

February 28, 2018

To the Legislature's Joint Committee on Carbon Reduction

Thank you for coming to Medford.

I am an environmentalist. In the year 2000, I was facilitating the Green Party meetings in Eugene, Oregon and going door to door campaigning for their candidate for the U.S. Presidency. In 2012 & 2013 I was on the Steering Committee for GMO-Free Jackson County. I am currently on the Steering Committee for Freedom to Say No to Smart Meters. I am a committed and active environmentalist.

Al Gore announced that the Vostok ice core samples showed a "correlation" between rising CO<sub>2</sub> levels and rising temperature. What he left out was the facts reported in the March 14, 2003 issue of Science Magazine, in an article written by several scientist, including paleoclimatologist Dr. Jeffrey P. Severinghaus, Ph.D.. To put his quote in context, the phrase "Termination III" refers to the ending of an ice age about 240,000 years ago from which Vostock ice core samples were taken. "The sequence of events during Termination III suggests that the CO<sub>2</sub> increase lagged Antarctic deglacial warming by  $800 \pm 200$  years."<sup>1</sup> Meaning the carbon increase occurred between 200 and 800 years after the warming started. Meaning the CO<sub>2</sub> increases could not have caused the warming to occur. In other words, Al Gore's entire premise went against the science he was pointing to. What does that say about his lack of integrity?

A prominent local environmentalist sent me a report called "Synchronous Change of Atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> and Antarctic Temperature"<sup>2</sup> written 10 years later, that purports to explain the discrepancy between Al Gore's statements and the evidence at the time. Of course, subsequent science doesn't excuse Al Gore's lack of integrity at the time, but I read it. Even this new science doesn't claim that the rise in CO<sub>2</sub> caused the rise in temperature. Instead, it claims that both the CO<sub>2</sub> rise and the temperature rise are probably caused by other unknown and complex mechanisms. "Changes in aCO<sub>2</sub> and AT were synchronous during TI within uncertainties."<sup>2</sup> and "Although the tight link between aCO<sub>2</sub> and AT suggests a major common mechanism, reviews of carbon cycle processes suggest a complex association of numerous independent mechanisms (2, 23)."<sup>2</sup> And yet, the initial unsupported story of CO<sub>2</sub> causing warming remains the same in the corporate media.

So how is it that the corporate media claims that 97% of scientists believe in man-made global warming? First, consider the source. The government and the corporate media are both notorious liars. For instance, they both lied about weapons of mass

destruction in order to get us into a war that needlessly killed hundreds of thousands of innocent people and left Iraq, the country we were supposed to be saving, in ruins. The corporate media is owned and controlled by huge multinational corporations that lie with impunity in order to boost their profits and control. When you examine the 97% figure, it's another blatant lie. The initial claim, made by Naomi Oreskes in 2004, actually says that only 25% of the published papers on climate change asserted that it was caused by humans, and the rest were inferred to be in support of that position.<sup>3</sup> The 97% lie is being pushed by corporations who stand to make Trillions of dollars off of cap and trade schemes.

Enron, the energy trading company that turned out to be a complete fraud, was a leading advocate of cap-and-trade in the climate treaty negotiations culminating in the Kyoto Protocol. "If implemented, this agreement [the Kyoto Protocol] will do more to promote Enron's business than almost any other regulatory initiative..."<sup>4</sup> In 2006, the United States Climate Action Partnership was formed to create "A Call for Action" to cut down on carbon emissions. The members of this Partnership included: Alcoa, British Petroleum of America, Duke Energy, DuPont, General Electric, Chrysler, Lehman Brothers, AIG, PG&E, the oil giant ConocoPhillips, Dow Chemical, General Motors, and Shell Oil.<sup>5</sup> That's who is pushing this so-called "environmental" agenda.

I am not against environmentalism. I am an environmentalist, and I am enraged that environmentalism is being used as a front to push a global corporate control scheme based on lies and fake news.

What's more, the proponents of human-caused climate change are demonstrably wrong.

1988: James Hansen, who headed NASA's Goddard Institute for three decades was asked by journalist and author Rob Reiss how the "greenhouse effect" would affect Manhattan within 20 years (of 1988, which was by 2008). Hanse replied: "The West Side Highway [which runs along the Hudson River] will be under water."<sup>6</sup> Which, of course it was not in 2008, and still isn't to this day.

1990: Princeton professor and lead author for the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Michael Oppenheimer, while working as the "chief scientist" for the Environmental Defense Fund, predicted that by 1995, the "greenhouse effect" would be "desolating the heartlands of North America and Eurasia with horrific drought, causing crop failures and food riots."<sup>6</sup> "By 1996", he added, the Platte River of Nebraska "would be dry"<sup>6</sup>. Of course, it's not.

2000: Senior Research Scientist David Viner, working for the Climatic Research Unit at the University of East Anglia, told the U.K. Independent that within “a few years,” snowfall would become “a very rare and exciting event” in Britain. “Children just aren’t going to know what snow is.”<sup>6</sup> However, in “a few years” it was still snowing in Britain. 19 years later on January 12, the BBC weather report was: EXTREME Arctic snow sparks PANIC in Europe after '-33C temperature plunge.’<sup>7</sup>

In 2005, the United Nations Environment Programme warned that imminent sea-level rises caused by “man-made global warming” would lead to massive population disruptions that, by 2010, would lead to 50 million “climate refugees” frantically fleeing from coastal areas, especially the Caribbean and low-lying Pacific islands.<sup>6</sup> However, by 2010, there were no “climate refugees” from those areas. In fact, population levels for the Caribbean nations grew during that period<sup>8</sup> and apparently still is.<sup>9</sup>

In 2007, 2008, and 2009: Al Gore publicly warned that the North Pole would be “ice-free” in the summer by around 2013 because of alleged “man-made global warming.” 2013 was 6 years ago. He is still wrong.

Even a lot of the believers in human-caused climate change recognize that cap and trade doesn’t help their cause. On December 22, 2009, Democracy now published an interview with James Hansen, whom they describe as “the nation’s leading climate scientist”. He said about cap and trade: “...the problem is that the emissions just go someplace else. That’s what happened after Kyoto, and that’s what would happen again... the Europeans thought they actually reduced their emissions after Kyoto, but what happened was.... the total emissions actually increased.”<sup>10</sup>

On November 5, 2009 the BBC reported that “Carbon trading could trigger a financial collapse like the sub-prime loans crisis, according to a new report from the green group Friends of the Earth.” “London is a major centre for the trade, which could reach trillions of dollars in the next few decades.” “Carbon trading is failing dismally at reducing emissions, yet allows speculators to grow rich from the climate crisis and hands politicians and industry a get-out clause for polluting business as usual.”<sup>11</sup>

Furthermore, the 25% figure mentioned earlier is not of scientists who believe in man made global warming. It’s a survey of published papers.<sup>3</sup> Who decides what papers are published?

Dr. Lennart Bengtsson, PhD in meteorology, was the head of Research and later Director at the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts in the UK. He was later the Director of the Max Planck Institute for Meteorology, and then Senior

Research Fellow with the Environmental Systems Science Centre at the University of Reading in the UK. When he submitted a scientific paper refuting the man-made global warming theory to Environmental Research Letters, they refused to publish it. Dr. Bengtsson later wrote: "I have been put under such an enormous group pressure in recent days from all over the world that has become virtually unbearable to me. If this is going to continue, I will be unable to conduct my normal work and will even start to worry about my health and safety. It is a situation that reminds me about the time of McCarthy."<sup>12</sup>

There's your consensus. It's a forced consensus of fear and bullying.

Dr. Judith Curry has PhD in geophysical sciences from the University of Chicago. Dr. Curry is an atmospheric scientist and climatologist who has researched atmospheric modeling, the polar regions and atmosphere-ocean interactions. She taught at the University of Wisconsin, Purdue University, Pennsylvania State University, the University of Colorado at Boulder, and Georgia Tech. In 2011, she published (with a collaborator) an article stressing the uncertainties involved in climate science and urging caution on her colleagues.<sup>13</sup> She also gave testimony a half dozen times between 2006 and 2015 to Senate and House subcommittees, expressing in several of them her concerns about the politicization of the usual scientific process in the area of climate change. In 2017, under a torrent of criticism from her colleagues and negative stories in the media, she was forced to take early retirement from her position as Professor in the School of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences at Georgia Tech, a position she had held for 15 years (during 11 of those years, she had been Chair of the School).<sup>14</sup>

There's your so-called consensus. It's a forced consensus of fear and bullying.

Professor at the Department of Physics at Princeton University and Former Director of Energy Research at the Department of Energy said: "I have spent a long research career studying physics that is closely related to the greenhouse effect." "I am convinced that the current alarm over carbon dioxide is mistaken...Fears about man-made global warming are unwarranted and are not based on good science." Dr. Happer views climate change as a predominately natural process. "The earth's climate is changing now, as it always has. There is no evidence that the changes differ in any qualitative way from those of the past." In 1993, he testified before Congress that the scientific data didn't support widespread fears about the dangers of global warming. That caused then-Vice President Al Gore to fire him. "I was told that science was not going to intrude on public policy".<sup>15</sup>

Despite the onslaught of bullying tactics by the corporate media and corrupt government officials, over 31,000 scientists signed the Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine Petition Project stating "there is no convincing scientific evidence that human release of carbon dioxide will, in the foreseeable future, cause catastrophic heating of the Earth's atmosphere".<sup>16</sup>

These courageous scientists have been dismissed as tools of big oil, but the truth is, big oil is heavily funding this so-called environmental movement, because, they started it.

Oil man Maurice Strong, C.E.O. of Petro-Canada,<sup>17</sup> also funded by Laurance Rockefeller and later a trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation<sup>18</sup>, was the first executive director of the United Nations Environment Programme. Strong commissioned Barbara Ward and Rockefeller employee Rene Dubos<sup>19</sup> to write "Only One Earth," a foundational text in the sustainable development.<sup>17</sup> In 1987, oil man Strong helped to organize the 4th World Wilderness Congress, in Denver, Colorado (along with mega-banker Edmond de Rothschild<sup>20</sup>) which led to the creation of "Wilderness Areas". The Rockefeller Foundation funded the 1972 Stockholm summit<sup>21</sup> which led to the first governmentally-administered environmental action plans in Europe and the creation of the UN Environment Programme (UNEP). The oil man Maurice Strong also organized the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro,<sup>17</sup> with the public support of oil man and Republican U.S. President, George H. W. Bush<sup>22</sup>. At the Earth Summit, Edmond de Rothschild got his "Global Environment Facility" (GEF). The GEF loans money to poor countries, with the country's mineral rich "wilderness areas" as collateral. When a country cannot repay loans to the GEF it must give up a piece of its territory to the Rothschild banks (GEF, IMF, World Bank).<sup>23</sup> The Earth Summit also gave rise to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Much of the funding for the big mainstream "environmental" groups still comes from oil companies and other multi-national corporations<sup>24</sup>, much of it hidden through nonprofit foundations.<sup>25</sup>

So why would even 25% of scientists believe in human-caused global warming? Because it pays. That's what the grant money is being given for. See: The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, ARTICLE 1, DEFINITIONS, 2. "Climate change" means a change of climate which is attributed directly or indirectly to human activity..."<sup>26</sup> So, if a scientist wants money to study "Climate Change", they will be given money to study human activity, by definition. The effects of the sun cycles on the climate doesn't fit the definition. Remember the "science" that showed that smoking is safe?

In an article called "Empirical evidence that humans are causing global warming"<sup>27</sup> it says that one proof of human-caused global warming is the fact that less heat is

radiating out from the planet than is arriving from the Sun. They don't cite any source for this claim, but, even their own graph kind of gives away the folly of their argument. It purports to show the increase in total heat content since 1960. It shows the heat content of the oceans rising drastically higher than the heat content of the atmosphere. Everyone knows there are underwater volcanoes. No one knows how many there are, because they are still being discovered.<sup>28</sup> Obviously, those heat the ocean. The argument I found against the fact that this heat can account for heating the ocean is in an article called "On Deep Sea Volcanoes and Ocean Warming"<sup>29</sup> where it says: "you would expect in this situation that ocean water would warm from the bottom (near the volcanoes) upwards, but it is actually the surface waters that are warming, not the deep ocean." What he means by "near the volcanoes" is not quantified. Obviously, the water above an underwater volcano would be heated. Heat rises. Once the heated water reaches the surface, the heat would tend to spread out laterally on the surface of the ocean and escape into the atmosphere. This would also contribute to a rise in water vapor in the atmosphere, which is widely acknowledged by scientists to be the most abundant of the "greenhouse gasses".

The Daily Mail reported that "Global warming stopped 16 years ago, reveals Met Office report quietly released."<sup>30</sup> The Met Office is the U.K.'s national weather service. The Met Office responded to the report, not by disputing the data that the Daily Mail reported, but by saying: "At the core of the debate are natural fluctuations in climate and the role they play in climate change. Natural patterns — such as cycles in ocean surface temperatures — can play out over multiple decades, augmenting or counteracting the effects of man-made changes." "Over the last 140 years global [sea] surface temperatures have risen by about 0.8 degrees C."<sup>31</sup>

140 years before 2012 was 1872. How does the Met Office know what the global [sea] surface temperatures were in 1872? Even today, "We find that there are large geographic regions that are frequently not sampled by the present drifting buoy network."<sup>32</sup> And the Met Office has the audacity to claim they knew the global sea surface temperatures in 1872 within a variance of 0.8 degrees C, while, today "Comparisons between drifting buoy SSTs suggest an error of - 0.4°C for nearly coincident buoy SSTs." and "A basic problem in evaluating the accuracy of in situ SST data used for satellite reference values is the lack of an independent measure of SST to act as a reference."<sup>32</sup>

The Met Office continued: "within this record there have been several periods lasting a decade or more during which temperatures have risen very slowly or cooled. The current period of reduced warming is not unprecedented and 15 year long periods are not unusual."<sup>31</sup> But they don't say why that is. They just refer to it vaguely as "natural

patterns”. If the climate can cool for 15 years for unknown reasons this time, why can’t it cool for unknown reasons for 30 years the next time?

One of the most common pieces of evidence you hear for global warming is that the glaciers are melting. However: “NASA Study: Mass Gains of Antarctic Ice Sheet Greater than Losses.” “A new NASA study says that an increase in Antarctic snow accumulation that began 10,000 years ago is currently adding enough ice to the continent to outweigh the increased losses from its thinning glaciers.” “The good news is that Antarctica is not currently contributing to sea level rise, but is taking 0.23 millimeters per year away.”<sup>33</sup> That is, it’s contributing to a 0.23 millimeter drop in sea level.

And that’s just the tip of the iceberg; for an amazingly long well-documented list of glaciers that are growing world wide, go to [https://iceagenow.com/List\\_of\\_Expanding\\_Glaciers.htm](https://iceagenow.com/List_of_Expanding_Glaciers.htm)

Why isn’t the corporate news splashing this news all across the headlines? Could it be they’re not interested in science, but in pushing an agenda that their corporate bosses will profit from, just like with GMOs and smart meters?

One of the most ridiculous claims you hear is that the ice is melting so fast that polar bears are drowning. Polar bears are excellent swimmers. To suggest that when a polar bear leaves an ice sheet to go out swimming in the ocean, that that ice sheet could melt back at a rate faster than the polar bear could swim to get back to it and therefore drown in trying, is so absurd it’s embarrassing. And yet, this is what the corporate media puts out.

“In the 1971 essay, ‘Overpopulation and the Potential for Ecocide,’ Dr. Holdren and his co-author, the ecologist Paul Ehrlich, warned of a coming ice age.”<sup>34</sup> (emphasis added) In 2015, as Obama’s Science Advisor, the same John Holdren said “The world needs ultimately to completely decarbonize,” to avoid global warming.<sup>35</sup>

Many of the human-caused climate predictions are made by computer models. As you know, computer models are created based on what is put into them. Therefore, even the best-intentioned scientists cannot duplicate the complex system of Earth’s climate in a computer model. In the hands of not so well-intentioned scientists, such computer models are worse than worthless.

At the February 23, 2018 Oregon Legislature’s Joint Committee on Carbon Reduction meeting in Medford, Oregon, many people repeated the corporate media’s claim that the increase in local wildfires were caused by global warming. However, forests have

been thriving around the world for hundreds of millions of years in temperatures much greater than we experience here in the Northwest today without burning up. I used to be in favor of “wilderness areas”, and I still am if they are truly old growth forests that are resistant to catastrophic wildfires due to their lack of highly flammable undergrowth. But what’s happening is that previously managed forests are just being left unmanaged in a way that has produced an alarming amount of highly flammable undergrowth. Add to this the closing of roads (roadless areas) which limits firefighter’s access to these areas and it’s a recipe for disaster. (If you go ahead with the planned destruction of our reservoirs, that would make fighting these fires even more impossible, because that’s where the helicopter water drops come from). To make matters worse, the Forest Service adopted a “Let it Burn” in the 1990s that allowed naturally occurring forest fires (those caused by lightning) to just burn without any effort to suppress them.<sup>36</sup> The theory was that because this was “natural” it must be good. Again, that makes sense for old growth forests, but it has proved to be catastrophic for the formerly managed forests that were just abandoned. Why has the corporate media been so quiet about this? For an extensive report on this issue see: <https://reason.org/policy-brief/forest-fires-management-reform/>

The Earth’s climate is a complex and dynamic system that is constantly in flux, and has been for billions of years, often dramatically so. Greenhouse owners routinely pump high levels of CO<sub>2</sub> into their greenhouses because plants thrive on it. More CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere would be a great benefit to all plants and therefore to the forests and to agriculture around the world. Climatologists on both sides of this issue agree that a warming climate generally increases the moisture in the atmosphere. “Warmer Air Means More Evaporation and Precipitation”<sup>37</sup> That would be another benefit for forests and for agriculture in general. There is nothing about CO<sub>2</sub> itself is harmful to people or the environment. Historically, colder climates have been much more disastrous for humans and the environment than warmer climates have been. The past threats of catastrophe within 10 years that were made 20 and 30 years ago were all false, and I see no better evidence to back up the corporately-funded rehash of those same predictions now.

The golden rule still applies: He who has the gold makes the rules. He who pays the piper calls the tune. Of course, I don’t have to tell you that, because you work in the State Legislature and you see it every day. What I’m saying is, a lot of people know this. You don’t have to be a climatologist to know that our climate has always been changing. You don’t have to be a geologist to see that our coastal cities are not flooding. You don’t have to be a biologist to know that CO<sub>2</sub> is essential to plant life and therefore good for the planet. You don’t have to be an economist to know that the multinational corporations own the media and corrupts government officials. You don’t have to be an



expert to see that the predictions of doom have all been wrong. We see that our lives are being threatened by liars and bullies. Don't work for the enemy of People. Don't submit. Be courageous. Search out the truth and speak it clearly. Protect the People of Oregon from this money-grabbing control scam.

Thank You,

Eli Dumitru  
Medford, Oregon

1. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/10855143\\_Timing\\_of\\_Atmospheric\\_CO2\\_and\\_Antarctic\\_Temperature\\_Changes\\_Across\\_Termination\\_III](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/10855143_Timing_of_Atmospheric_CO2_and_Antarctic_Temperature_Changes_Across_Termination_III)
2. Temperature During the Last Deglacial Warming Synchronous Change of Atmospheric CO2 and Antarctic, *Science* 339, 1060 (2013); F. Parrenin et al.  
DOI: 10.1126/science.1226368 ;  
<http://science.sciencemag.org/content/339/6123/1060.full> (Attached)
3. The Scientific Consensus on Climate Change, By Naomi Oreskes, Pg. 73  
<https://www.lpl.arizona.edu/sites/default/files/resources/globalwarming/oreskes-chapter-4.pdf>
4. <http://www.globalwarming.org/2009/08/20/policy-peril-segment-9-big-business/>
5. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/U.S.\\_Climate\\_Action\\_Partnership#USCAP\\_members](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/U.S._Climate_Action_Partnership#USCAP_members)
6. <http://ethanallen.org/5-15-15/>
7. <https://inforeport.co/bbc-weather-extreme-arctic-snow-sparks-panic-in-europe-after-33c-temperature-plunge-express-co-uk/>
8. [ufdcimages.uflib.ufl.edu/CA/00/40/03/00/00001/PDF.pdf](http://ufdcimages.uflib.ufl.edu/CA/00/40/03/00/00001/PDF.pdf)
9. <https://data.worldbank.org/region/latin-america-and-caribbean>
10. [https://www.democracynow.org/2009/12/22/leading\\_climate\\_scientist\\_james\\_hansen\\_on](https://www.democracynow.org/2009/12/22/leading_climate_scientist_james_hansen_on)
11. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/mobile/science/nature/8343489.stm>
12. Global Warming Policy Foundation (GWPF), "[Lennart Bengtsson resigns: GWPF voices shock and concern at the extent of intolerance within the climate science community](#)" (GWPF website, Press Releases, May 14, 2014).
13. J.A. Curry and P.J. Webster, "[Climate science and the uncertainty monster,](#)" *Bulletin of the Meteorological Society*, 2011, 175: 1667 — 1682.
14. <https://thebestschools.org/features/top-climate-change-scientists/>

15. <https://www.epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/press-releases-all?ID=5ef55aa3-802a-23ad-4ce4-89c4f49995d2>
16. <http://www.petitionproject.org/>
17. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maurice\\_Strong](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maurice_Strong)
18. [http://www.citizenreviewonline.org/august\\_2002/maurice\\_strong.htm](http://www.citizenreviewonline.org/august_2002/maurice_strong.htm)
19. <https://www.nytimes.com/1982/02/21/obituaries/rene-dubos-scientist-and-writer-dead.html>
20. <https://www.worldwildlife.org/press-releases/in-memoriam-godfrey-a-rockefeller>
21. [https://www.bibliotecapleyades.net/sociopolitica/sociopol\\_globalelite293b.htm](https://www.bibliotecapleyades.net/sociopolitica/sociopol_globalelite293b.htm)
22. <https://www.edf.org/blog/2018/12/04/george-h-w-bush-environmental-hero-he-exemplified-real-art-deal>
23. <https://centurean2.wordpress.com/2010/02/12/how-edmund-de-rothschild-managed-to-let-179-governments-pay-him-for-grasping-up-to-30-of-the-earth/>
24. <https://nofrackingconsensus.com/2012/02/17/big-oil-money-for-me-but-not-for-thee/>
25. <https://www.activistfacts.com/organizations/194-sierra-club/>
26. [http://unfccc.int/cop4/conv/conv\\_003.htm](http://unfccc.int/cop4/conv/conv_003.htm)
27. <https://www.skepticalscience.com/empirical-evidence-for-global-warming.htm>
28. <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/science/scientists-found-91-volcanoes-under-antarctica>
29. <http://volcano.oregonstate.edu/deep-sea-volcanoes-and-ocean-warming-reprint>
30. <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-2217286/Global-warming-stopped-16-years-ago-reveals-Met-Office-report-quietly-released--chart-prove-it.html>
31. [http://www.nbcnews.com/id/49432917/ns/technology\\_and\\_science-science/t/did-global-warming-really-stop/#.XHhITaB7lv4](http://www.nbcnews.com/id/49432917/ns/technology_and_science-science/t/did-global-warming-really-stop/#.XHhITaB7lv4)
32. Download the PDF:  
[https://web.archive.org/web/20110721051024/http://ecco2.jpl.nasa.gov/data2/data/sst/Liming/LLi\\_output/References/SST\\_IR\\_insitu\\_a.pdf](https://web.archive.org/web/20110721051024/http://ecco2.jpl.nasa.gov/data2/data/sst/Liming/LLi_output/References/SST_IR_insitu_a.pdf)
33. <https://www.nasa.gov/feature/goddard/nasa-study-mass-gains-of-antarctic-ice-sheet-greater-than-losses>
34. <https://tierneylab.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/09/29/dr-holdrens-ice-age-tidal-wave/?apage=2>
35. <https://news.nationalgeographic.com/2015/12/151207-climate-change-holdren-white-house-science-paris/>
36. <https://www.prlog.org/12663776-us-forest-service-new-policy-is-let-it-burn.html>
37. <https://www.climatecentral.org/gallery/graphics/warmer-air-means-more-evaporation-and-precipitation>

