one of “The 10 Commandments of Energy Efficiency”: stop air infiltration. Another article praises natural gas as a good alternative to coal and nuclear for electricity. Summary: In this no. of Rural Arkansas, Arkansas Electric Co-ops embrace efficiency and gas for the future electric needs of Arkansas, but no support is offered for sustainable energy, no recognition of the urgent need to reduce CO2 to 350 PPM.

CHESAPEAKE AGAIN “DOING ARKANSAS A WORLD OF GOOD”

A third of a page in The Arkansas Democrat Gazette shows Chesapeake’s logo, then the title “Doing Arkansas a World of Good,” then a photo from beautiful Pinnacle Mountain overlooking (?) Beaver Lake “near the gas-rich Fayetteville shale play,” and then the text, entitled “Natural Gas Is Clean.” Gas will do us a world of good (well, allow the writer some hyperbole) by providing “clean” energy. Well, not clean, but cleaner than coal or oil. It “reduces [some auto] emissions by up to 90%, including 30% less CO2” (well, as a footnote reveals, depending upon “type of vehicle and type of pollution”). So by “fueling a clean energy future" Chesapeake is “Doing a World of Good.” Of course, no recognition that if we are to have a future we must
replace fossil fuels by sustainable.

**COLBERT ON CHESAPEAKE** (thanks to Robert)

Stephen Colbert is no comedian. He’s a serious journalist. He understands America and Americans. Think I’m pulling your leg? No more Chesapeake Energy does and we know they would never do that.

See for yourself in this short video, "Prescott Oil Loves the Earth".

(WARNING: Do not think of Chesapeake Energy when watching this video or you might fall down laughing.)


---

**FULL PAGE AD IN ADG BY “THE PEOPLE OF AMERICA’S OIL AND NATURAL GAS INDUSTRY,” ENTITLED “Who Really Pays When Congress Taxes Oil Companies?”** All together now: “We all do,” “tens of millions of us.” Why, that’s outrageous, “It’s taxing American’s economic futures.” Why, how? Those millions have pensions, and those pensions are invested in oil and gas stocks. But the oil and gas industry cares for the people. Because they feel their pain, the industry has “invested nearly $1.2 trillion to keep Americans and the economy moving.” (Did we not already pay them handsome profits for that investment?) Twisting and turning, twice the ad refers to the "strong earnings" of the oil-gas companies (emphasizing security) as though the public were the recipients of the profits and not the managers and board members. Never mind, at the end the message is repeated that taxes on oil and gas target our livelihoods and energy future. (But not necessarily: taxes could target the managers and stockholders. The oil companies just pass through the increases and blame the government to justify larger profits for themselves in the process. If the industry is worried for the public, why don’t they reduce their profits and pass it along to the public? )

**FAYETTEVILLE**
“Dream Big': Summit Looks to Future” by Skip Descant, TMN (10-11-08). Really? Only one weak reference to CO2. “Messages at Conference Lean Toward Recycle, Reduce, Reuse,” including “need to live denser and reduce urban sprawl.” But alternative energy was discussed: in Austin, TX, a wind farm and solar energy. And a mass-transit system for NWA was discussed too.

In a message dated 9/11/2008 8:51:48 A.M. Central Daylight Time, maya8460@sbcglobal.net writes:

>From this morning’s UK Independent:

“Cleared: Jury decides that threat of global warming justifies breaking the law”
By Michael McCarthy, Environment Editor

“The threat of global warming is so great that campaigners were justified in causing more than £35,000 worth of damage to a coal-fired power station, a jury decided yesterday. In a verdict that will have shocked ministers and energy companies the jury at Maidstone Crown Court cleared six Greenpeace activists of criminal damage.

Jurors accepted defence arguments that the six had a "lawful excuse" to damage property at Kingsnorth power station in Kent to prevent even greater damage caused by climate change. The defence of “lawful excuse" under the Criminal Damage Act 1971 allows damage to be caused to property to prevent even greater damage - such as breaking down the door of a burning house to tackle a fire. ..."

The whole story here: http://tinyurl.com/63ndlv

www.alternativeenergy.com specializes in news about wind, solar, geothermal, biofuels, etc.

PREPARING FOR REFUGEES

If US businesses continue to deny, contradict, gainsay, disaffirm, disclaim, confute, negate, dispute, reject, refuse, withhold, decline, disavow, repudiate, renounce, disown, forswear, disclaim, evade, elude, dodge, sidestep, get out of, duck, circumvent the necessity of rapidly capping CO2 and then decreasing it, the United States and Arkansas will be faced with
hordes of refugees. As reported in *TMN Sept. 21, 2008*, NWA Red Cross sponsored Lt. Gen. Russell Honore to lecture on "Lessons Learned from Hurricane Katrina" at Springdale Holiday Inn. He told audience: "'We need to create a culture of preparedness,' to better deal with disasters." Ark. has taken refugees from Katrina and Ike, and supposedly from other disasters in the U.S. What about people from other countries?

**BUSINESS AS USUAL  September 2008**

A column by Dick Bennett

Two kinds of articles and ads appear in our media about fossil fuels: 1) companies that straightforwardly exalt the use of fossil fuels, with no concern for "sustainability 2) those that try to trick us into thinking a company is doing something significant to reduce CO2, or to distract us from the CO2 catastrophe to which they are contributing. I call both of these techniques, *greenwashing*.

**James Hansen calls** for prosecution of US oil corporate leaders.

James Hansen, among the greatest US experts on global heating, argues that the heads of big oil corporations and elected officials alike should be held ethically and legally accountable for high crimes against humanity and nature, accusing them of actively spreading doubt about global warming in the same way that tobacco companies blurred the links between smoking and cancer, and if cigarettes kill, wait until the average temperature rise reaches 4 degrees.
DRILL, DRILL, DRILL

“Older, Urban Oil Fields Get New Life,” The Morning News (March 23, 2008) 5D. In Signal Hill, CA, south of Los Angeles, aging oil wells are being rehabilitated with piles of money and new tech. The result is an increase of 2 ½ million barrels in 2007. “The story is the same across the nation.” Any problems? Well, some of these wells, as in Signal Hill and Whittier Hills, are now in the middle of towns, and the inhabitants don’t like them.

GREEN WASHING HYDRA USA


By making an argument in its ads (in contrast to the same old auto ads of brilliant tech sizzle and sex), BP engages us like Hydra.

BP = British Petroleum? Oh no, it’s now “Beyond Petroleum.”

But is that true (cut off that head)? Oh no.

BP is not “beyond,” not on the farther side of, not outside of petroleum, but is “working hard to expand and diversify the U.S. energy supply”—that is, expand petroleum and add some alternatives and increase efficiency. BP, “America’s most diverse energy portfolio” includes (“new oil and gas, solar, wind and biofuels, and [it is exploring material options?? To improve] energy efficiency.”

That’s the first paragraph. Now come some details, and we find (did we expect otherwise?) There’s Energy Security in Energy Status Quo: “We expect to spend over $30 billion over the next five years to expand and extend production of natural gas from the Rocky Mountains, to renew critical oil and gas infrastructure on the North Slope of Alaska, and to continue” etc. They do have some solar and wind projects, but we are not told the investment amount. But the investment in biofuels is $500 million. Finally, BP “strongly encourages energy conservation and energy efficiency.” Their wireless control system is reducing “the driving requirements of our employees by nearly 2 million miles a year.”

BEYOND PETROLEUM? Well, no, but there’s a gusher of chicanery. Never mind that all biospheres are in decline as the result of BP and the petroleum Hydra.

“Project Green Lite” By Dave Gilson, Mother Jones (March April 2008): Hollywood is “turning the traditional messages of the environmental movement on their heads, replacing existential anxiety with a relentlessly feel-good, prime-time-ready version of saving the
planet.” Included: “Eco Chamber: Deconstructing Vanity Fair’s annual ‘Green Issue.’”

CHRYSLER AD IN ARKANSAS DEMOCRAT GAZETTE (May 9, 2008).

“Chrysler Is Giving You Relief Just When You Need It Most.” Dodge, Chrysler, Jeep. Relief from CO2? Oh no, just the opposite, they will guarantee you $2.99 gas when you buy or lease “most new vehicles” (for up to 3 years or 12,000 miles), so you can drive, drive, drive, just as you have always been accustomed to. They do mention efficiency in the text, “seven fuel-efficient vehicles,” with a footnote specifying the models, the best 3 giving 23 mpg in town and 30 on highway. The text begins: “We started by offering you unmatched peace of mind with” (a sustainable planet?) “our Lifetime Powertrain Limited Warranty”.

GREENWASHING HYDRA ARKANSAS

ARKANSAS

‘Doing Arkansas a World of Good, “ ad by the natural gas company Chesapeake Energy (The Morning News July 15, 2008). Under this title is a color photo of a crumpled US flag being pulled apart by two hands. Under the photo the text is entitled “Natural Gas is AMERICAN.” Just as everything can be commodified for somebody’s profit, everything can be patriotized for somebody’s profit? Why is it a redwhiteblue company? While the oil companies import 70% of their oil, thereby “adding to our trade deficit and weakening the dollar,” 99% of Chesapeake’s natural gas comes from North America. (Feel shivers, stomach cramp? But of course you do, from the old shell game of shifting terms—oil is imported, but gas, though from N. America, is produced in the US and is therefore AMERICAN and Doing Arkansas a World of Good. So together, Chesapeake producing gas, increasing independence from OPEC oil, lowering energy costs, and “improving the environment” (gas is not a fossil fuel?), “we’re Doing Our Nation a World of Good” (well-taught beginning-ending repetition from writing 101). And that flag? Is someone patriotically pressing, embracing? the US flag against his chest? And never have even to think about CO2.

NORTHWEST ARKANSAS

SOUTHWESTERN ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY AD IN NORTHWEST ARKANSAS TIMES.

“The Power of Environmental Stewardship” is the large title of this half-page ad about SWEPCO’s “sustainable” Flint Creek Power Plant in Gentry. Oh great, we think, this electric
company will reduce CO2. But then we read that the stewardship is for promoting butterflies, bees, and birds. Certainly a good thing. But NO mention that for 29 years the plant has poisoned our atmosphere by its COAL/CO2 emissions.

“Fayetteville Seeks Growth” (March 23, 2008), 1A. Fayetteville possesses countless blessings but it “doesn’t have the business growth officials want.” Take heart officials, we have the baseball stadium and new overpass and new development all around it, and the western corridor being planned, and the XNA’s new strip, concourse, and approach highway though delayed is still intended. We can sprawl all we want. Yahoo CO2!

HUMAN PROTECTION

AS BUSINESS AS USUAL AND WARMING CONTINUE. THINK ABOUT THE VICTIMS

“Evacuees Arrive at Chaffee” (TMN 8-31-08). “Beebe OKs $300,000 for Gustav Response” (TMN 9-3-08), “Monsoon Swamps India” (9-1-08): “about 1.2 million people have been left homeless….Some 700,00 people are still trapped with little or no food”; “India’s Military Mounts Flood Rescue” (TMN 9-3-08).

Given climate change, Arkansas will be asked to do more and more for US refugees. Two of many questions are: how much are we prepared and willing to give? But the larger and much more difficult questions are: how well are we prepared and willing to help international
refugees caused by global warming, wars, and hunger (a third of Bangladesh could be under water)? And how might we prevent, world wide, the increase of militarization that these crises will inevitably bring?

All of us must read and think about these questions. How OMNI might lead the way? Our role in national and global issues, not possessing millions of dollars, has been to model to the peace, justice, and ecology movement. How might we be in the vanguard for the victims of warming? Here are three refugee actions we might begin in Arkansas:

EDUCATION:
1) Publicize support for the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), an office which deals with all kinds of refugees. Bring a representative here.
2) Annually recognize International Refugee Day.
   Coalition possible in 1 and 2 with Central Ark. UN/USA chapter and ACPJ.
3) RESCUE: Bring one family from a submerging nation or area to Fayetteville. The animal rescue movement is strong in NWA and can serve as a foundation for the human rescue movement.

Let us remember our successes and not be daunted. We marched and marched against the Bush wars and the wars happened and escalated. Those marches were necessary and must be continued, for they are an important part of our resisting public voice against lying and injustice and to hearten the public for the future. But always we continued to build the individual commitments and social and political structures for peace, justice, and ecology, true to our mission statement. While the US corporate warfare warming state grew, so did the peace and justice movement, which is now positioned to influence national policy and performance than formerly.

BUSINESS AS USUAL August 2008

AIRPLANES AND AIRPORTS
AIRPLANE HARMS: PUTTING PIECES OF INFORMATION TOGETHER

Some observations by Dick Bennett

I was first alerted to the environmental destructiveness of air travel by George Monbiot’s chapter called "Love Flights" in his book, *Heat*. He there lays out in detail the enormous amount of CO2 produced by airplanes.

Recently I read a report in a newspaper about someone stealing airplane fuel for his car. A fuel expert cautioned everyone against that, saying that the extreme amount of lead in airplane fuel would quickly ruin an auto engine.

The NOVA program August 5, "Dimming Sun," explained how contrails contributed to the recent rapid decrease of solar energy reaching the earth with consequent climatic disruptions. The paradox of airplanes producing greenhouse gases warming the planet and contrails cooling it was explained, and the greater effects upon warming than upon cooling asserted.

Much more research is needed surely. But at this point, it seems certain that air travel must be constrained as much or more than auto travel.

Yet XNA is planning to build a new runway, a new concourse, and a new access highway. XNA is the creation of powerful individuals and groups in NWA--Wal-Mart, the Razorbacks, realtors, contractors, bankers, travel agencies--who seek development and produce sprawl. Unfortunately, they cannot see more than a few inches beyond their bank accounts.

Study these issues, and if you agree that fossil-fueled planes are disastrous to the future of our planet, speak out not only to stop XNA’s growth plans, but to significantly reduce the flights to and from that airport.

How can citizens change our world for the better? By taking action where they are, where they live and work, modeling for people everywhere.

COMMODIFYING “SUSTAINABILITY”

On 7-30-08 in *TMN* the “Novozymes” company, “Doing Business in Bentonville,” purchased a half-page ad in *TMN* to announce a free breakfast and lunch at the Clarion Hotel to introduce its “Sustainable Solutions—Designing Your Products for the Better.” Experts in biofuels, sustainable detergents and textiles, food and nutrition, biological cleaning, and organic plant care will be on hand. It’s a claim familiar since the beginning of advertising a hundred years ago: Better! The old undefined comparative: better than what or to what degree? Better.
Takes your breath away to see Novozymes think they can fool anybody with that trick today. But what I enjoyed the most was the Latin. All of us who like words—and that’s everybody with a critical lobe—will be stopped by “novozymes.” New Ferment. That’s arresting. And how do they define it in the ad: Rethink Tomorrow. You can almost see the ad team brainstorming and getting all excited as they imagined us getting all excited over the words and hurrying out to buy. For as the ad also says: Novozymes just wishes to “share their expertise on sustainable technology—why and what you can do to design and manufacture your products to meet the needs and wants of consumers—and retailers alike!” And what are the needs and wants of consumers and retailers? Living in a world, living lifestyles of significantly reduced CO2?! A genuinely new ferment? A true rethinking for the future? It’s better to not mention any of that.

**EPA Gags Staff: ‘Do Not Respond To Questions’**

An email released by Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility (PEER) reveals that Environmental Protection Agency officials were directed on June 16 not to answer any questions from the press, the Inspector General, or the Congress’s investigative arm, the Government Accountability Office.

That same week, President Bush asserted executive privilege to block the Congressional investigation into White House interference with EPA decisions on global warming and smog regulations.

According to PEER Executive Director Jeff Ruch, “Inside the current EPA, candor has become the cardinal sin.” Furthermore, “while this directive is of questionable legality, an agency specialist risks discipline or even termination for disregarding a direct order.” The email, from Robbi Farrell, chief of staff in EPA’s enforcement office, was sent to managers in EPA’s Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance with the repeated admonition for all staff:

**Please do not respond to questions or make any statements.**

The full text:

Sen. Barbara Boxer, the California Democrat who heads the Senate environment committee, said that the administrator had turned “the EPA into a secretive, dangerous ally of polluters, instead of a leader in the effort to protect the health and safety of the American people.”

Comments

http://thinkprogress.org/wonkroom/2008/07/28/epa-gags-staff/
BRITISH PETROLEUM (BP) AD ON TV (Weather Channel)

“There’s energy security in energy diversity
OIL, GAS,” and alternatives.

Example of classic greenwashing. It’s what is not said, the sub-texts, that matter. BP supports solar and wind and other alternatives, but only as supplements to fossil fuels. They offer a reasonable package of diverse energy sources. And that will bring us security, the nation’s most deeply felt value. Security against Fascists and Nazis, against communists, against drugs, and now against “terrorists.” Wars were and will be necessary to triumph over this new enemy, and oil and gas will be essential, first and foremost, for a secure nation.

About this article

Close

This article appeared in the Guardian on Monday June 23 2008 on p8 of the UK news section. It was last updated at 10:42 on June 24 2008.

ALREADY PUBLISHED MATERIAL = BUSINESS AS USUAL #1 July 2008

Three corporate ads pertaining to oil/CO2 in the June 2008 Harper's Magazine.

1. Full page photo of a beautiful little girl drinking a glass of water, entitled "essential2ahhh!", accompanying by this message: "It is the plastic pipes, the chlorination technology, the things that help make water safe and refreshing. It is American chemistry. americanchemistry.com essential?" From the American Chemistry Council, Inc.

2. From CITGO, Venezuela's oil company: A half-page ad with photo of a "City Market Bakery" in background and two white-aproned workers carrying boxes of bread to a van, with this message: "We come together to help local businesses succeed. Every CITGO station is locally owned and independently operated. And together we provide a reliable source of fuel that helps neighborhood businesses succeed.....It's just one more way the people of CITGO are there for you at every turn....CITGO."

a meaningful dent in our oil dependence and protect against further global warming.”

All 3 corporate ads in the June Harper’s advance global warming.

SEND FOR R’S NEXT NEWSLETTER 6-30-08

ESSAY FOR ROBERT’S “350 PPP” NEWSLETTER

BUSINESS AS USUAL #2 by Dick Bennett

For a Culture of Peace

GROWING KNOWLEDGE AND AWARENESS VERSUS GREENWASHING

At last the public and mainstream media are awakening to the dangers of global warming, and many corporations are responding with damage control.

THE PUBLIC

Here are two examples of informed citizens speaking up. Rhonda Boldra of Bentonville in a letter in The Morning News (TMN) strongly urged us to choose life without plastics. Although her motive is primarily to save the Earth from the land-fill and ocean-fill poisons produced by plastic, she knows plastic comes from fossil fuels. Although the headline declared that April Ambrose gave Arkansas B’s a and C’s compared to its performance in the past, in the text she was quoted as grading the state a D when comparing it to the performance of certain other states (“Environmental Activists Give State Mixed Reviews,” TMN 4-20-08).

A newspaper. The Morning News (4-20-08) berated President Bush for opposing mandatory cuts in greenhouse gas emissions. Despite the call by the International Panel on Climate Change “for rich nations…to make reductions of ’25-40 percent below 1990 levels by 2020,’” Bush’s plan “would allow for continued growth in emissions until 2025.”

And a non-profit organization. The Carbon Caps Task Force of the OMNI Center for Peace, Justice, and Ecology publishes this newsletter, which focuses on the needed limit
of carbon in our atmosphere—350 parts per million—beyond which the planet will suffer increasingly irreversible damage.

People are learning the truth, and are speaking up.

SCAMS GALORE

But many people and businesses are not informed, or they don’t want the truth out. Some businesses and individuals wrap themselves in “Earth Day” only to perform activities irrelevant to the needs of a heating planet. Others speak up only to deny or displace in order to maintain the status quo.

Under the headline “Earth Day” TMN placed a photo of two employees of Tyson Foods painting park benches “in honor of Earth Day” (4-23-08).

The coal-powered Flint Creek Power Plant at Gentry published a half-page ad in all NWA newspapers hyping itself as a proponent of “Environmental Stewardship.” On what basis? They had received four awards from the Wildlife Habitat Council, a group of corporations, ecology organizations, and individuals. Their minute habitat stewardship is supposed to compensate for its immense production of CO2 from burning coal, which is, along with the internal combustion engine burning gasoline, the major source of CO2 and cause of warming. Do they think we are so stupid?

Here are a few analyses of auto ads which deceive regarding CO2 and heating; some are evasive, some deliberately duplicitous—from one number of Time (11-19-07) and one of the Arkansas Democrat-Gazette (10-18-07).

Auto ads in Time on one day 11-19-07.

Of the nine auto ads in this number of Time, three made no mention of global warming or CO2. Ford stressed its “voice-activated sync technology” to “effortlessly control your MP3 player and Bluetooth phone.” Hyundai, with a statue of a youth holding an old person’s mask (“Think About It”), discusses the nature of logos, and Hyundai’s “10-year/100,000 mile powertrain warranty.” Mercedes-Benz also stresses quality—suspension, body structure, styling—that “dominates.” In the other ads the heating issue
was finessed on one way or the other.

Or take one number of ADG, Oct. 18, in which appeared “Answering Energy Questions” by ExxonMobil. It is relevant to remember that company’s long history of crimes for which it refused accountability and their long record of lying, including its long history of creating think tanks, hiring “experts,” and publishing millions of dollars of ads to confuse the public and put off socially needed changes. The ad of the 18th reveals all. It begins by claiming to be a report of a “new study” of “important findings and recommendations for policymakers.” Who requested the study? Bush/Cheney’s Secretary of Energy. (If I were writing an article for publication, I would examine his background and connections.) And who did the report? The “National Petroleum Council.” The ad claims they represented “a broad range of views,” but that would have to be examined. And how is the ad framed in the opening paragraph? “How much energy will America and the world need in the future, and what kind? Where will it come from? How much will it cost?” Sounds reasonable right? Well, where from? No. 1 (of 6 “findings”): “Coal, oil, and natural gas will remain indispensable…. ” And what strategies will be required? The first is “efficiency,” yes of course, but how much and how soon in relation to global warming? But global warming is not mentioned.

NEXT, SOME ANALYSES BY OTHERS

See the analysis of one Royal Dutch Shell ad by Erik Assadourian and Joy Chen, “Shell Game,” World-Watch (Nov. Dec. 2007) 28-29. Shell’s claims of cleaning up its act and reducing CO2 are “just spewing hot air.”

Next, a bunch of SCAMS, USA, examined:

And finally, James Hansen’s call for prosecution of US oil corporate leaders.

I agree with James Hansen that the heads of big oil corporations and elected officials alike should be held not just morally, but also ethically and legally accountable for “high crimes against humanity and nature, accusing them of actively spreading doubt about global warming in the same way that tobacco companies blurred the links between smoking and cancer.” They have operated with impunity to increase profits and power for far too long and the present and future health of the planet and all of us who inhabit it (both human and non-human beings) has been permanently damaged as a result. While
we need to provide positive incentives to ecologically responsible behavior and investment we also need to make sure that the perpetrators of these crimes receive very tangible consequences for their cynical criminal actions and inactions as a strong disincentive to corporate and elected leaders who may act against our common good in the future.

Take the time to check out the website http://www.350.org/

and get involved!    Thomas Markham

Put oil firm chiefs on trial, says leading climate change scientist

· Testimony to US Congress will also criticize lobbyists
· 'Revolutionary' policies needed to tackle crisis

    ● Ed Pilkington in New York
    ● The Guardian.
    ● Monday June 23, 2008
    ● Article history

James Hansen, one of the world's leading climate scientists, will today call for the chief executives of large fossil fuel companies to be put on trial for high crimes against humanity and nature, accusing them of actively spreading doubt about global warming in the same way that tobacco companies blurred the links between smoking and cancer.

Hansen will use the symbolically charged 20th anniversary of his groundbreaking speech (pdf) to the US Congress - in which he was among the first to sound the alarm over the reality of global warming - to argue that radical steps need to be taken immediately if the "perfect storm" of irreversible climate change is not to become inevitable.

Speaking before Congress again, he will accuse the chief executive officers of companies such as ExxonMobil and Peabody Energy of being fully aware of the disininformation about climate change they are spreading.

In an interview with the Guardian he said: "When you are in that kind of position, as the CEO of one the primary players who have been putting out misinformation even via organisations that affect what gets into school textbooks, then I think that's a crime."

He is also considering personally targeting members of Congress who have a poor track record on climate change in the coming November elections. He will campaign to have several of them unseated. Hansen's speech to Congress on June 23 1988 is seen as a seminal moment in bringing the threat of global warming to the public's attention. At a time when most scientists were still hesitant to speak out, he said the evidence of the greenhouse gas effect was 99% certain, adding "it is time to stop waffling".

He will tell the House select committee on energy independence and global warming this afternoon that he is now 99% certain that the concentration of CO2 in the atmosphere has already risen beyond the
The current concentration is 385 parts per million and is rising by 2ppm a year. Hansen, who heads Nasa's Goddard Institute for Space Studies in New York, says 2009 will be a crucial year, with a new US president and talks on how to follow the Kyoto agreement.

He wants to see a moratorium on new coal-fired power plants, coupled with the creation of a huge grid of low-loss electric power lines buried under ground and spread across America, in order to give wind and solar power a chance of competing. "The new US president would have to take the initiative analogous to Kennedy's decision to go to the moon."

His sharpest words are reserved for the special interests he blames for public confusion about the nature of the global warming threat. "The problem is not political will, it's the alligator shoes - the lobbyists. It's the fact that money talks in Washington, and that democracy is not working the way it's intended to work."

A group seeking to increase pressure on international leaders is launching a campaign today called 350.org. It is taking out full-page adverts in papers such as the New York Times and the Swedish Falukuriren calling for the target level of CO2 to be lowered to 350ppm. The advert has been backed by 150 signatories, including Hansen.

OMNISEEKS A WORLD FREE OF WAR AND THE THREAT OF WAR, A SOCIETY WITH LIBERTY AND JUSTICE FOR ALL, A COMMUNITY WHERE EVERY PERSON'S POTENTIAL MAY BE FULFILLED, AN EARTH RESTORED. GRASSROOTS NONVIOLENCE, WORLD PEACE, HUMAN RIGHTS, SOCIAL and ECONOMIC JUSTICE, ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP PROTECTING SPECIES AND THE EARTH.

Dick Bennett 6-30-08
End of Dick’s 2nd Business as Usual Column 6-30-08

DECEPTIVE ADVERTISING
ONE ISSUE OF HARPER’S (Oct. 2007).
ERRORS IN GORE’S FILM?

Gene Lyons in “’Errors’ Minor Compared to Gore’s Message,” ADG (10-17-07) 5B, excoriates false and misleading attacks on Al Gore, including a judge’s mention of nine errors in Gore’s film. An actual reading of the judge’s statement reveals not one significant and the judge mainly wrong. Yet right-wing critics of Gore and deniers of warming exaggerated the judge’s claims and spread those falsehoods abroad.

AUTOMOBILE ADS

Do we need an org. to provide the cutting edge of knowledge? We have org. with half a million $ to facilitate the Commission. Kopsky’s AFC will lobby both the Comm. and the legislature. These two organizations are essential. But they are close to and inside the belly of the beast and can propose only limited objectives without strong public advocacy. They cannot say what Gore says (and Robert says in every letter): The truth about the climate crisis is an inconvenient one that means we are going to have to change the way we live our lives. Al Gore CCTF can the Chamber of Commerce truths about growth, development, sprawl, travel, CHANGE the other groups cannot, at least for the moment. We will show what changes must be made, giving cover to the other groups to work within. Don’t we agree that the vested interests will not give up their established profit-making methods until compelled to do it. They would rather walk over the cliff.
ARKANSAS

I will compile a special newsletter on the doubletalk, hypocrisy, and all deceptions by individuals, corporations, and governments regarding HEAT and CO2. Send me your discoveries. For example, the article in TMN 9-21 "PSC Tours Plant Site." There are major ignorances/deceptions and one outright lie in the report. We all need to read the statute the PSC must "consider" in reaching its conclusion, since the members might misrepresent what it says. And see "Utility Regulators Approve Programs," in which the PSC approved 4 programs to promote "energy efficiency and conservation," but one is an "education program" (not described), 2 are weatherization, and the 4th is unclear. One huff and and 2 puffs.

NATURAL GAS ADS IN ADG.

“Doing Arkansas a World of Good.” These full-page ads appeared during Nov. 2007 (and later??) extolling the value of NG.

CITIES

COMMODIFICATION is an indirect contributor to scorching: efforts to change or changes themselves are turned into profit.

NUCLEAR POWER

“Money Is the Real Green Power: The Hoax of Eco-friendly Nuclear Energy” by Karl Grossman, Extra! (Jan.-Feb. 2008). “Nuclear advocates in government and the nuclear industry are engaged in a massive, heavily financed drive to revive atomic power in the United States—with most of the mainstream media either not questioning or actually assisting in the promotion.” In addition to all the problems and dangers of nuclear power, in relation to CO2, the industry claims that nuclear power plants don’t emit greenhouse gases are false, for if you consider the entire nuclear cycle—uranium mining and milling, enrichment, fuel fabrication, disposal of radioactive waste—nuclear power produces “significant greenhouse gas emissions.”

Date: January 21, 2015

Dan Farber

Subject: [Legal Planet] Don't Know Much 'Bout Climatology by Dan Farber

Reply-To: Legal Planet <noreply@legal-planet.org>

[It’s both pathetic and dangerous to our grandchildren that such an argument still needs to be made in 2015. –Dick]

DAN FARBER January 21, 2015

Don’t Know Much ‘Bout Climatology

Why should we believe the scientists about climate change? Nobody — not even any individual scientist — understand all the details of the IPCC’s recent 1552 page “summary” of climate science. So why buy into the idea that tiny amounts of gases from beneficial energy production can cause devastating global harm?

Part of the reason is that scientists have had a great track record. We trust our lives to supercomputer calculations about wing shapes and aerodynamics, despite the obvious fact that a hundred-ton hunk of metal obviously can’t fly. We take medicines that rely on the absurd notion that illnesses are caused by tiny invisible creatures called germs. We convict criminals based on the bizarre notion that human
beings are built from a chemical code recorded on tiny molecules scattered all through their bodies. I’m writing this on a laptop that relies on transistors which are based on quantum mechanics, a theory that even Einstein thought was too crazy to be true. Believing in science has turned out to be a very good bet.

Climate change isn’t just some fad among scientists. The basic scientific insight is over a century old. Scientists in hundreds of universities and labs all over the world, have developed our current knowledge of climate change in thousands of studies. The evidence is truly massive — I recently strained my wrist when I carelessly picked up the first volume of the current IPCC report with one hand — at 1552 pages of tiny print, it’s a bit on the heavy side. And it’s only a summary of the evidence.

When you start looking a bit deeper, it’s remarkable to see how hard scientists have worked to confirm individual pieces of the puzzle and to test their theories. There’s lots of criticism of particular results and intense further research to investigate disputed questions. Another thing that’s impressive about the IPCC report is that there’s an elaborate system to provide the probability for each individual finding — some are considered “almost certain” while others are merely “very likely” or “likely”; the evidence on some is considered to provide “high confidence” while others are only “medium” or “low” confidence. These folks are really being careful to tell us what they know and what they don’t know — what’s the last time you saw a politician do that??

Sure there are handful of dissenters, just as there were a few scientists in the 1950s who insisted that cigarettes couldn’t possibly cause cancer. But we’d be irrational — and I don’t use that word lightly — to ignore what climate scientists are telling us.

END OMNI NEWSLETTER #1 ON CORPORATE AND HIRELING ANTI-SCIENCE CLIMATE DISINFORMATION, COVERING-UP, DENIAL, CHICANERY, DECEIT, FRAUD, BRIBERY. . . 
APRIL 25, 2015

HOW TO BE PERSUASIVE ABOUT CLIMATE CHANGE

As wonderful as it is to see our loved ones over the holidays, we all know that some of the simplest
conversations can turn contentious when politics gets in the mix!

Is it even possible to "talk turkey" about climate without ending up in a food fight? We think so.

**To help you out, we've pulled together a set of tips on how to talk about climate change with family & friends**—whether they're devoted nature lovers like you, or climate-denying Rush Limbaugh devotees.

You and I know that we have no time to lose in the fight for climate action. From extreme drought and catastrophic wildfires to devastating storms and floods, the climate crisis has arrived. And the key to solving it is educating those around you.

The conversation might be easier than you expect—and we've got your back!

*I hope you find these tips useful*. I know I'll be using them!

Thank you for your activism and support,

Heather Shelby
Action Network Coordinator

ENVIRONMENT DEFENSE FUND

---

Dick Bennett

**Newsletters**

http://www.omnicenter.org/newsletter-archive/