

Al Gore in Singapore

I wish I could afford to live at 125 Third Street. Located in the financial and theatre districts of San Francisco, this 42-story residence has been called “the finest condominium in the country.” With dedicated 24-hour concierge, butler and security services, and breathtaking interiors designed by the [Yabu Pushelberg Group](#), the [St. Regis Tower](#) includes a vista of the San Francisco bay that is unrivaled. The penthouse recently sold for \$70 million, and in my opinion is worth every cent. That’s because, [like Al Gore](#), I am not at all concerned about my “carbon footprint.”

During 2005, while filming the propaganda film ‘An Inconvenient Truth,’ Gore also purchased his lavish 125 Third Street condominium. But the lobby only is about 4 feet above the San Francisco bay water line. In his film, which a [British high court declared as “political”](#) (i.e. not scientific), Gore depicts cities like San Francisco deluged due to melting global ice sheets, allegedly caused by human carbon dioxide emissions.

Perhaps Gore’s intention is to save his multi-million dollar condo, not by reducing his carbon footprint but by virtue of common people reducing theirs, convinced to do so by his Nobel Prize? But is he convinced the condo can be saved by converting only the faithful? Apparently not. At the [June 2009 Cornell University ‘Global Forum on Sustainable Enterprise’](#) Gore proclaimed, “If the U.S. and every wealthy country cut greenhouse gas emissions to zero, and there was no change in the developing world, the crisis would still overtake us.” Therefore Gore also needs to convince developing world peoples, who are living in abject poverty, to become faithful.

The [InterPacific Bar Association \(IPBA\)](#) has scheduled Gore to their yearly conference in Singapore in May 2010. To put this IPBA sermon in perspective, listen to Gore at the April 2009 House Energy Subcommittee responding to Tennessee Congresswoman Marsha Blackburn’s question about his so-called green investments. [Gore retorts](#), “If you believe that the reason that I have been working on this issue for thirty years is because of greed, then you don’t know me!” I believe him. I also believe IPBA sources who explain that Gore required an honorarium of \$300,000.00, not including expenses and incidentals!

Since the IPBA is comprised of lawyers and judges, I proposed that the scales of justice be balanced by a debate speaker. I contacted leading climate experts and scientists to establish their availability for the Singapore gala. I promised to forward their names to the [conference organizers](#) on strict condition that they agree to an honorarium of zero! Eleven of twelve agreed to debate Gore in May 2010 for expenses only. From a [former lead author of the IPCC science report](#), to a world renowned [Lord of Parliament](#), the list is formidable. [Assuming Gore will forgo his well-known habit of shirking honest debate](#), we are awaiting Singapore’s selection from my list. But for expenses-only, and in the context of their profession, how can the IPBA deny that both cases be heard, especially in behalf the poor peoples of Asia?

In the meantime both Al Gore and I are predicting that 125 Third Street will be above water, at least through May 2010.