

# Climate Action Plan – The Religion of Global Warming

Even if you don't live in Albuquerque, you'll likely be paying for projects reducing green house gasses (GHG) in your area as well. City officials propose spending \$2B to "fix" the problem of Global Warming. Gen 1:28 charges us with stewardship of the earth. How much do we devote to "saving the earth" from perceived imbalances caused by man? Some radical environmentalists say the earth would be better off without humans altogether. Ex 20:3 says to have no other gods before the one true God. Radical environmentalism amounts to no more than worshipping creation rather than the Creator.

"The sky is falling, the sky is falling," Chicken Little screamed throughout the town. The townspeople reacted in a frenzy to Chicken Little's claim of certain disaster.

Albuquerque, with State and Nation sure to follow ([www.nmclimatechange.us](http://www.nmclimatechange.us)), is proposing extreme measures to fix a problem that likely does not exist. Chicken Little (The City) is presented a *Climate Action Plan* (CAP) to the City Council on Mon, 16 Nov 09 after ten Town Hall meetings in the month of August. [www.cabq.gov/cap](http://www.cabq.gov/cap) Mayor Chavez' reputation is on the line after signing the U.S. Mayors Climate Protection Agreement.<sup>1</sup> He wants this approved before Dec 1, 2009.

The CAP raises two unspoken questions – 1) Do people really buy into (*believe*) the panic reports of Global Warming and 2) Do people really *believe* enough to pay for solutions.

- 1) [Deleted in the revised CAP presented to the City Council on Nov 16. However, the strategy of convincing rather than polling is still applicable.] The CAP already answers the question of *belief*, anticipating public response. Propaganda targets specific groups of people, not with the idea of modifying the plan with public input, but to *convince* various segments of its "truth." This is a marketing plan, not a scientific proposal.

"The following stages define stakeholder readiness for change, and how receptive they are to **our** efforts. Different communications "framing" is done based on this knowledge. This is why, for internal planning purposes, we need to segment the stakeholder groups identified by the work groups into:

- **Pioneers**: The first 1% of the stakeholder population to embrace sustainable behaviors.
- **Early adopters**: The next 9% who follow the "pioneers" in embracing sustainable behaviors.
- **Early majority**: The 40% of the population that follows the "early adopters".
- **Late adopters**: Once 50% of the population has embraced sustainable behaviors, the "late adopters" represent 40% of the stakeholder population that is ready for change.
- **Laggards**: The final 10% of the stakeholder population that may never accept change. The "pioneers" are the most receptive group and should be engaged first. Any change effort should include assisting them in the change with their own social network. They need to be provided the communications tools and information to ensure that they are viewed as leaders in this effort by their peer group. Efforts to link the "pioneers" with the "early adopters" so they can exchange information (interactive activities such as fairs and

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://usmayors.org/climateprotection/cities.asp?state=NM>

parties) will increase the adoption process. To begin designing communications tools for each stakeholder group, the stakeholders should be identified as to where they are currently in adopting the desired behavior toward climate change principles.”

Are you a “laggard?” The City plans to ignore 10% of the population. Even if the percentage of “laggards” is actually higher, the City will claim it is only 10%.

Once the City has its “pioneers,” “early adopters,” and “early majority” supporters online, the battle is won – they have the majority. Don’t these labels sound so nice?

- 2) The CAP does not give a bottom line cost, so I did the work for you. These costs do not include expenses for the Climate Action Task Force (CATF) and the CAP itself. CAP could cost taxpayers from \$547.75M to **\$1,817.25M** (~\$2B) (see summary below).

Many countries will elect not to participate in funding solutions to Global Warming. Not only will this reduce the impact of America’s contribution, it will hurt the economy while countries like China thrive. The Peacekeeper ICBM broke the bank for USSR and the Berlin wall fell at the conclusion of the Cold War. Will radical environmental expenses break the bank for America? There is a “behind the scenes” economic philosophy – spending money stimulates the economy. Unfortunately, it’s taxpayers money and taxpayers always lose when they don’t spend their own money. Waste, corruption, and inefficiency are the rule for government spending rather than the exception.

The problem. Is Global Warming real? Observed effects are so inconsistent that media often uses the term “climate change” now instead of “global warming.”

“Among the many reasons President Barack Obama and the Democratic majority are so intent on quickly jamming a cap-and-trade system through Congress is because the global warming tide is again shifting. It turns out Al Gore and the United Nations (with an assist from the media), did a little too vociferous a job smearing anyone who disagreed with them as “deniers.” The backlash has brought the scientific debate roaring back to life in Australia, Europe, Japan and even, if less reported, the U.S.

“The number of skeptics, far from shrinking, is swelling. Oklahoma Sen. Jim Inhofe now counts more than 700 scientists who disagree with the U.N. -- 13 times the number who authored the U.N.'s 2007 climate summary for policymakers. Joanne Simpson, the world's first woman to receive a Ph.D. in meteorology, expressed relief upon her retirement last year that she was finally free to **speak "frankly" of her nonbelief.** Dr. Kiminori Itoh, a Japanese environmental physical chemist who contributed to a U.N. climate report, dubs man-made warming **"the worst scientific scandal in history."** Norway's Ivar Giaever, Nobel Prize winner for physics, decries it as **the "new religion."** A group of 54 noted physicists, led by Princeton's Will Happer, is demanding the American Physical Society revise its position that the science is settled. (Both Nature and Science magazines have refused to run the physicists' open letter.)

BBC Documentary:

[http://www.garagetv.be/video-galerij/blancostemrecht/The\\_Great\\_Global\\_Warming\\_Swindle\\_Documentary\\_Film.aspx](http://www.garagetv.be/video-galerij/blancostemrecht/The_Great_Global_Warming_Swindle_Documentary_Film.aspx)

“The collapse of the "consensus" has been driven by reality. The inconvenient truth is that the earth's temperatures have flat-lined since 2001, despite growing concentrations of CO<sub>2</sub>. Peer-reviewed research has debunked doomsday scenarios about the polar ice caps, hurricanes, malaria, extinctions, rising oceans. A global financial crisis has politicians taking a harder look at the science that would require them to hamstring their economies to rein in carbon.” – The Climate Change Climate Change, Jun 26, 2009  
<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB124597505076157449.html#>

The threat. The CAP report tries to scare the public into action. But what is the real threat – especially in New Mexico?

“In New Mexico, higher temperatures, increased precipitation and more extreme conditions on hot and stormy days are likely. Warmer and wetter conditions can increase mosquito populations, and extreme weather events can cause an increase in rodent populations. Earlier and more intense precipitation events can lead to an inability to store flood waters for later use in the summer as well as reduced crop yields.” CAP, pg 4

I must have missed something. I thought NM had a water problem. Yet the CAP report considers “increased precipitation” a negative for NM. The CAP report even implies that NM will have so much water we won’t be able to store it! “Reduced crop yields” because we can’t store enough water? Then spend the \$2B on water storage instead of reducing GHG emissions. If mosquitoes and rodents are the worst we can expect to see due to “increased precipitation,” then NM has no problem with Global Warming.

Real priorities. Is there a significant human contribution to the problem of Global Warming? We could be spending a lot of money on something we cannot fix. Are there other, more immediate problems besides Global Warming? How would scientists prioritize all world problems rather than focusing on one world problem?

“Bjorn Lomborg busted--and that is the only word for it--onto the world scene in 2001 with the publication of his book "The Skeptical Environmentalist." A one-time Greenpeace enthusiast, he'd originally planned to disprove those who said the environment was getting better. He failed. And to his credit, his book said so, supplying a damning critique of today's environmental pessimism. Carefully researched, it offered endless statistics--from official sources such as the U.N.--showing that from biodiversity to global warming, there simply were no apocalypses in the offing. "Our history shows that we solve more problems than we create," he tells me. For his efforts, Mr. Lomborg was labeled a heretic by environmental groups--whose fundraising depends on scaring the jeepers out of the public--and became more hated by these alarmists than even (if possible) President Bush.

“Yet the experience left Mr. Lomborg with a taste for challenging conventional wisdom.

[www.nmsciencefoundation.org/cap.pdf](http://www.nmsciencefoundation.org/cap.pdf)

In 2004, he invited eight of the world's top economists--including four Nobel Laureates--to Copenhagen, where they were asked to evaluate the world's problems, think of the costs and efficiencies attached to solving each, and then produce a prioritized list of those most deserving of money. The well-publicized results (and let it be said here that Mr. Lomborg is no slouch when it comes to promoting himself and his work) were stunning. While the economists were from varying political stripes, they largely agreed. The numbers were just so compelling: \$1 spent preventing HIV/AIDS would result in about \$40 of social benefits, so the economists put it at the top of the list (followed by malnutrition, free trade and malaria). In contrast, \$1 spent to abate global warming would result in only about two cents to 25 cents worth of good; so that project dropped to the bottom.

“Most people, average people, when faced with these clear choices, would pick the \$40-of-good project over others--that's rational," says Mr. Lomborg. "The problem is that most people are simply presented with a menu of projects, with no prices and no quantities. What the Copenhagen Consensus was trying to do was put the slices and prices on a menu. And then require people to make choices.

“Mr. Lomborg hopes that prioritization up top will inspire "competition" down below. "Most people work in their own circles--malaria guys talk to malaria guys, malnutrition guys to malnutrition guys. But if they understand that there are other projects out there, and that they also have price tags, and that the ones with the best performance are the ones that will get the extra money--you start to have an Olympics for best projects. And that means smarter ideas for how to solve problems." In fact, Mr. Lomborg wishes there were more Al Gores. "It's good we have someone educating about global warming. But we need Al Gores for HIV/AIDS, Al Gores for malnutrition, Al Gores for free trade, Al Gores for clean drinking water. We need all these Al Gores passionately roaming the earth with power-point presentations, making the case for their project. Because at that point, the real Al Gore would be slightly sidelined, since he's arguing for the most expensive cure that would do the least good.” – Wall Street Journal, Jul 8, 2006  
[http://online.wsj.com/article/SB115231740738201276.html?mod=opinion\\_main\\_featured\\_stories\\_hs](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB115231740738201276.html?mod=opinion_main_featured_stories_hs)

What's good about the CAP? There are ideas imbedded in the CAP that are VERY good, completely independent of solutions for Global Warming. One of those projects is described on pages 39-41 of the CAP report. Though requiring more water, increasing local food production reduces vulnerability to natural disasters in other parts of the world and saves money for the consumer by reducing transportation costs. Albuquerque already has a head start on this idea with local Community Gardening programs. <http://www.cabq.gov/albuquerquegreen/green-goals/trees/community-gardening>

Will the City listen and respond to critics? Personal contacts indicate that city and university employees are terrified of losing their jobs if they are perceived as opposing the religion of Global Warming. Since informed employees cannot speak for truth, citizens must. How much is \$2B? For a community the size of Albuquerque, that's about \$4,000 per person.

- Our first line of defense against spending \$2B, is to make comments on the CAP and attend a Town Hall meeting. <http://www.cabq.gov/cap> **[ENDED]**
- Our second line of defense against spending \$2B, is to keep the City Council informed. <http://www.cabq.gov/council/>
- Our third line of defense against spending \$2B, is to vote for candidates who are not blinded by the religion of Global Warming. Carefully review candidates for Mayor and City Council for the Oct 6 election. Early and absentee voting during Sep. <http://www.cabq.gov/clerk/elections>

The end of the Chicken Little story concludes with aliens. An interesting side-issue in itself. Grave predictions for 2012 abound in the media. Will “salvation” from a global environmental catastrophe be attributed to alien intervention? Then again, are aliens no more than demons in disguise? <http://creation.com/ufo-phenomenon-growing>

Mark Burton

[mark@nmsciencefoundation.org](mailto:mark@nmsciencefoundation.org)

MS Systems Engineering

USAF Major, Retired

Engineering Analyst for the Air Force Safety Center, Nuclear Surety, 1996-1998

CAP Costs:

- 1 = \$250,000 or less
- 2 = \$250,000–\$1 million
- 3 = \$1–\$25 million
- 4 = \$25–\$200 million
- 5 = \$200 million or more

- Page 9
  - 1s – 5
  - 2s – 4
  - 3s – 4
  - 4s – 1
  - 5s – 2
- Page 11
  - 1s – 4
  - 2s – 8
  - 3s – 5
  - 4s – 1
  - 5s – 0
- Page 13
  - 1s – 4
  - 2s – 2
  - 3s – 7
  - 4s – 3
  - 5s – 0
- Totals
  - 1s – 13, \$3.25M
  - 2s – 14, \$3.5M - \$14M
  - 3s – 16, \$16M - \$400M
  - 4s – 5, \$125M - \$1,000M
  - 5s – 2, \$400M
  - \$547.75M - \$1,817.25M