Date: December 15, 2010

To: California Air Resources Board

# RE: AB 32 Scoping Plans

I submit my comments not from association with any professional organization, I present them as a concerned member of the public, an interested citizen of this one fine state, and I will begin by asking this board to reject staff proposals for lack of scientific rigor.

To begin, the entire premise of AB 32 is based upon scientific consensus, by virtue of this claim of consensus the sponsors and supporters join those defined in the quote, “Historically, the claim of consensus has been the first refuge of scoundrels; it is a way to avoid debate by claiming that the matter is already settled.”

So how do we define statements of “consensus? Let’s try some quotes.

(1) “We should be concerned by “the extreme gravity of the global situation”

(2) “If current trends persist “the irreversible disruption of the life-support systems on this planet, possibly by the end of the [20th] century, certainly with the lifetimes of our children, are inevitable."

(3) “Governments are refusing to face facts and therefore are failing to undertake necessary “corrective measures”

(4) “A self-appointed group of “scientists and industrialists...is currently trying to persuade governments, industrial leaders and trade unions throughout the world to face these facts and to take appropriate action while there is yet time.”

(5) “A new political movement is necessary; this movement must embrace “a new philosophy of life, whose goals can be achieved without destroying the environment”

But these quotes are not as one might think, current or describing the modern construct of environmental scientists known as Anthropogenic Global Warming or AGW, rather it was concern of the pending ice age and the doom of severe climate change from a cooling earth.

It doesn’t get much clearer than that. Forty years ago some scientists used their respected place in society to advocate for a new political movement, a new philosophy of life. While scientists are entitled to their views, their expertise is not in political philosophy. This means their opinions regarding how the world should function deserve no more consideration than the opinions of a random nurse or taxi driver, or dare I say a movie star, entertainment mogul or even former Vice President turned opportunist.

What else were they saying back in 1972? The first line of the 1972 Blueprint for Action introduction declares that an industrial way of life is “not sustainable.” We were told humans are consuming too much, polluting too much, and having too many babies. We were told economic growth is the enemy and that austerity is the answer. We’re warned that unless things change radically “a succession of famines, epidemics, social crises and wars” are inevitable.

Let’s look at the parallel to today’s argument for Climate change in the other direction. We have the finest evidence government and hedge fund money can buy; scientists a plenty that would sell whatever their trainers wanted to buy; like so many corrupt politicians. If the saying that money is the mother’s milk in politics is accurate, it is certainly proven to be the life blood of scientific consensus, where reproducible results are no longer the basis for scientific theory but rather computer models that model nothing observable in nature.

To support my claims of science for profit and power I would like to start with the abusive thrust of US and other “1st world” governments pressure upon “3rd world” countries to support the IPCC findings. During COP 15 (IPCC Copenhagen Accord) support was secured by threatening loss of aid and other assistance[[1]](#footnote-1), the US was reported through Wikileaks released cables to have mounted a campaign to smear and otherwise coerce countries to support COP 15[[2]](#footnote-2). In the case of Saudi Arabia, we have offered to transition the support we provide for their corrupt political system from cash payments for petroleum to other forms of assistance[[3]](#footnote-3) while they work internally to *"climb down"* from their negotiating position by using "something clever," like India or China, that was not legally binding but indicated some goodwill towards the process without compromising key economic interest with the US taxpayers holding the bag on commitments made to provide global financing or "creative accounting"[[4]](#footnote-4) to ensure even industrialized countries support continued efforts to achieve agreements on GHG reductions. In COP 16 at Cancun, US citizens were raped to the tune of just under 100 billion per year beginning in 2020 to purchase the support or should I suggest the “consensus” of the 3rd world countries in support of an agreement.

As if the US efforts weren’t under enough pressure internationally, another and more pressing threat to the federal EPA action which threatens to undermine and expose the fraud that has been perpetuated as “science” in support of AWG, AB 32 and related bills is the open science bill (Public Access to Historical Records Act)[[5]](#footnote-5) recently introduced in the Senate. The mandate in this bill to release all data held by federal agencies will begin the erosion of the image of AWG as having a basis in sound science verse political expedience and profiteering by those willing to sell their research to the highest bidders. This is good news for skeptics as federal agencies have been directed under threat of censer for those that do not cooperate and tow the line and favor (or funding) for those that lead in the fraudulent findings supporting the AWG hypothesis. Rarely do we get glimpses of dissent from scientist within NASA or other bodies, but recently we are seeing release of reports[[6]](#footnote-6) that attack the basis of earlier reports and establishing the facts presented by “skeptics” as valid and commonly supported by scientific methods and not dependent upon computer models that work mainly to present the results programmed into them. In fact, new reports from NASA referenced show that a doubling of CO2 raises temperature at most 1.64 C and that inland areas may actually see a decrease associated with increased vegetation.

Where once Al Gore claimed “scientific consensus” trumped the usual requirement for reproducible results, we now have a shifting of consensus with as many as 1000[[7]](#footnote-7) scientists or 5 times as many as those that support the IPCC report, many current or former members of IPCC, now join the throng that “warmist” pejoratively call “skeptics”, many at risk of fortune, but able to hold their heads high knowing that they have not sold out their work for dishonest gain.

The proposed Cap and Tax scheme under consideration is an added burden to the federal proposed Green House Gas rules (40 CFR Part 98, Subpart W) placing California based companies at extreme hardship and at a competitive disadvantage[[8]](#footnote-8). Promulgation of this rule as proposed without assurance from the federal EPA that it would be “treated as equivalents or substitutes” signals to California based companies that investments should be made outside of California.

Further, the Western Climate Initiative (WCI), which might provide cover for California’s scheme is falling apart. New Mexico’s political change is ahead of our own and while they have recently passed a rule on the same day that the state elected a Governor that rejects Anthropogenic Global Warming (AGW) and is supported with electoral support that will result in the only state in the WCI that could be counted on to follow us as sure bets to call it off. The other states are all recalcitrant to support their obligations[[9]](#footnote-9) and are now poised to join in a new club with a different motive, to entice those companies that are considering leaving the Golden State to relocate to their own state. It is not unlike a group of kids that agree jumping off of a cliff is a good idea and convince the stupid one to try it first only to share in the dividing of his property after his demise. Not that I would call anyone here or the legislators that passed AB 32 stupid, I am only making an analogy; but we are the first ones off the cliff and it is pretty certain that the others are not going to follow.

If New Mexico remained our hope for company in this insane run, it is widely recognized that the rule they passed this last week, is not only likely to be repealed due to shifting political power but it has a leveraging provision that cancels the bill out without any other action required if the other WCI members don’t meet targets. How is it that a backwoods state like New Mexico has the foresight to ensure they aren’t walking the plank alone and this august body does not?

Estimated costs for this proposed trading scheme before you, according to a report compiled by free market proponent [Calwatchdog.org](http://calwatchdog.org/), the potential cost per household ranges from $570 to $6,500 annually, and the price of gasoline would increase 61 cents per gallon by January[[10]](#footnote-10). Now while there are those that would propose that the results will be dramatically different, they are made by the same people that claim "Outside of directly environmentally damaging extractive industries such as logging, mining, and oil drilling, it is very difficult to identify any jobs that have ever been lost to environmental regulations,…There's no reason to think that AB 32 or its LCFS will be different. The careful studies by CARB and researchers at UC Berkeley predict roughly zero net effect on state incomes and employment”[[11]](#footnote-11). To grant any person or entity credence after such absurd claims would be incredibly self-serving and naïve if not dishonest.

Some of the unintended consequences likely to result from this rule could be massive increase in harvesting of lumber in sensitive sites and selling back credits to California resulting in a double fee for commodity lumber, still more transfer of wealth from an already impoverished California citizenry and the devastation of precious habitat to countless endangered species of plants and animals[[12]](#footnote-12).

There is some irony in the COP 16 call to the ancient Myan god. It appears that what we have in commonality with the Myans whose demise is considered due to an earlier natural and cyclic climate change is that we too are not loath to sacrifice our brethren to the gods in a vain attempt to alter natural and cyclic changes in global temperature and weather systems rather than behaving as enlightened people and seek the means to mitigate the effects of these changes. We ignore that these changes have occurred in the past and will occur in the future and rather than use technology to prepare for and cope with the change we are sacrificing the livelihoods and fortune of our citizens and state to appease Gaia.

Laws like sausages are always better after being cooked by the press; diced by the lawyers, and seasoned by the end user. What is new to most is the construct of regulation barren of reason and completely devoid of rationale save that of providing a scheme to accumulate greater power for government over the lives of citizens. What I would like to ask of you, if you as individuals as you consider your vote in favor of this, what are you willing to do when the ruse is discovered, what will you sacrifice commensurate with those whose lives will be disrupted, what will be the indicators of your remorse and what will be the penalty for your deeds?

This once August Board has lost the prestige it once enjoyed. Once viewed for the rigor it brought into the field of atmospheric science and health and the means for improvement, it has become an example of bias, intrigue and dishonesty, staff reports devoid of objectivity, appearance of hidden agendas by the Chair and some members and generally poor decisions that support a waning political establishment. The time to start back towards reclaiming your reputation should begin today. As evidence I would suggest that you express your disappointed that Staff has not identified a single detracting report for your consideration. How are you to weigh your decision, against what shall you evaluate the risks? It is as if there is no conflict among researchers as to the validity of the AWG hypothesis when everyone in the room knows that the argument is being won by detractors with new findings and published reports on a monthly if not weekly basis. I ask you to consider these points and not dismiss them without answering the question as to what you will do when proven wrong and to weigh your deliberations against the risks of undue harm to an already seriously weakened economy and those that look to Sacrament for leadership and support. I ask you to send this back to Staff with directions that they at minimum provide some balance in their science, some dissent with which to measure your consideration and some alternatives including doing nothing until the science is fully investigated.

Sincerely,

Robert Hassebrock

273 Menlo Park Ave

Ventura, CA 93004

**Selected Quotes:**

***“We're not scientifically there yet. Despite what you may have heard in the media, there is nothing like a consensus of scientific opinion that this is a problem. Because there is natural variability in the weather, you cannot statistically know for another 150 years.”*** -- UN IPCC's Tom Tripp, a member of the UN IPCC since 2004 and listed as one of the lead authors and serves as the Director of Technical Services & Development for U.S. Magnesium.

***“Any reasonable scientific analysis must conclude the basic theory wrong!!”*** -- NASA Scientist Dr. Leonard Weinstein who worked 35 years at the NASA Langley Research Center and finished his career there as a Senior Research Scientist. Weinstein is presently a Senior Research Fellow at the National Institute of Aerospace.

***“Please remain calm: The Earth will heal itself -- Climate is beyond our power to control...Earth doesn't care about governments or their legislation. You can't find much actual global warming in present-day weather observations. Climate change is a matter of geologic time, something that the earth routinely does on its own without asking anyone's permission or explaining itself***.” -- Nobel Prize-Winning Stanford University Physicist Dr. Robert B. Laughlin, who won the Nobel Prize for physics in 1998, and was formerly a research scientist at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

***“In essence, the jig is up. The whole thing is a fraud. And even the fraudsters that fudged data are admitting to temperature history that they used to say didn't happen...Perhaps what has doomed the Climategate fraudsters the most was their brazenness in fudging the data”*** -- Dr. Christopher J. Kobus, Associate Professor of Mechanical Engineering at Oakland University, specializes in alternative energy, thermal transport phenomena, two-phase flow and fluid and thermal energy systems.

***“The energy mankind generates is so small compared to that overall energy budget that it simply cannot affect the climate...The planet's climate is doing its own thing, but we cannot pinpoint significant trends in changes to it because it dates back millions of years while the study of it began only recently. We are children of the Sun; we simply lack data to draw the proper conclusions.”*** -- Russian Scientist Dr. Anatoly Levitin, the head of geomagnetic variations laboratory at the Institute of Terrestrial Magnetism, Ionosphere and Radiowave Propagation of the Russian Academy of Sciences.

***“Hundreds of billion dollars have been wasted with the attempt of imposing a Anthropogenic Global Warming (AGW) theory that is not supported by physical world evidences...AGW has been forcefully imposed by means of a barrage of scare stories and indoctrination that begins in the elementary school textbooks.”*** -- Brazilian Geologist Geraldo Luís Lino, who authored the 2009 book “The Global Warming Fraud: How a Natural Phenomenon Was Converted into a False World Emergency.”

***"I am an environmentalist,” but “I must disagree with Mr. Gore***” -- Chemistry Professor Dr. Mary Mumper, the chair of the Chemistry Department at Frostburg State University in Maryland, during her presentation titled “Anthropogenic Carbon Dioxide and Global Warming, the Skeptic's View.”

***“I am ashamed of what climate science has become today.” The science “community is relying on an inadequate model to blame CO2 and innocent citizens for global warming in order to generate funding and to gain attention. If this is what 'science' has become today, I, as a scientist, am ashamed.”*** -- Research Chemist William C. Gilbert published a study in August 2010 in the journal Energy & Environment titled “The thermodynamic relationship between surface temperature and water vapor concentration in the troposphere” and he published a paper in August 2009 titled “Atmospheric Temperature Distribution in a Gravitational Field.” [*Update December 9, 2010*]

***“The dysfunctional nature of the climate sciences is nothing short of a scandal. Science is too important for our society to be misused in the way it has been done within the Climate Science Community.” The global warming establishment “has actively suppressed research results presented by researchers that do not comply with the dogma of the IPCC.”*** -- Swedish Climatologist Dr. Hans Jelbring, of the Paleogeophysics & Geodynamics Unit at Stockholm University. [*Updated December 9, 2010. Corrects Jelbring's quote.*]

***“Those who call themselves 'Green planet advocates' should be arguing for a CO2- fertilized atmosphere, not a CO2-starved atmosphere...Diversity increases when the planet was warm AND had high CO2 atmospheric content...Al Gore's personal behavior supports a green planet - his enormous energy use with his 4 homes and his bizjet, does indeed help make the planet greener. Kudos, Al for doing your part to save the planet.”*** -- Renowned engineer and aviation/space pioneer Burt Rutan, who was named "100 most influential people in the world, 2004" by Time Magazine and Newsweek called him "the man responsible for more innovations in modern aviation than any living engineer."

***“Global warming is the central tenet of this new belief system in much the same way that the Resurrection is the central tenet of Christianity. Al Gore has taken a role corresponding to that of St Paul in proselytizing the new faith...My skepticism about AGW arises from the fact that as a physicist who has worked in closely related areas, I know how poor the underlying science is. In effect the scientific method has been abandoned in this field.”*** -- Atmospheric Physicist Dr. John Reid, who worked with Australia's CSIRO's (Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization) Division of Oceanography and worked in surface gravity waves (ocean waves) research.

***“We maintain there is no reason whatsoever to worry about man-made climate change, because there is no evidence whatsoever that such a thing is happening***.” -- Greek Earth scientists Antonis Christofides and Nikos Mamassis of the National Technical University of Athens' Department of Water Resources and Environmental Engineering.

***“There are clear cycles during which both temperature and salinity rise and fall. These cycles are related to solar activity...In my opinion and that of our institute, the problems connected to the current stage of warming are being exaggerated. What we are dealing with is not a global warming of the atmosphere or of the oceans.”*** -- Biologist Pavel Makarevich of the Biological Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences.

***“Because the greenhouse effect is temporary rather than permanent, predictions of significant global warming in the 21st century by IPCC are not supported by the data.”*** -- Hebrew University Professor Dr. Michael Beenstock an honorary fellow with Institute for Economic Affairs who published a study challenging man-made global warming claims titled “Polynomial Cointegration Tests of the Anthropogenic Theory of Global Warming.”

***“The whole idea of anthropogenic global warming is completely unfounded. There appears to have been money gained by Michael Mann, Al Gore and UN IPCC's Rajendra Pachauri as a consequence of this deception, so it's fraud***.” -- South African astrophysicist Hilton Ratcliffe, a member of the Astronomical Society of Southern Africa (ASSA) and the Astronomical Society of the Pacific and a Fellow of the British Institute of Physics.

1. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/us-embassy-cables-documents/246644?intcmp=239> & <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/us-embassy-cables-documents/246026?intcmp=239> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2010/dec/03/wikileaks-us-manipulated-climate-accord?intcmp=239> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/us-embassy-cables-documents/248643?intcmp=239> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/us-embassy-cables-documents/249185?intcmp=239> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2010/12/08/a-bill-for-climate-data-integrity-the-public-access-to-historical-records-act/> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. <http://www.theregister.co.uk/2010/12/08/new_model_doubled_co2_sub_2_degrees_warming/> [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. <http://climatedepot.com/a/9035/SPECIAL-REPORT-More-Than-1000-International-Scientists-Dissent-Over-ManMade-Global-Warming-Claims--Challenge-UN-IPCC--Gore> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2010-12-02/states-want-cap-and-trade-added-to-u-s-epa-s-carbon-regulations.html> [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. <http://www.hcn.org/issues/42.21/western-climate-initiative-moves-forward-smaller-than-imagined> [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. <http://www.whittierdailynews.com/ci_16783685> [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Frank Ackerman, an economist with the Stockholm Environment Institute-US Center. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. <http://www.latimes.com/business/la-fi-chiapas-california-20101210,0,3329767.story> [↑](#footnote-ref-12)