Mickelson Anastasia

From: Patrino Beth
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2015 12:35 PM
To: Mickelson Anastasia
Subject: FW: HB 3470

From: Gordon Fulks [mailto:gordonfulks@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2015 12:34 PM
To: Rep Johnson
Cc: Patrino Beth; Rep Bentz; Rep Boone; Rep Heard; Rep Helm; Rep Holvey; Rep Reardon; Rep VegaPederson; Rep Weidner
Subject: HB 3470

Representative Mark Johnson
State Capitol
Salem, Oregon

Dear Representative Johnson,

As my representative in the State legislature, I hope that you will see the utter folly of HB3470 and oppose it.

I have looked at some of the public testimony you have thus far received, and it is abominable. One person after another without any standing on scientific issues insists that this bill will somehow save Oregon's environment and climate. They very ignorantly claim that controlling carbon dioxide is the key to controlling our climate and ocean pH. Anyone with any knowledge of the science should point out that whatever Oregon does at great cost will at the very least have no effect on atmospheric carbon dioxide levels and therefore no effect on our climate or oceans, regardless of whether or not they believe that carbon dioxide is the earth's thermostat or the driver of ocean pH. We are just too insignificant a part of this planet to matter in global issues. If we move toward committing economic suicide, we will become no more than a stark example of how NOT to deal with scientific issues.

Judgements need to be made by those of us who have the education to understand this subject. I'm a PhD astrophysicist originally from the University of Chicago with no conflicts of interest. My background is very similar to my astrophysical colleague, the Great Global Warming Guru James Hansen. He and I have talked and actually agree on many things, not to include carbon dioxide. That means that there is a raging controversy in the scientific community over the CO2 thermostat issue, a controversy that should indicate to all that this issue is anything but settled. Yet the ignorant claim they have more scientific support than we do. Among those with real standing that is clearly not the case and not the way we settle things in science anyway.

We never vote on scientific theories, because science is based on logic and evidence only. A little Jewish man spectacularly proved that in 1905 when he completely overturned Classical Physics with his Theory of Relativity. Closer to home, a high school biology teacher from Seattle by the name of J. Harlen Bretz stood up against the entire geological establishment to prove the importance of Ice Age floods down the Columbia River to the geology of our region. It took him decades to prevail, but he did. Recently, two obscure

Australians (Barry Marshall and Robin Warren) were awarded the 2005 Nobel Prize in Medicine for their discovery of the real cause of peptic ulcers. The Nobel Committee specifically noted that the medical 'consensus' behaved badly and tried to block Marshall and Warren. Such bad behavior is typical of the scientific establishment when it is losing a scientific battle. That's certainly the case with 'Global Warming' too.

Those of us with sturdy scientific credentials realize that the experiment of trying to reduce atmospheric carbon dioxide by reducing the burning of fossil fuels has already been performed on a far larger scale than insignificant Oregon. During the Great Depression, **the WORLD reduced coal consumption by 30%,** not to control 'Global Warming' but as a consequence of a dramatic downward spiral in economic activity. We were not consciously trying to torpedo our economies, as the Climate Cult seems determined to do today. It was happening for reasons we did not know how to control at the time.

As PhD meteorologist Martin Hertzberg* has pointed out, it became a great climate experiment of the sort that the scientifically illiterate advocate today. What happened? Fossil fuel consumption did go down dramatically (from 1.17 Gt C in 1929 to 0.88 Gt in 1932), but atmospheric carbon dioxide continued to rise as did the Global Temperature Anomaly. The planet paid no attention to what we were doing! Some might see this as proof that atmospheric CO2 and temperature are themselves related, but that man-made CO2 has nothing to do with either. However everyone knows that correlation is not causation. There have been several instances since then when atmospheric CO2 rose but the Global Temperature Anomaly held steady or declined. The most recent two decades show this clearly. **That does prove that CO2 cannot be a significant driver of our climate**, compared with natural effects. It is hugely important to understand - and something that the profoundly ignorant never will.

Let me leave you with two thoughts from the greatest meteorologist alive today, MIT Professor Richard Lindzen:

"Future generations will wonder in bemused amazement that the early twenty-first century's developed world went into hysterical panic over a globally averaged temperature increase of a few tenths of a degree, and, on the basis of gross exaggerations of highly uncertain computer projections combined into implausible chains of inference, proceeded to contemplate a roll-back of the industrial age."

"The need to resist Hysteria is clear."

Thank you for opposing HB 3470 and all similar legislation coming from the scientifically illiterate. I am always willing to help legislators understand complex scientific issues where I have considerable expertise. I can easily provide the necessary logic and evidence to back up what I say.

Please enter this letter in the record for HB 3470

Gordon J. Fulks, PhD (Physics)
Corbett, Oregon USA

* Hertzberg is a lifelong Democrat who refuses to go along with climate hysteria. Like all responsible scientists, he puts his science first.