

IN THE NAME OF GLOBAL WARMING

by Don Blankenship



SPPI COMMENTARY & ESSAY SERIES ♦ July 29, 2009

IN THE NAME OF GLOBAL WARMING

by Don Blankenship | July 28, 2009

In the name of global warming, politicians in Washington, DC are threatening to pass so called Cap and Trade legislation that will handicap our economy and force more American jobs offshore.

Many business groups and leaders are convinced that the best way to advocate against Cap and Trade legislation is not to challenge the science of global warming. They believe that although global warming is not a fact that the "scientific debate" is over. These business elites say that only the "political science" remains. They say it's a "political reality." They also say global warming is a "religion" and that the faith of those who believe in it cannot be changed.

But say what they will, "global warming" is neither a reality nor a religion. It is instead a "superstition." A reality is something that actually exists. Global warming has not existed for at least 7 years. Even the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's internal memos say it does not exist, and so do increasing numbers of noted scientists. A religion is a belief in a supernatural being, a system of faith or worship. Obviously, global warming does not fit this definition.

A "superstition" is a fear founded on irrational feelings and marked by credulity -- i.e. a willingness to believe in the improbable or the marvelous. It should be easy for even members of our Congress to understand that no projection of future world temperatures is a scientific reality. Even they can't be that credulous ... or can they?

What (other than extremely credulous) could you call a member of Congress who believes that by lowering the standard of living of 5% of the world's population (that includes you, me, and everyone else living in America) that the Congress -- by passing a law -- can reduce the temperature of the earth or lower sea levels? Simple common sense, not conflicted science is required to know better.

Only superstitious, credulous, and pompous politicians would even consider voting for such a bill ... sight unseen! You would have to first be irrational and have unfounded fears of something that doesn't exist; you would then have to be prone to believe in the highly improbable -- and then vain enough to believe you can change the climate system of the earth, even while most of the rest of the world is fully enjoying the benefits of carbon use.

Americans should be gravely concerned that Congress might act to deal with a superstitious belief and willfully and knowingly cost Americans their jobs, increase household utility bills, and increase worldwide toxic pollutants that are being released into the atmosphere. Yes,

increase pollutants in the name of the environment by transferring more jobs and industrial activity to heavily polluting countries like China that don't even have an EPA. Additionally, it is naïve to believe that these countries will follow our lead on CO₂ reductions since they have not done so for other truly polluting emissions.

The reality is that credulous political elites (whose personal ideology is to transfer wealth not only within classes of American citizens, but from America to foreign countries) will impede domestic energy production and fund countries and technologies that threaten America's homeland security.

But the political elites are only one group that is willing to damage America's economic strength and homeland security in support of Cap and Trade. Another group is the business elite. In the case of big businesses, it is not the grip of a medieval superstition, nor is it credulity driving, that is driving them. Instead it is what motivates most business people: profit and fear of government retaliation. Or maybe worse: hope for government favoritism. In fact, global warming - i.e., Cap and Trade - is a giant Ponzi scheme in the making that will make Madoff look like the tip of an advancing Alpine glacier.

Neither wind farms nor solar panels have any hope of effectively (cost effectively) displacing coal, nuclear, or natural gas as the primary energy sources for American electricity. Compelling America's workers to sacrifice more for the cap-and-trade falsehood is simply cruel and irresponsible.

Borrowing money from the largest polluting country in the world (China) to reduce a non-pollutant in order to address a superstition, to create a profit for multi-national companies that happen to be listed on the New York Stock Exchange (making most of their profits overseas) is an evil and cruel abomination. Politicians and business persons who participate in such a scheme, for whatever reason, are insensitive and represent a risk to the American way of life.

Anyone -- politicians, business persons, labor union leaders, journalists, teachers, environmentalists or a U.S. President -- that desires the best for America and its people will oppose Cap and Trade. Anyone who desires American prosperity, energy independence, homeland security, an improved environment, jobs and a future for our children will not be superstitious or complacent. They will not resort to trickery or seek an illicit profit. Instead, they will use a cost versus benefit evaluation based on real-world data to achieve true environmental and economic improvements.

Business people and politicians should be Americans first. They must use real science, truth, reality, and love for their country oppose to "Cap and Trade." If they do not, future American generations will consider them what they will have been - unmindful, unscrupulous, and uncaring. Going forward, we all owe our employees, our neighbors, our children, our constituents and all Americans nothing less than our best and honest effort to

find the right answers to real pressing and critical challenges. Global warming is not the challenge of our time. Even if it were, Cap and Trade is the wrong answer.

President Reagan was man enough to label "evil" when he saw it. Madoff's Ponzi scheme was described by a judge as "evil." The Cap and Trade scheme, if passed, will be many times more "evil."

Conversely, a true worldwide effort to regulate and reduce particulate, sulfur and other pollutants on a cost benefit basis in developing countries would provide a real and significant improvement to the world's environment, without empty sacrifices of American lives and liberties. The choice between the two possibilities should not be difficult, even for the U.S. Congress. It incorporates, after all, their oath of office to protect Americans from enemies foreign and domestic, and to defend the constitution.



Don Blankenship is CEO of Massey Energy.

Source: http://www.americanthinker.com/2009/07/in_the_name_of_global_warming.html.

