

Testimony regarding SB844
Request my testimony to be made a part of the Public Record

Date: April 15, 2013, prior to 12 noon deadline

From: Cynthia P. Weiss, M.A.T. I am a scientist, environmentalist, and teller of truth.

Springfield, OR 97478

Re: SB844 **VOTE NO**

I respectfully request that you vote “NO” on SB844 for the following reasons:

1. There is no such thing as anthropogenic global warming. Here is some evidence, not speculation, or myth. New data from NOAA (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration) part of our Federal Government, (see references at the end of my testimony)) shows that while carbon dioxide emissions increased in 2012, that global temperatures DID NOT RISE. There is no causal effect. The activists in global warming conjecture are having a very difficult time explaining this to their followers. THE DATA DOES NOT SUPPORT THEIR HYPOTHESIS.

According to James Taylor at Forbes.com, “Regardless of the future pace of ongoing reductions in U.S. carbon dioxide emissions, global carbon dioxide emissions will continue to rise. Even if the United States committed economic suicide by imposing all or most of the carbon dioxide restrictions advocated by global warming activists, the ensuing U.S. carbon dioxide reductions would amount to merely a drop in the bucket compared to the flood of emissions increases by the world as a whole and by developing nations such as China and India in particular.

Fortunately, as the new NOAA data show, and as global warming ‘skeptics’ have observed all along, rising carbon dioxide emissions are having only a modest impact on global temperatures and are not creating a global warming crisis.”

2. Between 1995 and 2012, carbon dioxide emissions rose by 10 percent, but global temperatures remained at 1995 levels. U.S. carbon emissions DECREASED by 10 percent over the last decade, so any warming can be attributed to increased carbon emissions in countries such as India and China, who have expanded their industries and their carbon dioxide emissions. Since we have one earth with one atmosphere, then **even if** there were such a thing as anthropogenic global warming, then without the two largest producers of carbon dioxide producers reducing their emissions, any attempts by us in Oregon to “create a smaller carbon footprint” would not have any effect on global emissions.

3. The “scientific research “that supposedly shows global warming used flawed model; the data was tampered with by the scientists; and they “fudged” the data and changed the models to try and make it look like there was global warming since the industrial age began. Google “Climategate” and read about the emails which were made public showing the climatologists at the Climatic Research Unit at the University of East Anglia admitted to each other about changing the data to get the results they wanted. In my opinion, they did it for greed, in order to continue to get research grants and to make a case for their cognitive biases. Please note: I am a scientist and educator who has done scientific research. For those of you not familiar with the scientific method or those of you who may have forgotten, let me remind you that once a question is asked, such as, “Is there global warming?” one must then set up an experiment to collect data. If the data DOES NOT support your hypothesis or question, then you have proven the REVERSE, or NULL HYPOTHESIS. The scientists wanted to promote the concept of global warming, because they believe it exists. When the data did not support this, they changed the model they used to interpret it, and CHANGED DATA to support their position. Scientists are supposed to be IMPARTIAL. If one has a belief and one sets up an experiment to guarantee the results one wants, which does not follow the scientific process, then it is not based on fact, nor science. The scientists quoted by the United Nations, our EPA, and AL Gore are mostly from one university, the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) at the University of East Anglia. Their emails show they intentionally falsified their results and felt justified in doing so. The emails expose the fraud.

This caused much controversy, but after reading the emails myself, my analysis is that they purposefully changed the data and interpretation. Agreed, there is a large segment of the population who believes in the propaganda used to support the hypothesis of global warming caused by humankind, but majority of OPINION is not worth anything. An example, of majority being in the wrong, would be the issue of slavery. Just because the majority of southerners in the 1700s believed slavery was acceptable, does not make it so. Just because a large group of people have an opinion on global warming does not make it so.

4. Before embarking on scientific research, one of the first steps is REVIEW OF LITERATURE, which means the researcher, in this case, climatologist or other scientist researching global warming, checks all the published research to find out what has been proven or disproven that relates to the question or hypothesis before the final hypothesis is chosen. In all scientific research, a list of all references to the subject to be researched, are listed as part of the research paper. Let's say that SCIENTIST A does FAULTY research, but it is published anyway. Then when SCIENTIST B wants to research GLOBAL WARMING, he or she would then Quote SCIENTIST A's untrue data or analysis thereof. So now we have 2 scientists who are quoting the wrong "facts". Then SCIENTIST C uses the research of A and B, publishes, and now we have 3 supposed scientific studies who quote each other's incorrect data or conclusions. ONCE FAULTY RESEARCH IS PUBLISHED, there is no way to put it all back to the truth, because each successive scientist who wants to believe in global warming will then keep quoting each other to "show" that their research is backed up by all this other research. THINK OF THE CHILD'S game, "TELEPHONE" where a circle of children start with a sentence, whisper it to the next person. By the time it gets back to the original person, the message has been changed and it is not even recognizable. This same thing has been happening in the GLOBAL research arena. The original data and interpretation was flawed to begin, and now, decades later, the truth is almost unrecognizable.

5. For each scientific study one can quote in defense of the concept of mankind causing global warming, I can quote at least an equal number of studies that proves that mankind is not the cause. The media for decades had pounded into the public that, "Global warming has been

proven to be true. They claim that the vast number of scientists have PROVEN this. There has been NO PROOF. One must be able to analyze the data correctly. Most people cannot do this without cognitive bias. We have a tendency to “find” what we believe. The media helps to perpetuate what I can only term as fraud, intentional misleading of the public. They give us no credit for actually having a working cerebral cortex. As Cassius said in defense of killing Julius Caesar, “I would not have been a wolf, had they not been sheep.”

6. Carbon credits- Now this is completely ridiculous. There is no such thing. This is anthropogenic STUPIDITY. If one were to accept that there is such a thing in reality as a “carbon credit”, which I know to be unadulterated garbage, then what makes anyone think that BUYING carbon credits will change the supposed “carbon footprint” (yet another anthropogenic case of stupidity) by throwing money at it. THIS JUST MAKES THE PEOPLE LIKE AL GORE AND ALL HIS SUPPORTERS who are PROFITING from this hoax much, much richer. I never trust someone’s “evidence” who has a clear and obvious CONFLICT OF INTEREST. As Al Gore goes to our children’s schools and produces videos, and TED talks, etc, he and his friends are raking in BILLIONS of dollars. Not to mention the hypocrisy of Al Gore who has one of the largest “carbon footprints” with his extravagant lifestyle. “Do as I say, not as I do.”

7. Have any of you thought about the O₂ Cycle or the Carbon Cycle since your grade school days? Just because the EPA says that carbon is a harmful substance, does not make it so. We need carbon dioxide to have vegetation. Remember, the plants create O₂ out of CO₂. Let’s plant more trees and foliage. Let’s not pass a bill that puts the BURDEN OF HIGHER ENERGY PRICES FOR OREGONIANS! We are burdened enough with all the regulations and taxes which create higher energy costs to us. It is a fact that when CO₂ levels DECREASE, that there is less vegetation to eat.

8. Humans are carbon-based creatures. To carry the “decrease the carbon footprint to its extreme, it would mean that we have to get rid of all humans. That would really decrease the carbon footprint of humans.

9. SB844 wants there to be a reduction in greenhouse gas production. It does not limit it to carbon. Do we include methane? Then we have to get rid of all the animals, too. Being a biologist, and a person who is an omnivore, I happen to want farmers to be able to grow vegetables and raise animals so I can EAT them.

10. Climate is most affected by natural events, over which humans do not have control. Let's face it, mother nature or God, or natural history cause the bulk of climate changes. We have only tracked climate changes since 1959. The earth has cooled and heated many times before and after there were humans; and before and after the industrial revolution. One of the hottest periods on earth was during the middle ages, before we had industrial production of carbon dioxide. Also, for those of you living near Mt. Saint Helens when it erupted, think how much that affected Oregon and surrounding states, and eventually, all over the globe. Think of solar flares, meteor strikes, and earthquakes or seaquakes, to name a few. Did the dinosaurs go extinct because they had too big of a carbon footprint? LOL For what kind of gas emissions were they responsible?

In conclusion, SB844 is not based on scientific evidence, and it will cost Oregonians more jobs and higher energy costs. Plus it will perpetuate faulty "data", faulty "evidence", and will perpetuate us trying to buy "special dispensation" for using the natural resources that God put on this earth. Should Americans and especially Oregonians pay for emissions caused by all the other countries? Are we responsible because we, as Americans wear collective guilt on our sleeves, like Hester Prynne wore a scarlet letter on her chest? (Literary reference, not meant to hurt anyone. In today's culture, Hester Prynne might boast of her exploits on Facebook, and might recount her facile hookups with strangers.) Culture changes, issues change, but science is science. It is black and white. There are absolutes in this world... not too many, but enough exist to make me believe in right and wrong.) It would be wrong to vote for SB844.

PLEASE VOTE NO, and prove to me that you are worth voting for next time.

References:

1. <http://www.forbes.com/sites/jamestaylor/2013/03/06/as-carbon-dioxide-levels-continue-to-rise-global-temperatures-are-not-following-suit/>

2. "NOAA data show atmospheric carbon dioxide levels rose 2.67 parts per million in 2012, to 395 ppm. The jump was the second highest since 1959, when scientists began measuring atmospheric carbon dioxide levels."

<http://www.noaa.gov>

3. Dr. Art Robinson's book, *Common Sense, 2012, debunks human caused global warming*

Sincerely,

Cynthia P. Weiss M.A.T.