

## Looking at global warming in a new way

Jack Van Zandt

January 21, 2016

At a 2015 press conference in Brussels, Christiana Figueres, executive secretary of U.N.'s Framework Convention on Climate Change stated "we are setting ourselves the task . . . to intentionally transform the economic development model for the first time in human history."

With people being killed every day by terrorists, why are our political leaders considering global warming a higher priority when the people are being killed daily by terrorists?

Here's the answer. The brainiacs of our culture believe they can change the way we live and the way the earth operates to something better if we just give them control. Climate change apocalypse attempts to establish the basis for them to take that control.

Settled: The President, most of Congress, most governors, political leaders in the UN, the political donor class tell us the "science is settled." And I agree. "The science" is settled – the political science!

Skewed: This science tells us that 97 percent of some group of scientists agree we have global warming and the cause is man. However, Investors Business Daily researched this and it was inaccurate. It noted:

The study supposedly looked at roughly 12,000 scientific abstracts on global warming or climate change published from 1991 to 2011.

Researchers then assigned one of seven classifications to each abstract, the strongest being the "explicit endorsement" that humans cause warming "with quantification," the weakest being an outright rejection of the idea.

The middle classification was a neutral position, neither an endorsement nor a rejection.

Of the 12,000 or so papers, 8,261 fell into the neutral grouping, while only 65 were judged as showing the strongest endorsement. That's not 97 percent...

In fact, the number of scientists endorsing man-made global warming is falling.

Costly: The Heritage Foundation projects that rules already in place in the U.S. “will cost the economy \$2.23 trillion from 2015 to 2038 . . . kill 600,000 jobs . . . slash a family of four’s income by \$1,200 by 2023.” Cutting CO2 emissions 80 percent by 2050 would cause an aggregate loss to the U.S. of \$207.8 trillion by 2100.”

That comes out of OUR pockets . . . off our kitchen table.

Uncooperative: The CATO Institute published a paper noting the real world weather isn’t cooperating with the alarmist’s computer models, calling it “a poor correspondence between climate model expectations and real-world observations.”

The report further noted “If the known climate behavior cannot be well-captured by the models, no case can be made for the veracity of projections, from the same models, of the future evolution of our climate.” Or as the Bible instructs, if a prophet gives a short-term prophecy and it doesn’t come true, don’t believe his long-term prophecy.

Unpredictable: This is probably why the apocalyptic alarmists’ projections didn’t come true. Why nations were not swept off the earth in 2000, why the earth lasted more than 50 days in 2009, more than 4 years in 2007, and why the average earth’s temperature has not budged in 18 years.

Impact: So, government is spending billions of our dollars subsidizing inefficient energy technology, destroying fossil fuel energy providers, eliminating high paying jobs, etc. This is all done under the guise of preventing the predicted impacts of catastrophic climate change based on computer models that have failed to date.

Ms. Figueres is correct. Global warming is not about climate. It’s about policies designed to transform “the economic development system” worldwide. And its happening in America, Spain, Germany, and around the globe . . .

Science? Or science fiction? It’s high time to rethink this.