

# The Rising Climate of Change

Contributed by Paul Perry  
Wed, Oct 21, 2009, 06:46 AM

Over 31,000 scientists have signed a petition to contradict what they regard as the myth of manmade global warming, according to Access To Energy, a science newsletter. In order to be eligible to sign the agreement, one has to have a degree in the physical sciences. As I understand it, psychologists and anthropologists can't sign; neither is Al Gore qualified to do so.

Conversely, a United Nations initiative to have scientists sign a petition in agreement with the manmade global warming theory was fraught with controversy. Many of the signatories turned out not to be scientists, some turned out to be uncredentialed aides (I guess they happened to be hanging around in the halls) and at least one scientist decided after reviewing newer research that he wanted his name removed and is suing to make that happen, as the U.N. decided to use his name anyway as do others.

Scientists complaining of having their government and other research grants threatened for not signing on to the most extreme manmade global warming initiatives abound. Other scientists who have publicly opposed the theory have lost their research grants. Respected French scientist Claud Allegre reports that he changed his views at a high personal cost.

President Barack Hussein Obama was in Copenhagen recently where he was cheerleading an effort by U.N. negotiators to make energy more expensive for all of us using the U.N.-endorsed catastrophic view of climate change as a pretext. All the while, he was turning a more or less deaf ear on an American general who was suggesting that we need more troops in Afghanistan.

Washington, D.C., papers are reporting tiny bit of movement on getting some troops to Afghanistan, and the president is continuing his effort to bury U.S. energy production in United Nations bureaucracy. The so-called Copenhagen Accords seek to do what the administration's Cap and Trade domestic agenda also will do: raise the price of carbon-based energy for all of us — that's anything with a carbon molecule, including coal, natural gas, gasoline and diesel — while allowing large industry to purchase off-sets that will be sold on something like a commodities market.

Eventually you may have to purchase such off-sets or credits, as well, depending on the size of your house and how much you drive. One proposal, still alive in the legislation, is that people who live in a house over 2600 square feet will have to pay a surtax to the federal government. That shouldn't go over very well at Spring Creek Crossing, West Main Street and most of Ovilla, much less with those of us who live in 30-year-old ranch-style homes that need a coat of paint.

As I said, these off-sets will be traded on an exchange. The price will vary. I bet a lot. No doubt the good folks down at Goldman Sachs are licking their chops over this little scheme. The same kind of thinking the Clinton administration used to force mortgage issuers to insure marginal housing loans that were declared marketable by the administration is being used by the Obama administration to create a false market in pollution credits. If you create a market to achieve a narrow social result, it will backfire.

The Copenhagen-based negotiations are seeking to do very similar things on an international scale. If our Senate votes to agree to a U.N. agreement on climate change, then we will be required by law to implement the scheme, including an international market in pollution credits, unless a subsequent administration withdraws before implementation. Opportunities for market manipulation abound.

Interestingly enough, while President Obama has frozen additional offshore oil and gas exploration in our country, he supported giving Brazil a loan to increase offshore oil and gas exploration there. On the one hand, we are told oil and gas consumption is bad for the climate, but our president seems OK with foreigners doing it. He is even willing to have you pay for it.

Earlier this summer, investigations of the oil futures market was threatened by a democratically controlled Congress, and

there were even a few growls in support from the administration. Such talk has all but disappeared as oil and gasoline futures have advanced and your price at the pump is starting to rise. Why? In a real market, no one could justify these prices in a global recession. The dollar hasn't fallen enough in recent months to justify current prices, in my opinion.

Is this market being manipulated in some way? Perhaps. The Left accused everyone of that when a Republican was president.

Why the silence now? Because whether the market is being manipulated or not, higher prices serve our current regime's agenda.

Higher prices make punishing conventional providers more palatable to the ignorant. At the same time, the administration is taking measures to ensure our domestic production of oil and gas drops while loaning money to a cash-rich nation to increase its oil and gas production and enrich that country.

Is Obama really interested in being America's president or the world's?

Paul D. Perry