



## Straight Talk

by Muriel Sluyter

## Saviors of the Planet or Deceivers?

01 July, 2003

---

Greetings, Gentle Reader,

About a year ago, John Stossel interviewed schoolchildren about the environment. They were frightened, being trained as environmentalists through fear, and convinced we are destroying our planet and ourselves. Global warming would surely kill us all.

Julian Simon, economist, wrote "Hoodwinking The Nation." His facts and figures show our media repeat everything environmentalist terror mongers say, no matter how misleading. Their sky-is-falling mentality is the media's line.

Bjorn Lomborg, statistics professor at the University of Aarhus, Denmark, assigned his ten best students the task of disproving Simon's claims.

He says, "I ... read an interview with the American economist, from the University of Maryland. He maintained that much of our traditional knowledge about the environment is ... based on preconceptions and poor statistics. Our doomsday conceptions of the environment are not correct ... I am an old left-wing Greenpeace member and had ... been concerned about environmental statistics ... I teach statistics, and it should therefore be easy for me to check Simon's sources ... I had never really questioned my own belief in an ever deteriorating environment — and here was Simon, telling me to put my own beliefs under the statistical microscope."

After discovering that Simon was right, Lomborg was astonished that his fellow Danes denied the veracity of his findings. Even close friends concluded he must be wrong and the doomsday scenario correct.

Author Anna Bramwell, "Ecology in the 20th Century: A History" says, "Ecology is now a political category, like socialism or conservatism ... (It) required an ethic which saw man and animal as comparable before ecologists could extend their observations to human society. This is crucial for the political implications of ecologism."

Even the environmentalist Worldwatch Institute admits consumer costs have decreased, rather than increased: non-fuel commodities cost about 46 percent as much as in

the mid-1970s, food and fertilizer about 25 percent, metals about 50 percent, oil about 50 percent.

Global warming? The 15th to the 19th century has been called the Little Ice Age. Using tree data, corals and ice cores, called proxy data, the 19th century was proven the coldest in the last 1,000 years.

The coldest years were 1862, 1907 and 1909, making food production very difficult, yet environmentalists consider them the desirable norm and any variation therefrom cause for alarm.

The UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change statement, "the increase in temperature in the 20th century is likely to have been the largest of any century during the past 1000 years," avoids mention that it was the only period of warming in the past 1000 years.

Actual surface temperature changes since mid-19th century: 1856 to 1878 — increased 1/3 of one degree; to 1911 — decreased 4/10 ; to 1944 — increased over 8/10; to 1976 — decreased over 1/10; to 2002 — increased almost 8/10.

One panelist, John R. Christy, says the statement that thousands of IPCC scientists agreed on anything is simply untrue and misrepresents the process. He says most of the 122 authors involved — some accomplished scientists but many unknown bureaucrats — had nothing to do with much of the final report. It was edited and approved by a political body, not a scientific one.

Bottom line? America's water and air are becoming cleaner. We have vast regions of unused land. We have not run out of food or water. Our natural resources are increasing, rather than decreasing, due to good management. Only accessibility is decreasing, and that because environmental strictures deny us the use of our own abundant resources.

The facts are out there, but as the good professor learned, many people are so addicted to the environmentalist's high drama scenario called "We are destroying the earth!" that they cannot accept the truth.