

## Global Environmental Issues Can Distract Us From Local Problems

Written by Susan Jones

Friday, 05 November 2010 11:20

---



I'd like to share my current thoughts on the use of the terms "climate change" and "global warming". My comments are triggered after watching coverage of the excellent demonstration "Dig in for Climate Change" and while it appears to have been a great success, from my point of view, the use of the term, "climate change" distracted from the real issues of the South Fraser Perimeter Road.

I'm concerned about the use of the terms "climate change" and "global warming" as it is my opinion that they are too broad in scope and are not good labels to consistently use. It is simple to call me a "climate change denier" and ignore this, however I request that you give me an opportunity to share my thoughts.

I think debating the truth about "climate change" and "global warming" is a way of distracting people from looking at specific issues. People are being "sucked into" using these terms. It prevents people from examining the direct impact of actions and developments that are destroying the environment. To me, the worldwide loss of habitat is devastating. The loss of species, farmland, and natural environments along with the pollution of soil, air and water are critical issues. In some cases, the causes are change in climatic conditions and these should be specifically cited as caused by warming or cooling conditions.

I suspect our governments, and "destroyers of the environment" like nothing better than to use "green rhetoric" to avoid the truth about what they are wilfully doing for power and money. They love to use the terms, "climate change", "global warming", "greenhouse gases", "sustainability", "alternate energy", "green buildings", "ecodensity", "growth" and "balance". It is my opinion that these terms have become green rubbish.

It is important to avoid the rhetoric and point out the specific impacts of actions and developments that are destroying the environment.

In the case of the South Fraser Perimeter Road, the Project will destroy some of Canada's best farmland, habitat for species at risk, Burns Bog hydrology, transitional habitat, a highly-significant archaeological site and the quality of life. It will result in air pollution and over 50 kilometers of environmental degradation.

Prince Charles who in a recent interview declared his aim is to be a "defender of nature...", makes a more accurate statement as to what our goals should be.

The debate about "climate change" is ongoing. I am alarmed about the information that is coming out. It is so easy to use the terms as if they are the "cause" of all evil. I haven't read anything that would help me use these terms with comfort and have a sense that I know what I am talking about. Using these labels is a lazy way of avoiding doing proper homework on the issues facing us and sidetracks the debate about the real issues of willful environmental

Written by Susan Jones  
Friday, 05 November 2010 11:20

---

destruction.

I'd like you to consider the following article. It is articles like this that make me uncomfortable using terms that I know so little about. One can go on the internet and find excellent arguments on both sides of the debate. How many of us really know and understand the science? What we do know is that we need to continually speak up against deliberate environmental degradation.

----- Begin Article

### **US physics professor: 'Global warming is the greatest and most successful pseudoscientific fraud I have seen in my long life'**

*Harold Lewis is Emeritus Professor of Physics at the University of California, Santa Barbara. Here is his letter of resignation to Curtis G. Callan Jr, Princeton University, President of the American Physical Society.*

Dear Curt:

When I first joined the American Physical Society sixty-seven years ago it was much smaller, much gentler, and as yet uncorrupted by the money flood (a threat against which Dwight Eisenhower warned a half-century ago). Indeed, the choice of physics as a profession was then a guarantor of a life of poverty and abstinence—it was World War II that changed all that. The prospect of worldly gain drove few physicists. As recently as thirty-five years ago, when I chaired the first APS study of a contentious social/scientific issue, The Reactor Safety Study, though there were zealots aplenty on the outside there was no hint of inordinate pressure on us as physicists. We were therefore able to produce what I believe was and is an honest appraisal of the situation at that time. We were further enabled by the presence of an oversight committee consisting of Pief Panofsky, Vicki Weisskopf, and Hans Bethe, all towering physicists beyond reproach. I was proud of what we did in a charged atmosphere. In the end the oversight committee, in its report to the APS President, noted the complete independence in which we did the job, and predicted that the report would be attacked from both sides. What greater tribute could there be?

How different it is now. The giants no longer walk the earth, and the money flood has become the *raison d'être* of much physics research, the vital sustenance of much more, and it provides the support for untold numbers of professional jobs. For reasons that will soon become clear my former pride at being an APS Fellow all these years has been turned into shame, and I am forced, with no pleasure at all, to offer you my resignation from the Society.

It is of course, the global warming scam, with the (literally) trillions of dollars driving it, that has

## Global Environmental Issues Can Distract Us From Local Problems

Written by Susan Jones

Friday, 05 November 2010 11:20

---

corrupted so many scientists, and has carried APS before it like a rogue wave. It is the greatest and most successful pseudoscientific fraud I have seen in my long life as a physicist. Anyone who has the faintest doubt that this is so should force himself to read the ClimateGate documents, which lay it bare. (Montford's book organizes the facts very well.) I don't believe that any real physicist, nay scientist, can read that stuff without revulsion. I would almost make that revulsion a definition of the word scientist.

So what has the APS, as an organization, done in the face of this challenge? It has accepted the corruption as the norm, and gone along with it. For example:

1. About a year ago a few of us sent an e-mail on the subject to a fraction of the membership. APS ignored the issues, but the then President immediately launched a hostile investigation of where we got the e-mail addresses. In its better days, APS used to encourage discussion of important issues, and indeed the Constitution cites that as its principal purpose. No more. Everything that has been done in the last year has been designed to silence debate

2. The appallingly tendentious APS statement on Climate Change was apparently written in a hurry by a few people over lunch, and is certainly not representative of the talents of APS members as I have long known them. So a few of us petitioned the Council to reconsider it. One of the outstanding marks of (in)distinction in the Statement was the poison word incontrovertible, which describes few items in physics, certainly not this one. In response APS appointed a secret committee that never met, never troubled to speak to any skeptics, yet endorsed the Statement in its entirety. (They did admit that the tone was a bit strong, but amazingly kept the poison word incontrovertible to describe the evidence, a position supported by no one.) In the end, the Council kept the original statement, word for word, but approved a far longer "explanatory" screed, admitting that there were uncertainties, but brushing them aside to give blanket approval to the original. The original Statement, which still stands as the APS position, also contains what I consider pompous and asinine advice to all world governments, as if the APS were master of the universe. It is not, and I am embarrassed that our leaders seem to think it is. This is not fun and games, these are serious matters involving vast fractions of our national substance, and the reputation of the Society as a scientific society is at stake.

3. In the interim the ClimateGate scandal broke into the news, and the machinations of the principal alarmists were revealed to the world. It was a fraud on a scale I have never seen, and I lack the words to describe its enormity. Effect on the APS position: none. None at all. This is not science; other forces are at work.

4. So a few of us tried to bring science into the act (that is, after all, the alleged and historic purpose of APS), and collected the necessary 200+ signatures to bring to the Council a proposal for a Topical Group on Climate Science, thinking that open discussion of the scientific issues, in the best tradition of physics, would be beneficial to all, and also a contribution to the nation. I might note that it was not easy to collect the signatures, since you denied us the use of the APS membership list. We conformed in every way with the requirements of the APS Constitution, and described in great detail what we had in mind—simply to bring the subject into the open.

## Global Environmental Issues Can Distract Us From Local Problems

Written by Susan Jones

Friday, 05 November 2010 11:20

---

5. To our amazement, Constitution be damned, you declined to accept our petition, but instead used your own control of the mailing list to run a poll on the members' interest in a TG on Climate and the Environment. You did ask the members if they would sign a petition to form a TG on your yet-to-be-defined subject, but provided no petition, and got lots of affirmative responses. (If you had asked about sex you would have gotten more expressions of interest.) There was of course no such petition or proposal, and you have now dropped the Environment part, so the whole matter is moot. (Any lawyer will tell you that you cannot collect signatures on a vague petition, and then fill in whatever you like.) The entire purpose of this exercise was to avoid your constitutional responsibility to take our petition to the Council.

6. As of now you have formed still another secret and stacked committee to organize your own TG, simply ignoring our lawful petition.

APS management has gamed the problem from the beginning, to suppress serious conversation about the merits of the climate change claims. Do you wonder that I have lost confidence in the organization?

I do feel the need to add one note, and this is conjecture, since it is always risky to discuss other people's motives. This scheming at APS HQ is so bizarre that there cannot be a simple explanation for it. Some have held that the physicists of today are not as smart as they used to be, but I don't think that is an issue. I think it is the money, exactly what Eisenhower warned about a half-century ago. There are indeed trillions of dollars involved, to say nothing of the fame and glory (and frequent trips to exotic islands) that go with being a member of the club. Your own Physics Department (of which you are chairman) would lose millions a year if the global warming bubble burst. When Penn State absolved Mike Mann of wrongdoing, and the University of East Anglia did the same for Phil Jones, they cannot have been unaware of the financial penalty for doing otherwise. As the old saying goes, you don't have to be a weatherman to know which way the wind is blowing. Since I am no philosopher, I'm not going to explore at just which point enlightened self-interest crosses the line into corruption, but a careful reading of the ClimateGate releases makes it clear that this is not an academic question.

I want no part of it, so please accept my resignation. APS no longer represents me, but I hope we are still friends.

Hal

*Harold Lewis is Emeritus Professor of Physics, University of California, Santa Barbara, former Chairman; Former member Defense Science Board, Chairman of Technology panel; Chairman DSB study on Nuclear Winter; Former member Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards; Former member, President's Nuclear Safety Oversight Committee; Chairman APS study on Nuclear Reactor Safety Chairman Risk Assessment Review Group; Co-founder and former Chairman of JASON; Former member USAF Scientific Advisory Board; Served in US Navy in WW II; books: Technological Risk (about, surprise, technological risk) and Why Flip a Coin (about decision making)*