



## **The 'lukewarmers' show how environmentalists are in denial about denial**

Paul Mulshine

March 12, 2017

Perhaps you have a gas stove in your kitchen.

When you turn it on, do you worry that it might pollute your water?

Probably not. But the alleged threat to the water supply from natural gas is a primary argument employed by the radical environmentalists who oppose the construction of gas pipelines in New Jersey.

We already have more than 35,000 miles of oil and gas pipelines in the state. Why this sudden rise in protests over a few minor additions to an existing network?

Blame a guy by the name of [Bill McKibben](#). He's an environmental activist who has declared a jihad on all pipelines, period. His goal is to "Keep It in the Ground" - the name for his campaign against fossil fuels.

"Every piece of fossil-fuel infrastructure will have to be contested," McKibben writes. "Every month of delay adds new costs; every layer of uncertainty makes it harder for investors to justify."

But perhaps you like the convenience of inexpensive natural gas for cooking and heating.

'Consensus' is a political term, not a scientific one, as the recent revelations about the role of fat in the diet prove. The real question is not what the consensus on global warming is now but what it will be in 30 years. The answer? No one knows.

Beware. You may be labeled a "climate denier."

That's the term the protestors apply to virtually everyone who questions their war on fossil fuels.

Fortunately a couple of scientists, Paul C. Knappenburger and Patrick Michaels, have come up with a better term: Lukewarmists.

They've just come out with a new book titled "Lukewarming: The New Climate Science that Changes Everything."

When I called Knappenburger, a climate scientist with the free-market Cato Institute, he told me the term is a more accurate representation of the views of those scientists often derided as "climate deniers."

"We're not denying that there is man-made climate change," he said. "We're saying it will be relatively modest and something we can live with."

That argument has also been put forth by a couple of Princeton scientists who are among the smartest people on the planet, Princeton physics professor William Happer and Freeman Dyson, who's been at the Institute for Advanced Studies since Einstein roamed the grounds.

Freeman Dyson may be the most accomplished physicist not just in New Jersey but on the planet - too smart to accept simplistic explanations of climate change

Happer is being considered for a post in the Trump administration. Both he and Dyson have been labeled "climate deniers" when in fact they accept the idea that some climate change is man-made.

The "lukewarmist" view is that atmospheric carbon dioxide has some good effects that may outweigh any negative effects.

One positive effect is that CO-2 makes plants grow faster, thereby literally making the world more green, said Knappenburger.

"When you come down to it, I can't really think of anything better than having plants grow," Knappenburger said. "Whether you're a herbivore or carnivore, all your energy is coming from plants."

As for CO-2's effect on temperature, Knappenburger argues that the apocalyptic scenarios pushed by people like Al Gore rely on feedback mechanisms that amplify the effect of CO-2 - in theory. In practice, he said, studies show a small increase in temperatures.

"I expect about 1.5 degrees Centigrade of warming across this century - an amount that should be readily adapted to and overall non-disruptive, but will include winners and losers," he said. "The U.S. contribution to that overall warming will be about a tenth of a degree."

It's hard to believe the Blue Jersey people are this dumb. Alas, they are! How many people in New Jersey will die of lung disease because of Chris Christie's withdrawal from the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative consortium? Does this deep thinker honestly believe that carbon dioxide harms the lungs? Somebody's got to inform him (or her; I can't tell...

The explanation for why the U.S. will have such a small impact is - ironically enough - "largely because of cheap gas" and its lower carbon footprint compared to oil and coal, he said.

For that reason environmentalists were supporting natural gas production until recently.

"They were in favor of natural gas while there wasn't much of it," he said. "The notion was that this was a bridge fuel. But now it's so cheap that the bridge goes on forever."

Here we come to what Gore might call an inconvenient truth:

The radical environmentalists' side lost the election.

The winner already pushed through that pipeline at Standing Rock that was so heavily protested. And he's given every indication he will do so with the pipelines planned for the rest of the country.

If my e-mail is any indication, every conservative in New Jersey is angry with the three Republican congressman from our state whose votes last week helped provide the winning margin for that cap-and-trade bill. With good reason. It's an awful bill. And I'll give you two reasons: Blood and Gore. No, I'm not talking about a horror movie, but...

That's good news for Jersey consumers.

The protesters have failed to stop a pipeline - supported by both our Republican governor and our Democratic Senate president - that will permit conversion of a coal-burning plant in Cape May County to cleaner-burning natural gas.

And then there's the proposed PennEast Pipeline that will give residents of Central Jersey access to inexpensive gas coming in from Pennsylvania.

Despite all the protests, that pipeline is set for approval later this year by the federal government.

It looks like the lukewarmists are in the driver's seat for the next four years - in a vehicle propelled by fossil fuels.

As for the alarmists, they're left out in the cold - unless of course their homes have clean-burning gas heat.

In that case they can be lukewarm in reality - if not in fantasy.