# The Trudel Group

**Business Innovation Update** 

3Q09

"An occasional newsletter to share ideas and insights on current topics."

## The multi-layered plan for massive U.S. energy taxes...

Propagand	a Legis	slation	Treaties
Gore's Warming	Cap and Trade	Big Governme	nt UN Agenda

Gore copied an old <u>movie</u> and portrayed global warming as (literally) the end of the world. But, it turns out, the planet is really cooling. And it's no big deal. *How embarrassing is that?* 

The Earth warmed about 0.8 degrees Fahrenheit during the 20th Century as we recovered from the Little Ice Age of the 19th Century. There has been no dangerous global warming, nor is it likely. In the United States, the warmest recent years were during the Dust Bowl of the 1930's. Since 2001 there has been a *decrease* in global temperature. It's getting cooler, not warmer.

Even the "official" IPCC data shows weather is not cooperating with Mr. Gore. The <u>result</u> has been desperate propaganda to keep fear alive, mostly anecdotes about scary observations or opinions:

**Claim:** Greenland (and/or the Arctic icecap) is melting. A new island was "discovered" off Greenland when the ice melted. There was major news special on this one, calling it "warming island" and claiming this "discovery" was a signal of imminent planetary disaster.

**Facts:** True and false. The warming island discovery was a hoax (there are photos of it in books from the 1950s), but, yes, the Arctic was indeed thawing some, back to about where it was in the <u>fifties</u>. Even here, warming may have stopped. The Canadians recently <u>reported</u> a surprise: Arctic ice doubled in thickness in 2008. The ice pack size is recovering; it's almost back to <u>normal</u>.

**Claim:** Melting pack ice will cause Florida and/or most of the Eastern Seaboard to be <u>under</u> tens of meters of water. People will drown, etc. The snowpack in the Cascades is <u>down</u>, etc.

**Facts:** False. Check it out yourself. Put ice in a glass, fill it to the brim with water, and wait. The glass will not overflow. Melting land ice can raise water levels, but even here there is <u>nothing to worry about</u>. See <u>Climate of Extremes</u> for data about manipulated climate data and science.

**Claim:** There is a huge ice shelf in Antarctica about to fall apart, proving global warming, etc.

**Facts:** Partly true, but it certainly has nothing to do with global warming. Antarctic ice is <u>growing</u>, not shrinking. <u>The Wilkins ice shelf</u> is so large that waves and tidal stresses are <u>cracking</u> it.

**Claim:** It's not "fair" to report global cooling based on "only" ten years of data. A hundred years of data shows (minor) warming. A hundred years is "better" data than ten years.

**Facts:** False. The notion of "better" or "worse" data is psycho-babble, not science. Data is data. The ten-year record shows no increase. The hundred year record shows minor warming. The

10,000 year record shows *extreme* cooling, and the 1,000 year record shows *major* cooling. The Vikings once visited Greenland in open boats in winter and grew wine grapes in Newfoundland.

**Claim:** But there is climate change. You can't deny that.

Facts: True. There is climate change and always has been. We call it "weather."

Severe storms haven't been increasing. The American public isn't afraid of normal weather, nor should it be. A Pew Research Center <u>poll</u> released in January found global warming *last* among 20 voter concerns; it trailed issues like addressing moral decline and decreasing the influence of lobbyists. This seems quite reasonable: Global warming is a manufactured fear.

# If it's not about climate, what's going on?

he Obama Presidency has a radical agenda, one best judged by its deeds. Its dark side is just now becoming understood. Raising fears about barely perceptible Global Warming or carbon dioxide (which is an <u>unlikely choice</u> to be the poster child for warming – water vapor would be better) are covers for what is, in essence, an ideological or religious crusade.

Rich Karlgaard, a publisher at *Forbes*, has figured it out. Obama has different objectives and they are on record. Rich says the key thing is this: **Obama's Recovery Is Not Your Recovery.** 

"How the 44th President defines recovery may be far different from any definition we've come to expect. Most of us would define recovery as GDP growth, rising employment, higher incomes and a stock market going up 10% a year. Not so Mr. Obama, apparently. Each day it becomes clearer that he has a different idea of recovery.

President Obama believes America must 'recover' from its sin and addiction. According to Obama the national sin is greed, and the national addiction is to cheap energy. Google 'Obama on greed' and you get 7,570,000 hits. Read Obama's campaign book, The Audacity of Hope, and you get the secular equivalent of the Bible's Book of Revelation: 'If the prospect of melting ice caps, rising sea levels, changing weather patterns, more frequent hurricanes, more violent tornadoes, endless dust storms, decaying forests, dying coral reefs and increases in respiratory illness and insect-borne diseases--if that doesn't constitute a serious threat, I don't know what does.'"

Like all good preachers, Obama paints a vivid picture of hell. Like any true believer, he harbors no doubt. From **The Audacity of Hope**: 'Just about every scientist outside of the [Bush] White House says global warming is real, is serious, and is accelerated by the continued release of carbon dioxide.' Not true, Mr. President. The alarmist view of global warming is far from a consensus. The list of scientists who doubt your alarmist scenario grows by the month." More...

Such radical ideology (or religion) necessitates intense attacks on capitalism and energy. Obama's doing this with success. As Newt Gingrich recently <u>said</u>, commenting on Obama's 100 days, "At home, in everything from his economic policy to his <u>energy policy</u> to his just-announced science policy, President Obama has successfully moved the country from a traditional American model of entrepreneurship and private initiative to a European model of regulation and government control."

Obamanoids are committed to <u>radical</u> environmentalism even if what they are doing doesn't help, and even if this requires totalitarianism. The populist spokesperson for environmental extremism is Tom Friedman, the writer. His worldview is *Hot, Flat, and Crowded*, and generally quite dismal:

"Conservation International notes that every 20 minutes 1,200 acres of forests will be burned and cleared for development. The CO2 emissions from deforestation are greater than the emissions from the world's entire's transportation system – all the cars, trucks, planes, trains, and ships combined." (pg 148) Virtually all the 3.5% of man-generated CO2 is from forests, cows, etc.

Friedman therefore admits the trillions Obama wants to spend on energy rationing and taxes will have little or no environmental <u>impact</u>. Even if man-made CO2 was a problem (dubious), Cap and Trade wouldn't help. This is nuts. What's frightening is that Friedman (and presumably Obama) advocates totalitarianism in service of "green." One of Friedman's chapters, China for a Day, specifically endorses communism if done quickly for social good.

"As far as I am concerned, China's system of government is inferior to ours in every respect – except one. That is the ability of China's current generation of leaders – if they want – to cut through all their legacy industries, all the pleading special interests, all the bureaucratic obstacles, all the worries of a voter backlash, and simply order top-down the sweeping changes... that reflect China's national interests." (pg 372) [Interests defined by China's Politburo.]

According to Friedman, communism is good, if in a worthy cause. As was said in support of Mussolini and Hitler before the horrors of WW II, "At least the trains run on time."

Are we to suffer Carbon Communism? Will our own government be allowed to <u>destroy</u> our energy industries? If so, unlike Global Warming, I suggest here's a credible fear.

#### Carbon Communism

If Gore's assertions are false, then we must ask why the people in power are putting so much effort into spreading fear to allow radical policy. That answer is becoming clear: It's about taxes to fund massive socialism. One good book is *Blue Planet in Green Shackles*.

"Cap and Trade" is the biggest, broadest <u>tax</u> system since the Roman Empire. But there's a problem. So far, Congress isn't going along. Obama's solution is to bypass Congress.

Republicans were completely disenfranchised, cut out of the process, for the Stimulus Bill. Obama is in the process of disenfranchising all of Congress, including his own party, by using <a href="EPA">EPA</a> to <a href="Microstyte">dictate</a> massive carbon taxes by executive order. One hopes this may inspire Congressional and citizen outrage. It's already <a href="mailto:started">started</a>. Part of Carbon Communism is a <a href="war on the red states">war on the red states</a>.

## You are encouraged to copy or forward this newsletter...

The Business Innovation Newsletter is published by The Trudel Group, 1102 N. Springbrook Road, # 281, Newberg, OR 97132. Telephone 503-538-1169; email <a href="mailto:jtrudel@trudelgroup.com">mailto:jtrudel@trudelgroup.com</a> or <a href="http://www.trudelgroup.com/">http://www.trudelgroup.com/</a>. ©2009, John D. Trudel. Forwarding or quotation with attribution including contact information is encouraged.

All information is of a general nature and is not intended or presented to replace individual counsel or services. Sources of information are reliable, but accuracy cannot be guaranteed. We welcome comments and strive for objective nonpartisanship.



"Cap-and-trade can only work by raising energy prices. Consumers who are forced to pay higher prices for energy will have less money to spend on other things. While the individual companies that provide the higher-priced "green" energy may do well, the net economic effect will be (substantially) negative.

It is necessary to look at the bigger picture. Profits can be made when energy is rationed or subsidized, but only within an economy operating at lower, or even negative, growth rates. This means that over the longer term, everyone will be competing for a piece of a pie that is smaller than it would have been without energy rationing."

Václav Klaus is President of the Czech Republic, which holds the presidency of the Council of Ministers of the European Union until June 2009. He holds a PhD in Economics.

**John D. Trudel** -- Consultant and Professor Emeritus, Inventor, Engineer, Author, and Novelist.

Note: If you got this by post or forwarded, please send us an email address. To get full information and citations, you need an electronic copy with the links. Our mail lists are confidential, and you will be immediately removed upon request. THANK YOU.

The Trudel Group 1102 N. Springbrook Road, # 281 Newberg, OR 97132

Forwarding and Address Correction is Requested.