

WHAT IS THE HURRY?

Fabricated Need to Rush

The Greens have engendered urgency in the global warming issue in the same way they have done in every other failed Green initiative. They tell us “If we don’t act now the ‘sky will fall in’.

Since we have never seen the “sky fall in” during ten similar campaigns, I don’t think it is unreasonable to ask the question “What’s the hurry?”, and hopefully receive a sensible answer. To date, no sensible answer has been given, so let us look at the benefits that can be obtained by moving slowly on this issue.

Is it Really Going to Happen?

Unlike environmentalists who present us with real problems that can be observed, measured and fixed today, the Green movement, in all their campaigns, ‘sell us’ a negative good – some disaster will happen in the distant future. They demand action now and ask us to trust them.

If we were rational, we might fall for that ‘con trick’ once – but only the irrational fall for it ten times without learning.

So, the first benefit of waiting, allows us to compare reality with the predictions being made by the Greens. If their predictions fail, we know disaster is not going to happen.

If we had waited, sometimes only a few years, in every Green campaign, we would have had strong indications that we were being conned and did not need to take any action.

So, we should wait and are likely to discover that the Greens are wrong, yet again. Their large “wolf at the door” first turns into a “small mouse”, and then a “flea at the door”.

For example, in this campaign we were told the human race would become extinct by the year 2000. We weren’t all about to die on the 31st December 1999. Waiting five years and seeing the population grow and not shrink, would give us confidence to either wait longer or declare that the prediction would fail.

Time to Check the Green Science

After asserting that “the science is settled, and all the scientists agreed” the Green movement went to a lot of trouble to stop anyone disagreeing or checking their “science” right from the beginning of this campaign.

With the Green “scientists” hiding their work behind confidentiality agreements, and refusing to release their work, it has taken years (nearly a decade) to discover some of the fraudulent science (e.g. Mann’s hockey stick graph, and Hansen’s manipulated temperature data) that are underpinning the Greens’ predictions.

It takes time for scientists to review, replicate, and then test the Green science to confirm that the science is “solid”. As soon as any science is found less than solid, more time is needed to dig deeper. It makes little sense to assume the science is good and start acting on it in the light of the Greens’ poor track record.

Time to Highlight all the Deception Tools

Most, if not all, the knowledge that a citizen learns about such issues comes from a very professional Green public relations machine and a submissive media. As we have already found on this website, this machine will not hesitate to lie, deceive and mislead the public.

It takes time for citizens to learn about all the deception tools being used to deceive them.

For instance, to engender urgency the Green machine told us that rising CO₂ concentrations were reaching a “tipping point” and would result in “runaway global warming” which, in turn, would lead to “irreversible weather” [1]. We had to act quickly.

Note all these terms were never explained or their use justified.

With significantly higher CO₂ concentrations in the past, it took time to realise that, the tipping point had already been passed, runaway global warming must have happened, and the planet already had irreversible weather – the wonderful weather we have today that apparently will never change!

Or the Greens could be wrong.

Time to Make Better Decisions

If you hurry, you can make mistakes – and some of these can be serious.

In our hurry to take action, the Greens led us by the nose to implement a “prevention strategy”. By using definitional deceit, the Greens argued that Man was responsible for 100% of the global warming and prevention was the only way to go.

It was only later that it was realised by most that Man only contributed a small amount (3-6%) of the total CO₂ produced annually. So, the bulk of the problem was not caused by Man but by nature. The small part of Man’s effect that we were trying to prevent was a very small amount of the total problem. Obviously, it would have been better to adapt to what is primarily a natural problem.

There are several advantages of following an adaption strategy. First, we are operating in the environmentalist’s real world rather than the Greens’ imaginary world. We have real problems that we can see and can fix. Unlike the Green world, we know with near certainty that the fix will work.

Adaption is cheaper in time, effort and money than prevention. Adaption also has the major advantage that if the science is falsified and the problem no longer exist, adaption

measures do not have to be implemented. In contrast, un-necessary prevention measures could have been going on for decades.

CONCLUSION

It is rarely, if ever, smart to be 'stampeded' into making decisions. To make good decisions, we need a rational and unemotional environment where we can logically apply the facts to solve our problems. Asking "What's the hurry?" might lead to such a result.

Notes.

1. **This has led to unfounded claims of "tipping points" and "irreversibility" of the climate trends, and that the danger from anthropogenic global warming is even greater than IPCC has projected. In reality, runaway global warming is an illogical concept.** The Age, Business Section, William Kininmonth July 8, 2008