

DDM Consulting
22357 Columbia Street
Dearborn, MI 48124-3431
313-277-5095
pvs6@cornell.edu

30 October 2017

VIA FEDEX Ground [1283181 – 00005081](#)

President Donald J. Trump
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Ave NW
Washington, DC 20500
202-456-1111

- Subject 1: Withdrawal from the Paris Climate Accord**
Subject 2: My Simple Question Remains Officially Unanswered
Subject 3: Upcoming Tyrannical Censorship of Climate Science Instigated by NGOs
Subject 4: Upcoming Execution of Global ‘Intellectual Genocide’
Subject 5: True Sustainability : Electrification of the Ground Transportation Fleet

Dear Mr. President:

Thank you for keeping your promise to withdraw the United States from the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), as re-specified by the Paris Climate Accord. You have made a correct, integrated choice.

As you will see in the letter that follows, although integrity should not be an issue, a lack of such remains central to these subjects, For perspective, I excerpted a recent Washington Post (WP) article:

“The Arctic Ocean is warming up, icebergs are growing scarcer and in some places the seals are finding the water too hot, according to a report to the Commerce Department yesterday from Consul Ifft, at Bergen, Norway.

Reports from fishermen, seal hunters and explorers, he declared, all point to a radical change in climate conditions and hitherto unheard-of temperatures in the Arctic zone. Exploration expeditions report that scarcely any ice has been met with as far north as 81 degrees 29 minutes. Soundings to a depth of 3,100 meters showed the gulf stream still very warm.

Great masses of ice have been replaced by moraines of earth and stones, the report continued, while at many points well known glaciers have entirely disappeared. Very few seals and no white fish are found in the eastern Arctic, while vast shoals of herring and smelts, which have never before ventured so far north, are being encountered in the old seal fishing grounds.”

The basis of this WP article was a report forwarded to the US Department of State . . . please note, neither the original report nor the WP article mentions the term ‘carbon dioxide.’

But let me apologize . . . my use of ‘recent’ is misleading . . . as is most we hear from the Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) news media, especially when they are regurgitating rants from climate scientists and their comrades in Big Academia . . . the latter an alleged beacon of integrity.

The next page is the original source for the above WP article. It was entitled, The Changing Artic . . . ***but it is from the Monthly Weather Review of . . . November 1922 !***

NOVEMBER, 1922. MONTHLY WEATHER REVIEW.

THE CHANGING ARCTIC.

By GEORGE NICOLAS IFFT.

[Under date of October 10, 1922, the American consul at Bergen, Norway, submitted the following report to the State Department, Washington, D. C.]

The Arctic seems to be warming up. Reports from fishermen, seal hunters, and explorers who sail the seas about Spitzbergen and the eastern Arctic, all point to a radical change in climatic conditions, and hitherto unheard-of high temperatures in that part of the earth's surface.

In August, 1922, the Norwegian Department of Commerce sent an expedition to Spitzbergen and Bear Island under the leadership of Dr. Adolf Hoel, lecturer on geology at the University of Christiania. Its purpose was to survey and chart the lands adjacent to the Norwegian mines on those islands, take soundings of the adjacent waters, and make other oceanographic investigations.

Dr. Hoel, who has just returned, reports the location of hitherto unknown coal deposits on the eastern shores of Advent Bay—deposits of vast extent and superior quality. This is regarded as of first importance, as so far most of the coal mined by the Norwegian companies on those islands has not been of the best quality.

* R. L. Holmes: Quart. Journ. Royal Meteorol. Soc., January, 1905.

The oceanographic observations have, however, been even more interesting. Ice conditions were exceptional. In fact, so little ice has never before been noted. The expedition all but established a record, sailing as far north as 81° 29' in ice-free water. This is the farthest north ever reached with modern oceanographic apparatus.

The character of the waters of the great polar basin has heretofore been practically unknown. Dr. Hoel reports that he made a section of the Gulf Stream at 81° north latitude and took soundings to a depth of 3,100 meters. These show the Gulf Stream very warm, and it could be traced as a surface current till beyond the 81st parallel. The warmth of the waters makes it probable that the favorable ice conditions will continue for some time.

Later a section was taken of the Gulf Stream off Bear Island and off the Isfjord, as well as a section of the cold current that comes down along the west coast of Spitzbergen off the south cape.

In connection with Dr. Hoel's report, it is of interest to note the unusually warm summer in Arctic Norway and the observations of Capt. Martin Ingebrigtsen, who has sailed the eastern Arctic for 54 years past. He says that he first noted warmer conditions in 1918, that since that time it has steadily gotten warmer, and that to-day the Arctic of that region is not recognizable as the same region of 1868 to 1917.

Many old landmarks are so changed as to be unrecognizable. Where formerly great masses of ice were found, there are now often moraines, accumulations of earth and stones. At many points where glaciers formerly extended far into the sea they have entirely disappeared.

The change in temperature, says Captain Ingebrigtsen, has also brought about great change in the flora and fauna of the Arctic. This summer he sought for white fish in Spitzbergen waters. Formerly great shoals of them were found there. This year he saw none, although he visited all the old fishing grounds.

There were few seal in Spitzbergen waters this year, the catch being far under the average. This, however, did not surprise the captain. He pointed out that formerly the waters about Spitzbergen held an even summer temperature of about 3° Celsius; this year recorded temperatures up to 15°, and last winter the ocean did not freeze over even on the north coast of Spitzbergen.

With the disappearance of white fish and seal has come other life in these waters. This year herring in great shoals were found along the west coast of Spitzbergen, all the way from the fry to the veritable great herring. Shoals of smelt were also met with.

The archaic definition of imbroglia is *“a confused heap”* . . . an accurate descriptor of the current state of climate science. This imbroglia relates not only to the NGO news media, and to the Paris Accord, but to their condominium with Big Academia.

Regarding the latter, we quote the **“Father of Anthropogenic Global Warming”** (AGW), Stanford University Professor Stephen Schneider :



“ On the one hand, as scientists we are ethically bound to the scientific method. On the other hand, we are not just scientists but human beings as well.

*To do that we need to get some broad based support, to capture the public’s imagination. That, of course, means getting loads of media coverage. So we have to offer up scary scenarios, make simplified, dramatic statements, **and make little mention of any doubts we might have.***


Each of us has to decide what the right balance is between being effective and being honest.”

But the open renunciation of (the strict requirements for) integrity by Big Academia is far more subtle, and esoteric, than that demonstrated by Professor Schneider . . . the esoterica involves a simple question that climate scientists refuse to answer.

Subject 2: My ‘Simple Question’ Remains Officially Unanswered

Note that I have copied the Ivy League, including my alma mater Cornell University. Not millions, but billions of taxpayer dollars pour into these institutions under the pretense of climate change research; now in response to their latest fund-raising term “sustainability.”

The Cornell home page (<http://www.cornell.edu/>) **always** emphasizes the following section:



The fundamental underpinning of the Cornell Center for Sustainability involves carbon dioxide. Big Academia in-general forcefully declares “*what we know about climate change.*” **Their central thesis:**

Atmospheric carbon dioxide is **positively correlated** to global temperatures and, most emphatically, the CO₂ that is attributable to human activity is the primary cause of global warming; now re-marketed as “climate change.”

Whether visiting the Center for Sustainability, or Al Gore’s mansions, or the UNFCCC in Paris, the above declaration is deafening. They also claim that this rhetoric enjoys “*the consensus of 97 per cent of scientists worldwide.*” The latter is not a mistake, it’s a lie.

Upon withdrawal from the Paris Accord, California Governor Jerry “sanctuary state” Brown reiterated the standard carbon rant:

*“Well immediate reaction is this is a crazy decision. It is against the facts. It is against science. It is against reality itself. **We know we have to decarbonize our future.** If we don’t, it is a horror. People will die. Habitat will be destroyed. Seas will rise. Insects will spread in areas they never have before. This is not a game. It is not politics to talk to your base. It is humanity and whether it makes it through the 21st century. California will stay the course.”*

We “know” no such thing . . . what we *do* know is that their “consensus,” which they have forcefully declared for decades, **and as we will see they intend to brutally enforce by law**, asserts :

- Carbon dioxide drives global climate, and is positively correlated to warming.
- Incremental “carbon” from human activity is THEE cause of recent global warming, with other climate inputs being uncorrelated or of minor import.

Subject 2: My ‘Simple Question’ Remains Officially Unanswered - con’t

Perspective is needed before we get to my ‘Simple Question.’ The following is from the very good Learning Liffoff website. This screen shows that grammar school children can easily learn and calculate a statistical value called correlation coefficient:

The screenshot shows the Learning Liffoff website interface. At the top, the logo reads "LEARNINGLIFTOFF" in purple and yellow, with the tagline "Reaching New Heights in Your Child's Education". A navigation bar contains links for "IN THE NEWS+", "LIVE & LEARN+", "GAMES & ACTIVITIES+" (highlighted), "STUDENT SUCCESS+", and "COLLEGE & CAR". Below the navigation bar, the breadcrumb "Home > Games & Activities" is visible. The main heading is "High School Math Learning Activity: Correlation Coefficient". A row of social media sharing buttons includes Facebook (23), Twitter, Pinterest (14), G+ Google+, Email, and More (172). The text below the buttons reads: "Practice identifying the correlation coefficient in this interactive activity. Use the slider to estimate how strongly the given scatter points resemble each other. Then compare your estimate to the actual correlation." Below this is the instruction: "Use data that is preloaded or challenge yourself by making your own data set." The activity interface features a large purple header with the text "Correlation Coefficient" in white. Below the header is a scatter plot on a grid. The plot is divided into two sections by a vertical line. The left section contains five grey data points. The right section contains three grey data points. In the center of the plot, there are two buttons: "Use Practice Data" and "Use My Data".

I was taught the basic arithmetic concept of correlation in 8th grade by Mr. Robert Edebohls, my Junior High School math teacher at Washingtonville Central High School, in Washingtonville, New York.

Subject 2: My ‘Simple Question’ Remains Officially Unanswered - con’t

For decades the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) refuses to answer my Simple Question:

“ What is the correlation value, and the R-squared value, between atmospheric carbon dioxide in PPM and global temperatures; please specify the time period for the values you offer? ”

The IPCC, in their never-ending parade of “assessment reports” (AR-1, AR-2, AR-3, AR-4 and AR-5), refuses to state an R-Squared value, and they only insinuate correlation. AR-5 muses, quote:

*“It is **extremely likely** that more than half of the observed increase in global average surface temperature from 1951 to 2010 was caused by the **anthropogenic** increase in greenhouse gas concentrations . . .”*

We emphasize, their crux is that CO₂, especially from **human activity**, drives global climate and is positively correlated to recent alleged “global warming.” Therefore, the IPCC phrase ‘extremely likely’ is an agenda-driven opinion; it has no connection to the rigors required by competent science or the claimed ideals of Big Academia.

In 2009, our suspicions about these matters were exposed by a travesty known as **ClimateGate**. Big Academia, the group notorious for maintaining image, wants us to forget about ClimateGate. Therefore I offered members of that esteemed group an opportunity to officially shun ClimateGate.



In that context I interviewed climate experts. Of my twenty-odd attempts, only two had the courtesy and integrity to respond.

One very cordial fellow was Professor Alan Robock of Rutgers University, former researcher for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and “contributor” to the IPCC.

When I asked my Simple Question (above), Robock stated:

“ That question is too simplistic. The correlation value is high but correlation does not mean cause and effect.”

Here we have a strident advocate of the Paris Accord declaring that its crux is **“too simplistic”**?! Robock was very polite, and very generous with his time. But I had asked this climatologist for a number, not a subjective qualitative opinion.

Even if you presume that Professor Robock had a basis for his claim that *“the correlation value is high,”* we are compelled by the second part of his, albeit, unsolicited *“cause and effect”* response.

Subject 2: My 'Simple Question' Remains Officially Unanswered - con't

(A quick tutorial on correlation.)

Professor Robock's statement , "*correlation does not mean cause and effect.*" might seem to rebut the argument implied by my Simple Question. It is does the reverse, it supports it !

We examine an example wherein he is correct; there are many. First, we measure and tabulate the increase in a boy's height over a ten year period from age 1 to age 11. Then, for sake of argument, we assume this ten year period also includes a yearly rise in global temperatures. We then measure and tabulate the latter. We now have two data sets.

Now, we go to the grammar school website (Page 5), input these two data sets, and calculate the correlation value; a number that ranges from negative one to positive one. Because the boy's height and the global temperatures are both increasing, the calculated R value would be "*high*" and positive. This would seem to suggest a '*cause and effect*' connection.

Of course, it is absurd to suggest that this example has merit; there in no cause-effect connection between those data sets; here Robock is correct: "*correlation does not mean cause and effect.*"

But let us now examine the opposite; where the two data sets are already forcefully declared as being correlated, wherein the alleged merit is so high that it enjoys an alleged "97% consensus." Again, the heart-n-soul of the Paris Accord asserts:

Atmospheric carbon dioxide is positively correlated to global temperatures and, most emphatically, the CO2 that is attributable to human activity is *thee* primary cause of global warming; now re-marketed as "climate change."

There is nothing "*too simplistic*" in their marketing onslaughts directed at the naiveté of humanity.

In terms of the Scientific Method, when an effect has a theoretical cause, but the correlation value is very small (positive, negative or zero), then the theory is discarded as false by scientists with integrity. The Paris Accord is based on the exact opposite:

So . . . If their '*CO2 equals global warming*' connection is true, and therefore correlated, then climate scientists should be specifying/quantifying and proclaiming with unbridled pride their "*high*" R value . . . from every snow-covered mountain on Planet Earth!

Instead, they refuse to answer my Simple Question.

Al Gore also has no problem asserting the '*CO2 equals global warming*' connection. In his discredited film, '*An Inconvenient Truth*,' Gore stands before tabulated graphs, which he alleges depicts his fundamental claim (these did not); quote:

" The relationship is actually very complicated, but there is one relationship that is far more powerful than all the others, and it is this, when there is more carbon dioxide the temperature gets warmer, because it traps more heat from the sun inside. "

Gore singles-out the crux of the Paris Accord: CO2 is the culprit that drives global warming, as "*more powerful than all the others.*" **That is,** Gore asserts that CO2 is positively correlated to temperature.

Subject 2: My 'Simple Question' Remains Officially Unanswered - con't

First, they forcefully assert that the 'CO₂ equals global warming' connection is absolutely true; that increases in CO₂ and alleged increases in global temperatures are positively correlated.

But then my Simple Question is dismissed as **"too simplistic."**

Confirming their duplicitous position, simplicity was deemed to be of great utility to the "Father of Global Warming," Stanford University Professor Schneider who demanded :

"So we have to offer up scary scenarios, make *simplified*, dramatic statements, and make little mention of any doubts we might have." (Page 3 above)

There are many reasons why Big Academia refuses to answer my Simple Question. Most of these reasons involve money, but these also involve the issue of integrity.

In 2009, when a blatant lack of integrity was exposed by ClimateGate, I interviewed the Cornell Center for Sustainability director Professor Frank DiSalvo (pictured). I asked him to respond to the documented fraud and outright criminality of the scientists exposed by ClimateGate :

"There's no doubt people know about it (ClimateGate), and are chagrined by it."



But note the irony . . . according to Cornell University, "Climate" is the priority facing humanity, not **ethics** or integrity. Possibly adding to his chagrin, I posed my Simple Question to Professor DiSalvo:

"What is the correlation value, and the R-squared value, between atmospheric carbon dioxide in PPM and global temperatures; please specify the time period for the values you offer? "

Similar to Professor Robock, Professor DiSalvo was very cordial and generous with his time; unlike the other "climate scientists" who have refused to respond to that Simple Question.

Subject 2: My 'Simple Question' Remains Officially Unanswered - con't

Review of Page 4 above reveals that *thee* underpinning of the Cornell Center for Sustainability involves the decades-old assertion that there is a positive correlation between increased CO2 and the alleged increase in global temperatures.

During my recent visits to his office I mentioned that I would quote, in this letter, his 2009 response to my Simple Question:

“ There’s no simple one (answer) because so many other factors come in to it. That’s why it’s so difficult.

So, for example, if CO2 does start to cause atmospheric warming, that also causes increases of water vapor going into the atmosphere, which does one of two things, or it does both things. And it’s a question of which predominates. Water vapor itself is a greenhouse gas, in fact it’s the most predominant greenhouse gas in the atmosphere. So, that effect would tend to warm up the atmospheric even more. On the other hand if the water vapor condenses and forms clouds, then you ask what kind of clouds; certain clouds are very reflecting, so that they reflect the sunlight back out into space and that leads to cooling. Other clouds turn out to be absorbing, and they actually will heat the atmosphere; depends on their altitude and their shape, and what’s in the cloud. And so, trying to figure out; that’s just one example, there’s a whole bunch of other things that determine what happens, like ocean currents, and all, and all of these things have to be put it. And they’re all coupled to each other.

*So it’s like a giant machine with about, you know, thousands of wheels that are all connected to each other, and I’m going to wiggle one wheel, and ask what happens to the other thousand or how the other thousand respond to produce something on the other side; that’s a hard question. That’s **a really tough job.***

So, in general, what you can say, what climate scientists try to do, is they look at all the different pieces that they at least presently know about, and say if that one increases what does it do to; and climate change is a lot more than temperature. It has to do with precipitation; not so much global temperature as local temperature that’s important, some places in climate change will actually get colder because they get much cloudier in those places, so it’ll get colder. But then the Artic; in every model that I have looked at, and at least current data suggests the Artic is warming up a lot more than the rest of the planet.

So the questions you ask have to be a lot more detailed than just what’s happening to global temperature. ”


DiSalvo’s very first utterance provokes further examination of Page 5 above.

But more importantly, what follows demonstrates that my Simple Question is **not** *“a really tough job.”*

Subject 2: My 'Simple Question' Remains Officially Unanswered - con't

Of the twenty-odd non-responses and non-answers that I received, from so-called climate scientists, DiSalvo's delivery and tone was the most polite.

But, if this "settled science" confirms that CO₂ is positively correlated to global temperatures, **then my Simple Question should be welcomed, not shunned!**



In fact, it was in that context that I did **not** ask him for the intermediate couplings or their individual correlation values. I asked for the correlation value between **HIS** first domino and **HIS** last domino.

In order to remain consistent with **their** assertion that CO₂ drives climate change, I did **not** ask for the intermediate correlations, diverted to by Professor DiSalvo. I did **not** ask for the correlation between:


- CO₂ and water vapor,
- CO₂ and clouds that reflect and cool,
- CO₂ and clouds that absorb and warm,
- CO₂ and shapes of clouds,
- CO₂ and what is inside clouds,
- CO₂ and ocean currents,
- CO₂ and "a whole bunch of other things",
- CO₂ and wiggling wheels,
- CO₂ and "giant machines."

Despite my deference to his position at Cornell, I felt his response (page 9) lacked professional etiquette. With a Bachelor's degree in physics from MIT, a PhD in Applied Physics from Stanford, Professor DiSalvo is fully aware that the intermediate dominos do not, in any way, obviate an answer to my Simple Question. His was a **non**-answer, which compels the following admonition:

In stark contrast, **such is probably not what he conveys to Cornell students.** But it certainly is not what he conveys to the public when fundraising for "*reduction of Cornell's carbon footprint.*"

Subject 2: My ‘Simple Question’ Remains Officially Unanswered - con’t

Is it possible that all of this has changed? That their ‘CO2 equals global warming’ rant has been modified, or diminished as their public relations and climate science priority. Not a chance!



A few weeks ago, Cornell University published a taxpayer funded Malthusian ruse called:

REVERSING INEQUALITY, COMBATting CLIMATE CHANGE : A Climate Jobs Program for New York State

Now, we have “climate jobs” ?!

But a direct question could be asked:

How many of the proposed “climate jobs” are oriented at quantities or factors other than carbon dioxide?!

I analyzed this 68-page report, searching for the “many other factors” mentioned by Professor DiSalvo in non-response to my Simple Question.

That is, in the context of Professor DiSalvo’s non-response, I searched for terms that allegedly obviate an answer to my Simple Question. Tabulation is shown below:

Various “Many Other Factors” Terms Usage in New York ‘Climate Jobs’ Report	Frequency of Usage in ‘Climate Jobs’ Report
water vapor	0
clouds that reflect and cool	0
clouds that absorb and warm	0
shapes of clouds	0
what is inside clouds	0
ocean currents	0
a whole bunch of other things	0
wiggling wheels	0
giant machines	0
Memo: Carbon or Carbon Dioxide mentioned	61

“ What is the correlation value, and the R-squared value, between atmospheric carbon dioxide in PPM and global temperatures; please specify the time period for the values you offer? ”

Given their ongoing emphasis on carbon dioxide, this Simple Question should be welcomed.

Subject 2: A Simple Question - CONCLUSION

Although unsolicited, Professor DiSalvo also emphasizes, **“Water vapor itself is a greenhouse gas, in fact, it’s the most predominant greenhouse gas in the atmosphere.”** Correct.

Not relevant to my Simple Question, I did not ask him to assess the H2O emissions from nuclear power plants, such as Beaver Valley in Pennsylvania; a short drive from Cornell University:



In his farcical film, Al Gore says we have data covering “650,000 years.” There is so much climate data, that an answer to my Simple Question can be calculated by grammar school students, or meteorologists . . . a calculation that implicitly accounts for the intermediate dominos (Page 10) :

Strength of Correlation to Warming		
Courtesy: Meteorologist Joe D'Aleo		
CO2	1895-2007	.43
Sun	1900-2004	.57
Oceans	1900-2007	.85
CO2	1998-2007	.02!!!

AccuWeather.com*

During the time that I was being rebuffed by NASA, NOAA, and various ClimateGaters, I interviewed retired meteorologist Mr. Craig James who had calculated conjoint values for similar time periods:

In James’ opinion, the solar-ocean conjoint calculated for similar periods is +0.88 !


Memo 1: Implicit Assumption of a Correlation Value in their Climate Models

The US taxpayer funds the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). Professor Alan Robock of Rutgers is very familiar with NOAA’s its work, especially the section dedicated to computer climate modeling (pages 6/7 above).

NOAA explains that its climate models use “advanced equations which are based on the fundamental laws of physics, fluid motion, and chemistry.” Again, my Simple Question:


“What is the correlation value, and the R-squared value, between atmospheric carbon dioxide in PPM and global temperatures; please specify the time period for the values you offer? ”

The models, that the taxpayers have been funding for decades, implicitly use (or iterate) as part of their algorithmic structure the underlying assumption that there is a positive correlation between atmospheric CO2 and global temperatures. Note, this is not an actual correlation or R-squared valued, **this is an assumed value that gets buried in the models.**



Their lack of response to my Simple Question is insidious: **Implicitly the climate models will not run unless an assumed correlation value is “plugged in” to the data section. Most insidious, the correlation values that are necessarily assumed in the models, and the true correlation to the climate system response . . . do not converge . . . and never have.**

Memo 2: Their Open Accusation: You are *Insane*



A popular yarn among so-called climate scientists is a book that openly declares that members of the human race are insane for merely questioning the notion that CO2 drives global climate.

In fact, during a recent visit with Professor DiSalvo, in his Clark Hall office on the campus of my alma mater, he proudly shared his copy of George Marshall’s book with me. He is among many who promote, not only its readership, but its portent.

The next section will also lay the context for **Subject 2** of this letter. In the next section the truly insane will be exposed.

But . . . as we will see, the types of books shown at-left were not among those identified for censorship by a foreign NGO . . .

Their Unbridled Vileness - An Introduction to Subject 3

On May 24, 2017, Pope Francis handed you a signed copy of his 184-page *‘Encyclical Letter, **Laudato Si**’ of the Holy Father Francis on Care for Our Common Home.* The Washington Post declared that his letter:

“... called for a new partnership between science and religion to combat human-driven climate change.”

Reading this two-year-old tome, I noted he used the term carbon or carbon dioxide seven times.



That is, the Pope promotes the notion that carbon dioxide is positively correlated to “climate change.”

But for sake of comparison, let us presume his “partnership between science and religion” as a basis for enforcing a faith in the notion that ‘CO2 equals global warming.’ **Picture the following . . .**

The faithful have allegedly strayed; they fail to act upon the papal edicts of “*human-driven climate change.*” Hearing of their blasphemy, picture the following, that Pope Francis pronounces the following diatribe to all Christians, Catholics in particular (again, this is fictional) :

‘I would like to say we’re at a point where global warming is impossible to deny. Let’s just say that global warming deniers are now on a par with **Resurrection Deniers**, though one denies the past and the other denies the present and future.’



Pope Francis would never state anything so vile. And he certainly did nothing close in *Laudato Si*. If he did, one can imagine the outrage from the NGO news media!

But you, the Pope, and Big Academia, have failed to chastise those that have already deployed a vileness that is unprecedented in recent science . . . in fact, the above fiction is an exact paraphrasing of a very well-known quote that was openly promoted by the NGO media :

Their Unbridled Vileness - An Introduction to Subject 3 - con't

*"I would like to say we're at a point where global warming is impossible to deny. Let's just say that global warming **deniers** are now on a par with **Holocaust deniers**, though one denies the past and the other denies the present and future."*

Ellen Goodman of the Boston Globe.



■ Now . . . what follows is a small sampling of equivalent vileness, a vileness that is not fictional:

*"Currently, about 300 thousand people die every year from the effects of climate change, with another 325 million seriously affected, primarily because of reduced access to fresh and safe drinking water. At its core, global warming **denial** is like **Holocaust denial**, an assault on common decency."*

Banker, David Federer.



*"Clouds of a different sort signal an environmental **holocaust** without precedent. Once again, world leaders waffle, hoping the danger will dissipate. Yet today the evidence is as clear as the sounds of glass shattering in Berlin."*

Filmmaker Al Gore.



*"I wonder what sentences judges might hand down at future international criminal **tribunals** on those who will be partially but directly responsible for millions of deaths from starvation, famine and disease in decades ahead. I put this in a similar moral category to **Holocaust denial**."*

Mark Lynas, author of the nihilistic book, *The God Species: How the Planet Can Survive the Age of Humans.*'



Their Unbridled Vileness - An Introduction to Subject 3 - con't

" A lot of them complain because they say the word **denial** puts them in the same bin as **holocaust deniers**. That's too bad. But the thing is, they do have something in common: a **denial** of evidence and of scientific consensus. "

Phil Platt, Big Bang astronomer.




" An Inconvenient Truth is so convincing that it makes opposers of the argument as credible as **Holocaust deniers**. "

Jon Niccum, NGO news reporter.




"Bluntly put, **climate change deniers** pose a greater danger than the lingering industry that **denies the Holocaust**."

Joel Connelly, NGO News reporter



"Others working to derail this critical piece of legislation will be seen as the Adolf Hitler's of our day, contributing to a **holocaust** vastly eclipsing the horrors of World War II."


Chad Kister, author of 'How Global Warming is Destroying One of the World's Largest Wilderness Areas' (Kister is referring to the Artic, please review page 2 above).



Their Unbridled Vileness - An Introduction to Subject 3 - con't


" Those who abjure global warming are not skeptics; they are **deniers**. To call them skeptics is to debase language as much as to call the Ku Klux Klan 'prejudiced,' **Holocaust deniers** 'biased,' or Flat-Earthers 'mistaken.' "

James Powell, National Physical Science Consortium.



" If we cannot stop the building of more coal-fired power plants, those coal trains will be **death trains** – no less gruesome than if they were boxcars headed to **crematoria** . . . "

James Hansen, former member of the taxpayer funded vested interest group called NASA.



" **Denialism**, a concept that was first widely used, as far as I know, for those who claimed that the **Holocaust** was a fraud, is the concept I believe we should use."

Professor Robert Manne of La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia



"They (Exxon-Mobil) have been funding organizations that are climate change **deniers**."

New York Attorney General Eric T. Schneiderman, deploying "denier" vernacular when alleging fraud by now Secretary of State Rex Tillerson, ex CEO of Exxon-Mobil.



Their Unbridled Vileness - An Introduction to Subject 3 - CONCLUSION

" It (climate change denial) reminds me in some ways of the debate taking place in this country and around the world in the late 1930s – there were people - who said 'don't worry! Hitler's not real! It'll disappear! "



Ex-Presidential Candidate Bernard Sanders.

HOME JOIN LOG IN FORUM VIDEOS ASK JTF CONTACT עברית

"GLOBAL WARMING CAUSED HITLER"

November 25, 2015 | Shlomo | 3 comments

The lunatic left is teaming with complete morons. You just can't get any more stupid and naive than this.

Global warming's reputation as the most evil and dangerous thing ever to happen in the history of the world has just gone full Godwin: apparently – among all its myriad other crimes – it may have been responsible for the rise of Adolf Hitler, the spread of fascism across Europe and, by extension, the death of six million Jews.

[global_warming](#)

This novel theory, first reported on in an American newspaper in 1941, has just resurfaced in the wake of claims by John Kerry and others that climate change was responsible for creating ISIS. Researchers were naturally keen to discover whether there was any precedent for such "global warming" related idiocy. And indeed it turns out that there was.

Little is known about what became of Dr Clarence A Mills, professor of experimental at the University of Cincinnati, and his amazing theory that "gradually warming temperatures of the world" helped bring Hitler and Mussolini to power because "people are more docile and easily led in warm weather than in cold."

But Dr Mills would surely be proud to know that his legacy lives on among such great 21st century thinkers as ex-jailbait-choral-nymphet Charlotte Church, the Prince of Wales, John Kerry, Thomas Friedman and the fifth most obnoxious Social Justice Warrior on Twitter, Graham Linehan.

The above is a sampling of the desperate status and ever diminishing stature of those academicians, climate scientists, and their mouthpieces in the NGO media, that are irretrievably tethered to their failed notion . . . the notion that 'CO2 equals global warming.'

But this sampling is far more than that . . . it is indicative of their collective inveracity . . . an inveracity that will soon advocate, enact, and then enforce **Subject 3** of this letter (See overleaf).

Subject 3: Upcoming Tyrannical Censorship of Climate Science Instigated by NGOs (Yad Vashem, Climate Bolsheviks, and Big Academia)



It is unknown if, during your May 24, 2017 visit to Yad Vashem, you questioned its director, Robert Rozett, regarding his solicitation and receipt of censoring what Americans are allowed to read:

THE JC
THE JEWISH CHRONICLE

Newsletters & more
Sign up to get daily news, Editor's email, competitions, special announcements and much more.
Join our community here

NEWS COMMENT SPORT LIFESTYLE CULTURE EDUCATION COMMUNITY JUDAISM ARCHIVE S&P SUBSCRIBE

NEWS UK NEWS WORLD ISRAEL NEWS FEATURES OBITUARIES THE DIARY

Under pressure, Amazon stops selling Holocaust-denial books
Nathan Jeffay
March 8, 2017

**Subject 3: Upcoming Tyrannical Censorship of Climate Science Instigated by NGOs
(Yad Vashem, Climate Bolsheviks, and Big Academia) - con't**

But you are aware that Rozett characterized his demand to Amazon billionaire CEO Jeff Bezos as a request to ***“curb the spread of hatred.”***

Since when in the history of humankind has intellectual censorship curbed hatred?

On the other hand, to the best of my knowledge, people like Director Rozett have never chastised, at any level, the charlatans on pages 15 thru 18 . . . for the repulsive blaspheming of the portent of Yad Vashem. It is not difficult to assert why no such revulsion has occurred.

In any case . . . it appears your role as the American president, and your declarations about “America First” have tacitly submitted to restrictions that potentially violate your duty under the United States Constitution.

At your June 1, 2017 Rose Garden news conference, you withdrew the US from the Paris Accord, declaring that you *“were elected to represent the citizens of Pittsburgh, not Paris.”*

But relevant to that laudable decision, you failed to alert Americans to the fact that a censorship of what they can read in regard to climate science is **also** a mere legalistic stepping stone away . . .

You are not alone in your accommodation, if not participation, in allowing a foreign NGO to dictate what America is allowed to read or watch or think . . . about . . . anything :

But, contrary to their self-absorbed self-image, the truth is that Big Academia is in lock-step with Yad Vashem and Jeff Bezos (below) . . . we are at the point where making **“Climate Denial”** a criminal offense with mandatory incarceration . . . is merely . . . academic.



Image: BUSINESS INSIDER/CHRISTOPHER SCHLATTER

**Subject 3: Upcoming Tyrannical Censorship of Climate Science Instigated by NGOs
(Yad Vashem, Climate Bolsheviks, and Big Academia) - *con't***

Is that last paragraph of Page 20 misinformed? If so, I am apparently not alone in my thinking. We are witnessing the debasing of science by the same characters that orchestrated the brutal murdering of the Christian czar and his family. In the context of our First Amendment; Jacob Schiff, Yakov Yurovskym and Lev Davidovich would be proud of Mr. Pezos:



Specifically, if there was a single overriding operative in the drawn-out existence of the dreary murderous parasitic enterprise called the Soviet Union, **it was the tyranny of censorship.**

In truth, millions were murdered, and the worst environmental disaster in the history of Planet Earth (World War II) occurred because of ***this*** “meddling” . . . and ***this*** “collusion” !

But as you and your colleagues at Yad Vashem are fully aware, “sovereign nations” have already made disagreement with *any* aspect of the Shoah Theology punishable with mandatory incarceration. The list of “sovereign nations” continues to grow, and currently includes:

Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, and Switzerland.

Subject 3: Upcoming Tyrannical Censorship of Climate Science Instigated by NGOs (Yad Vashem, Climate Bolsheviks, and Big Academia) - con't

Has a Nuremburg-styled criminal connection already been publically proposed which connects the existing practice of imprisonment of "Holocaust Deniers" to that of "Climate Deniers"?


Similar to the readership ban in the US by Yad Vashem regarding "Holocaust Denial," is a Climate Denier imprisonment proposal also advocated under the guise of "**curbing the spread of hatred**"? A few examples among many:

" David Irving is under arrest in Austria for **Holocaust denial**. Perhaps there is a case for making **climate change denial** an offence – it is a **crime** against humanity after all. "



Margo Kingston, Member of the NGO News media in Australia, where mandatory incarceration of "Holocaust Deniers" is already law.

"There are now proposals that **'global warming deniers'** be treated the same as **'Holocaust deniers'**: professional ostracism, belittlement, ridicule and, **even jail.**"



Peter William Postlethwaite, Movie Industry

" It's about the climate-change **denial** industry. We should have war crimes trials for these bastards - some sort of climate **Nuremberg.** "



David Roberts, NGO news reporter.

**Subject 3: Upcoming Tyrannical Censorship of Climate Science Instigated by NGOs
(Yad Vashem, Climate Bolsheviks, and Big Academia) - con't**

Cornell University welcomed its 14th president, Ms. Martha Pollack. A sampling of her recent quotes:

"This is an educational institution, so I prefer to look at this as an opportunity where we, as a community, are educating one another about the value of free speech."

"By far the most important (value) is **integrity**. Without integrity, you don't have trust, and without trust, you don't get anywhere. I think that when two people trust each other, you can make lots of progress even if you vehemently disagree. For me, starting from a point of integrity is essential." *



* To her credit, President Pollack is in disagreement with Israeli Educational Minister Naftali Bennett who advocates limiting academic freedoms and free speech, on the basis of one's "political worldview."

Also reported in the Cornell Chronical:

"Her passion also shone through when describing her **fundamental, unwavering commitment** to free speech. That means free speech should be afforded to everyone, she said, and not just people with whom you agree.

"That can be difficult," she said. "That means you have to be willing to accept offensive speech. But history has shown that when you take away free speech and start clamping down on freedom of expression, it's marginalized groups that suffer most."

Her background is mostly Big Academia, so these good, but trendy proclamations are not surprising. Her biography gives no indication that her alleged **"fundamental, unwavering commitment"** to these values has been thoroughly tested . . . at levels such as personal sacrifice, etc.

For example, I can assure you that Cornell President Pollack, **as well as Big Academia**, is fully aware of the "Holocaust Denial" censorship demanded by Yad Vashem and then deployed by their new lackey, Jeff Bezos lackey at Amazon.com:

- We will **not** find President Pollack, or an administrator of *any* educational institution, whom routinely tout "free speech," denouncing this recent Bolshevik-styled censorship, enacted in behalf of the NGO Yad Vashem. **Not a peep!**
- Similarly, given their vesting in the 'CO2 equals global warming' dogma, Big Academia would **not** oppose the censorship implicit to "Climate Denier" laws, especially regarding the implications to their **ongoing** "climate change" fundraising schemes.

**Subject 3: Upcoming Tyrannical Censorship of Climate Science Instigated by NGOs
(Yad Vashem, Climate Bolsheviks, and Big Academia) – CONCLUSION**

We can presume that Cornell University President Pollack, and her Ivy League counterparts, are aware of the statements made by the charlatans shown on Pages 15 through 18, and 22 above.

We can presume Pollack's familiarity with the statements of Professor Schneider (Page 3 above). She knows that such violates the tenets of the *Cornell University Code of Academic Integrity*. In that context and others, I am deeply "chagrined" if my alma mater is in-any-way associated with :

- The Climate Change imbroglio which openly requires renunciation of personal and professional integrity
- The enforcement or encouragement of censorship
- Operating philosophies and public posturing that reek of duplicity
- Slander / Libel and the many other forms of vitriol, diatribe and vilification
- The notion that the rigors of the Scientific Method will be subjected to and/or answerable to various belief systems (Shoah, Catholicism, etc.)
- Open or tacit threats of incarceration against those with whom there is alleged "vehement disagreement."

Nowhere will you find statements by any Big Academia administrator condemning the recent Bolshevik-styled Yad-Vashem/Amazon censorship.

But this complicity already has a parallel precedent . . .

You will not hear from Big Academia, **most especially from their highly vaunted "Law Schools,"** open condemnation of the viciousness and violence demonstrated in the fate of 88-year-old Ms. Ursula Haverbeck:

With complicit behaviors, legal precedents, and open promotions of "Climate Denier" laws in plain view, will enactment of this Bolshevik-styled tyranny be attempted in the USA?

Mr. President, with so much ego and money involved . . .



The answer is an emphatic, **"YES!"** The climate Bolsheviks and their counterparts in the NGO media are already preparing the public for its acceptance of 'Climate Denier' laws.'

Intermission : Remarks

1. Congratulations on your decision to withdraw from the Paris Climate Accord; its pundits refuse to state a defensible correlation value to its alleged genesis: ‘*CO2 equals Global Warming.*’
2. At present, the taxpayer funded vested interest group NASA is still ranting about:

“unprecedented loss of ice in the Artic.”

Since a well-known history of the Artic presents periods of zero ice, many scientists strongly challenged these alarms. NASA has now deployed a revised, coyly worded rhetoric:

“the lowest in the satellite record.”

When I broached the 1922 reports (Pages 1/2 above), NASA refused to comment. When I asked External Relations to answer my Simple Question, NASA refused. As of this letter I have still not received a response.

In conversations I have asked about the well-known fact that for decades planet Mars and the outer planets have exhibited “Global Warming.” This planetary warming is ongoing.

3. Central to the Paris Accord (and the IPCC) is the dogma that ‘*CO2 equals Global Warming.*’ If true, that increases of CO2 drives increases in global temperature, then these two data sets will be mathematically correlated, and the value will be positive. If the cause-effect connection is strong, then correlation will be **“high.”** **Again, my Simple Question should be welcomed.**
4. You do not need to be a highly-trained scientist to calculate the correlation value between two data sets; grammar school children are routinely taught this basic arithmetic concept.
5. Big Academia refuses to respond to my Simple Question (page 6), but participates in the vileness that, **“Climate Deniers” are equivalent to “Holocaust Deniers.”**
6. The physical world and its processes have no regard for human beliefs or theological dogmas. The rigors of the Scientific Method dictate that pronouncement of a physical fact must be based on precise experimentation that is representative of the alleged fact, and is repeatable.
7. Given that the groups which instigated the recent “Russia narrative” (and the “meddling” and the “collusion” rhetoric) are the same groups that enforce the ‘*CO2 equals Global Warming*’ dogma, and therefore share similar behavioral characteristics, it is unlikely that they will ever fully admit that they were wrong about carbon dioxide.
8. I am not aware of any Christian group, including the Catholic Church, demanding that any books that amount to **“Resurrection Denial”** be censored by Amazon.com.
9. With the imposition of censorship, relating to so-called “Holocaust Denial” books, already successfully executed against America by a foreign NGO (Yad Vashem), extension of **this Bolshevik-styled tyranny will be attempted against so-called “Climate Denial books.”**
10. With complicit behaviors, legal precedents, and the open advocacy of “Climate Denier” laws, **enactment of a Bolshevik-styled tyranny in the USA will be attempted against these so-called “Climate Deniers,” which is proposed to include mandatory imprisonment similar to existing “Holocaust Denier” laws.**

Intermission : Remarks – *Con't*

11. It might appear that I have singled out Rutgers University Professor Alan Robock and Cornell University Professor Frank DiSalvo. I included them for very positive reasons. Although their responses were lacking, both were polite and professional; open to debate. Both shunned the repulsive statements on pages 15 to 18 and page 22 above. This also occurred during my recent two face-to-face visits with Professor DiSalvo in his Clark Hall office.

The other “scientists” that I interviewed were self-absorbed, condescending. A Cornell professor of Atmospheric Sciences, declared that I was, quote, “*just a denier.*” In general, these cases are not worthy of mention. However, to give this imbroglio more perspective, I will offer an additional example of the insidious tactics of the ‘*CO2 equals global warming*’ pundits.

In 2014, Benjamin Brown-Steiner was a PhD student at Cornell. He is now a Postdoctoral Associate at the MIT Center for Global Change Science.


Interjecting religion into science, Brown-Steiner lectured at the “*Interfaith Climate Change Seminar*” conducted off-campus in Ithaca, New York.

I emailed Brown-Steiner on January 22, 2014:

Mr. Brown-Steiner:

The Ithaca Journal article indicates that you will lead these seminar sessions on “climate change.” Are you going to review the correlation between atmospheric CO2 and global temperatures? That is, will you be sharing an R^2 value for any particular time period; which you will obviously specify? Will you be offering any other correlated relations, and those R^2 values? Note that I am copying the IJ Senior Editor, Bruce Estes.

Paul Sheridan, Class of 1980



His response, after several gratuitous diversions and non-answers:

From: Benjamin Brown-Steiner [mailto:ben.brownsteiner@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 23, 2014 9:39 AM
To: Paul V. Sheridan
Subject: Re: Ithaca hosts interfaith climate change seminar QUESTION

Mr. Sheridan,

No, I will not be presenting or discussing R-squared values.

Thanks,

Ben Brown-Steiner

Intermission : Remarks – *Conclusion*

So, although unbridled while promoting “*simplified dramatic statements*” to the unwashed masses, statements which implicitly proclaim their ‘*CO2 equals global warming*’ thesis; these pundits remain rife to defend their thesis at merely the level of grammar school statistics?!

12. What does anyone gain by studying the ‘*CO2 equals global warming*’ thesis, learning that it is false, and then so stating?! People who disagree with this thesis are subjected to ridicule, vitriol, and open threats to their financial and physical well-being:

The lawsuit by New York AG Eric Schneiderman against Exxon-Mobil might prevail, but only if he can prove that his ‘*CO2 equals global warming*’ thesis is **undebatable**.

In the context of public safety and service, it is criminal when these esoteric subjects are diverted from scientific rigor by the agendas of money and power agenda. These diversions are even more sinister/militant when motivated by global hegemony versus the sovereignty of nation-states . . .

We are now beyond mere “political rhetoric,” all the way to the psychotic, evidenced by the tacit acceptance of the repulsive diatribe that a “**Climate Denier equals a Holocaust Denier.**”

But let answer Question 2: I have nothing personal or professional to gain by expressing my concerns regarding the ‘*CO2 equals global warming*’ thesis. If my doubts interrupt the cash flow of climate fund-raisers, I apologize; but such was consequential, not intentional.

Intermission : Requests

- A. During the June 6 edition of ‘Morning Joe,’ EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt was pummeled by Joe Scarborough with the outburst, “*It’s a simple question.*” Oh? Neither offered an answer to my Simple Question. **Please direct Mr. Pruitt to officially answer my Simple Question:**

“ What is the correlation value, and the R-squared value, between atmospheric carbon dioxide in PPM and global temperatures; please specify the time period for the values you offer? ”

Assume that we will scrutinize this response, especially the sources of the “temperature record.” ClimateGate?! Please have Mr. Pruitt confer with NASA acting Administrator Robert Lightfoot.

If there is doubt about the relevance of my Simple Question, note that the recent US Global Climate Change Research Program – Climate Science Special Report (which focuses on and severely ridicules withdrawal from the Paris Accord) **uses the word ‘correlation’ SEVENTEEN times!**

- B. If Mr. Pruitt confirms values as shown on Page 12, then it would be incumbent upon all of us to refocus on to the good efforts of true environmental protection:

In the context of true environmental protection, the current spending on demonstrably ineffective and dangerous “wind farms,” or the spending of trillions on the ludicrous scheme of “*Carbon Sequestration*” is approaching criminal fraud.

These follies must be scrapped. In the context of ethics, we are confronted with far more crucial, and meritorious, environmental/infrastructure projects in need of our attention and funding: **Flint, Michigan?**

Personalized Observations

No single operative in society provokes more hatred, and more quickly, than the lie. Typically when the lie is endemic to a false agenda, that lie must be protected by censorship, **the lie cannot survive the light-of-day**. In the extreme cases, the power brokers will corrupt and then deploy the “law.” With this in mind, let us reexamine recent events.

Enactment of “Holocaust Denier” laws has prompted opportunists to connect similar political rhetoric to climate science. The crux is the ‘*CO2 equals Global Warming*’ dogma. This ludicrous connection is claimed to be justifiable, and has led to demands that a “Climate Denier” suffer the same violence as that already meted out to Ms. Ursula Haverbeck (Page 24):

Now that these two utterly unrelated issues (“Holocaust Denial” to “Climate Denial”) are fraudulently connected, what happens to the former, in the minds of the masses, when the ‘*CO2 equals Global Warming*’ dogma is refuted at the level of true science?

This sequence is not new, and has been scrutinized by Big Academia. George Washington University researcher, Dr. Nathan P. Kalmoe wrote, “*Fueling the Fire: Violent Metaphors, Trait Aggression, and Support for Political Violence.*” Dr. Kalmoe states:

“ The recent concurrence of violent political rhetoric and violence against political targets in the U.S. and abroad has raised public concern about the effects of language on citizens. ”

This quote exposes the true relationship between agenda and power, and the groveling of Big Academia. Predictably Kalmoe accommodates the one-sided argument that the perpetrator of violence is the citizen, and that the “*political target*” of that violence are the power brokers.

Therefore it is no surprise that Big Academia is rife of scholarly works for the reverse; for the overwhelmingly more frequent reality, where the power broker inflicts the violence, and the naïve citizen is their “political target.”

- Apparently the violent political rhetoric (“Holocaust Denier”) and subsequent violence inflicted upon the nice 88-year-old lady pictured on page 24 are . . . not violent enough?
- Apparently the violent political rhetoric already levied and the violence of subsequent incarceration already proposed in their “**Climate Denier**” laws focused upon citizens that do not submit to their ‘*CO2 equals Global Warming*’ dogma are . . . not violent enough?
- Big Academia is rife of research to determine “*the effects of language on citizens*” such as that sampled on page 15 thru 18 and page 22 above . . . is this not violent enough?

The truth is, Big Academia, the “science community,” the NGO media, and vested interests **are in so deep, thy are so entwined** in their ‘*CO2 equals Global Warming*’ thesis, they cannot get out!

They are so tethered to historical political rhetoric and animosity (i.e. hate), towards those that dare question their dogma, that they have now reduced their stature to threats endemic-to and fashioned-upon “Holocaust Deniers” laws. Higher learning?

Again, when a lie is endemic to agenda or power, that lie must be protected by censorship and laws. It is said that only lies need to be protected by laws . . . the truth needs no such protection.

Personalized Observations - *Conclusion*

While Big Academia was immediate in their condemnation of the August 12th events in Charlottesville, they have never condemned the vileness sampled on pages 15-18 and 22 above. One can imagine the spewed vitriol; the protestations had an equivalent “global warming” opportunism been deployed using concepts dear to the Christian faith and peoples (Page 14 above).

Above I discussed the issue of ethics; most especially the inveracity demonstrated on page 3. I have a long history of addressing such topics with my alma mater, Cornell University. The effects of a lack of corporate ethics, was part of contributions I offered to its Graduate School of Management. My materials were used in the Cornell classroom (Attachment ??).

But let us **personalize** this discussion; regarding both you and I (see Item 3 below).

1. My maternal family entered the USA, already speaking English, able to support themselves, while fulfilling all of the legal requirements of immigration during the early 1900s. My mother’s maiden name was Bennett, she was a first-born, natural citizen; I am a second-born natural citizen. My maternal family was from the great nation of Ireland:

- As half Irish-American, I am very familiar with the genocide of *An Gorta Mor*. Does anyone believe that I would tolerate misuse of that horrific and thoroughly documented event, by self-absorbed “global warming” opportunists?

I would not . . . not for one New-York-second would I tolerate opportunists accusing someone of being an **‘An Gorta Mor Denier,’** upon the motivation of vilifying a person that disagrees with the *‘CO2 equals Global Warming’* dogma.

2. My paternal family entered the USA, already speaking English, able to support themselves, and doing so while fulfilling all of the legal requirements of immigration during the early 1900s. My father’s birth name was Szigety, he was a first-born, natural citizen. My paternal family was from the great nation of Hungary:

- As half Hungarian-American, I am very familiar with the genocide of ***The Hungarian Uprising of 1956***. Does anyone actually believe that I would tolerate misuse of that thoroughly documented horror, by a group of self-absorbed “global warming” opportunists?

Not for one New-York-second would tolerate opportunists accusing someone of being a **‘Hungarian Uprising of 1956 Denier,’** on the basis that they disagreed with the *‘CO2 equals Global Warming’* dogma.

3. By virtue of your kept promise, to withdraw the USA from the Paris Climate Accord, it is possible that the opportunists, sampled on pages 15 thru 18 and 22, will proclaim that you, by the definition they ascribe, are a **“Holocaust Denier.”** Mr. President, I am confident that your new associates at Yad Vashem will find that objectionable. But . . .

Personalized Question:

What would motivate Yad Vashem, Big Academia, and the NGO media to tolerate the exploitation by the charlatans sampled on page 15 thru 18 and 22 above? What would be the overriding motivation which enforces “tolerance” regarding exploitation of the “Holocaust” when such is known to be utterly unrelated to climate science?

This complicit behavior, which is most egregious by-definition at Big Academia, has been going on for decades . . .

Subject 4: Upcoming Execution of Global ‘Intellectual Genocide’

The word ‘genocide’ was coined by a Raphaël Lemkin, in reaction to the “Holocaust.” He included that word in his 1944 work, *“Axis Rule in Occupied Europe.”* Similar to the word holocaust, Lemkin relied on the Greek; its prefix *genos* meaning race or tribe. The Latin suffix *cide* means to kill.

The website of the United Nations, the same global organization that sponsors the IPCC and promoted the Paris Accord, states:

“ Genocide was first recognised as a crime under international law in 1946 by the United Nations General Assembly (A/RES/96-I). It was codified as an independent crime in the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (the Genocide Convention). The Convention has been ratified by 147 States (as of December 2016). The International Court of Justice (ICJ) has repeatedly stated that the Convention embodies principles that are part of general customary international law. This means that whether or not States have ratified the Genocide Convention, they are all bound as a matter of law by the principle that genocide is a crime prohibited under international law. The ICJ has also stated that the prohibition of genocide is a peremptory norm of international law (or ius cogens) and consequently, no derogation from it is allowed. ”

Now, this same globalist organization is effectively, if not actually, utterly complicit with the Bolshevik-styled ‘*climate denier laws*’ which, as discussed above, are fashioned after ‘*Holocaust Denier Laws.*’

These two laws, proposed and in-force, are designed for the explicit purpose of killing any open disagreement with dogma, whether scientific or theological . . . please review Page 22 above. We are already well-along in the legal and social processes **of the exact opposite portent of the 1948 UN laws which are intended to protect humanity against genocide.**



We are witnessing, orchestrated by the allegedly highest levels of human society, the official banning, by threat of prosecution and derision; the banning of any honest disagreement with the ‘*CO2 equals Global Warming*’ thesis. That the UN is directly involved in this hypocrisy is staggering . . . specifically:

The issue of intellectual genocide, inflicted against humanity on the basis of “global warming” dogma, is upon us.

An exaggeration? Hopefully. But I would offer the parallel fate of Dr. Robert Faurisson in-rebuttal.

For merely disagreeing with the strict dogma of the “Holocaust,” Dr. Faurisson **was beaten to near-death, in the streets of France, the location of the Paris Accord.** The guilty identified themselves as *“The Sons of the Memory of the Jews.”* No genuine investigation of this attempted murder was conducted. And the response from Big Academia, to the September 16, 1989 fate of Dr. Faurisson? ***Not a peep!***

Only a fool would argue that a similar fate, at least at the intellectual level, does not await any person that is in violation of the proposed ‘*Climate Denier Laws.*’

Subject 5: True Sustainability : Electrification of the Ground Transportation Fleet

In 1985, Chrysler Corporation Chairman Lee Iacocca asked his upper level staff the following:

“What is the cleanest type of vehicle from an emissions point of view?”

The quick answer he received was electric, or what was/is lauded as a “*zero emission vehicle*” or ZEV.

Understanding that the response was far too quick, Mr. Iacocca decided to get an answer that resulted from detailed analysis and hard facts; not shoot-from-the-hip sycophantism. The assignment was forwarded to my boss Mr. James Hossack, who then directed that I answer Mr. Iacocca’s question.

At the time we were in the Advanced Components Planning Group, which handled sourcing decisions for emissions components (among many others).

From my detailed analysis, contained in my paper which was reviewed by the Office of the Chairman

and the later the Board of Directors, the quick answer, the ZEV, was *wrong!*

In 1979 I took a course in ‘Cost Accounting’ by esteemed Cornell University Professor Ronald Hilton. One section involved “system wide” costing. Some in the accounting profession declared this practice as ABC or Activity-Based Cost Accounting.

The true system-wide cost is not restricted to the individual component, or an instant in time. True cost is derived from all activities over time: from cradle to grave to rebirth (e.g. environmental protection and cost recovery through recycling). Again, we are answering a question asked in 1985:

At that time the cleanest vehicle from a systems-wide, emissions point-of-view was **not** electric powered; the cleanest was the natural gas fueled vehicle.

As today, and this aspect has not changed sufficiently to warrant a major revision of my 1985 paper, the energy generation mix from the grid, that portion of the infrastructure that recharges the vehicle batteries, was energized by far too many pollution-emitting sources, especially coal. In 1985, there was no such thing as “clean coal.” (Note: My paper did **not** mention CO₂ because that molecule is not a pollutant and, as such, was not a measured quantity of the Clean Air Act.)

When all of the system-wide polluting sources were (implicitly) included in the ABC process, the clean winner was the natural gas vehicle. The electric vehicle came in second.

The present rhetoric (from Elon Musk or Al Gore or Greenpeace) declares that the electric vehicle is a zero emission vehicle or ZEV. But at the system-wide level, in the context of the ongoing electrical energy generation mix in the USA, that rhetoric has as much credibility as the sycophantism spewed at Mr. Iacocca in 1985. At the systems-wide level, **the ZEV remains a well-promoted myth.**

Subject 5: True Sustainability : Electrification of the Ground Transportation Fleet – *con't*

So . . . **all the way back in 1985** my paper declared that without the installation of a more efficient electrical energy distribution grid, and without additional non-polluting nuclear power plants to energize that grid, the natural gas fueled vehicle would reign as the cleanest form of personal transportation. As a recent headline reads:

USA needs 'robust' nuclear industry for security

18 August 2017

A Washington, DC-based organisation led by former US Energy Secretary Ernest Moniz has called for greater federal-level recognition of the importance of the USA's nuclear energy supply chain to national security. In its first major report, Energy Future Initiatives (EFI) recommends immediate government action to support and encourage existing and future new-build projects and strengthen the supply chain.

The report, 'The U.S. Nuclear Energy Enterprise: A Key National Security Enabler,' mentions the term carbon dioxide **eleven times**; its use promotes the notion that CO2 is the cause of climate change, a term used **ten times**. The 'electric vehicle' is never mentioned in the referenced report.

And the simple and obvious fact that an electric fleet would further the viability of the nuclear power choice, through the enormous electricity demand, is also not discussed by the EFI report.

Yet the full electric vehicle has been discussed for decades.

Rarely confronted with competence: Where are we going to acquire the implied energy, and how we are going to distribute that enormous incremental electrical energy, demanded by the recharging units, which will replace the "gas station" ?

These recharging units are being deployed at both commercial and residential locations.



The EFI report is just one example of this gloss-over. Instead of regurgitating misinformation about CO2, the EFI should focus its efforts on the enormous environmental, **sustainability**, and safety benefits of an electric ground transportation fleet.

Subject 5: True Sustainability : Electrification of the Ground Transportation Fleet – con't

For the record, 'Electrification of the ground transportation fleet' is not some esoteric conspiracy that is lurking behind the scenes, or hidden from public view . . . a few samples:

France to ban sales of petrol and diesel cars by 2040

Move by Emmanuel Macron's government comes a day after Volvo said it would only make fully electric or hybrid cars from 2019

Germany pushes to ban petrol-fuelled cars within next 20 years

The resolution urges the European Commission to implement the ban across the European Union



INDEPENDENT

News Voices Sports Culture **Indy/Life** Tech Daily Edition

News > World > Asia

India to make every single car electric by 2030 in bid to tackle pollution that kills millions

Technology will be introduced 'in a very big way', says minister



Bloomberg Businessweek

Markets Tech Pursuits Politics Opinion **Businessweek**

■ June 1, 2017, 12:01 AM EDT

The Country Adopting Electric Vehicles Faster Than Anywhere Else

● Fueled by cheap power and government subsidies, Norway is racing to ditch the "fossil car."

Subject 5: True Sustainability : Electrification of the Ground Transportation Fleet – *con't*

But let us return to 1985, Chairman Iacocca's question, and my response. Forty-two years later, more than four decades later, **the NGO media is finally catching up to the basics:**



The above article offers hyperlinks to various studies conducted earlier this year that

But, as with all the NGO media, the undercurrent in Bloomberg is that carbon dioxide is “dirty,” hence their use of the street vernacular “carbon emissions.”

Although the byline regarding the sources of power is correct; albeit decades behind, the article then makes claims about “renewable sources of energy,” an NGO media phrase for ‘sustainable.’

Baba Yaga

The Day After Tomorrow

mark twain; it is easier to fool people then convince them they have ben fooled

Co2 and therefore Characterized by page 3 above.

In attachem muct greater detail

Dumping paris good but must follow up

Science not a democracy most insidious encroachment

They do not offer any REAL solutions just trendy crap windils solar

Ban subsidies to wind farms

Paradigm to on-board generation

Solar eclipses and nightfall aside solar shit

As part of your infrastructure for USA

Energy independence

True environmentalism

Must do infrastructure with emphasis on needs of converting the fleet
President Trump Announces Manufacturing Jobs Initiative

Thanking you in advance, I remain,

Respectfully yours,

Paul V. Sheridan

Attachments

Republican National Committee (RNC), 310 1st St SE Washington, DC, 20003-1885, US

Pence
Dr. Ernest Moniz, Joseph Hezir and Melanie Kenderdine

- Subject 1: Withdrawal from the Paris Climate Accord**
Subject 2: My Simple Question Remains Officially Unanswered
Subject 3: Upcoming Tyrannical Censorship of Climate Science Instigated by NGOs
Subject 4: Upcoming Execution of Global 'Intellectual Genocide'
Subject 5: True Sustainability : Electrification of the Ground Transportation Fleet

Courtesy Copy List

Ms. Martha E. Pollack
Office of the President
Cornell University
300 Day Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853
607-255-5201

Ms. Christina Hull Paxson, President
President's Office
Brown University
Providence, RI 02912
401-863-2234

Mr. Lee C. Bollinger, President
Office of the President
Columbia University
Mail Code 4309
535 West 116th Street,
New York, NY 10027
212-854-1754

Ms. Amy Gutmann, President
Office of the President
University of Pennsylvania
Room 100
1 College Hall
Philadelphia, PA 19104
215-898-7221

Mr. Philip J. Hanlon, President
Office of the President
Dartmouth College
207 Parkhurst Hall
Hanover, NH 03755
603-646-2223

Ms. Drew Gilpin Faust, President
Office of the President
Harvard University
Massachusetts Hall
Cambridge, MA 02138 USA
617-495-1502

Mr. Christopher L. Eisgruber
Office of the President
Princeton University
1 Nassau Hall
Princeton, NJ 08544
609-258-6100

Mr. Peter Salovey, President
Office of the President
Yale University
105 Wall Street
New Haven, CT 06511
203-432-2550

Secretary Rex W. Tillerson
US Department of State
2201 C Street, NW
Washington, DC 20520
202-647-4000

Mr. Scott Pruitt, Administrator
Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20460
202-564-4700

Dr. Sebastian L. Gorka
Deputy Assistant to the President
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Ave NW
Washington, DC 20500
202-456-1111

Mr. John F. Kelly
Chief of Staff
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Ave NW
Washington, DC 20500
202-456-1111

The Farce that Venus is a “Sister Planet” to Earth

If you visit my alma mater, you will encounter in Ithaca, New York the following display:



This public display above, a short walk from the Cornell University campus, asserts:

“Venus’ atmosphere is 90% carbon dioxide, a greenhouse gas, making Venus the hottest planet in the Solar System.”

That wording implies (as does the sputum from climate scientists and their assets in the NGO media) a direct cause-and-result relationship: That is, the cause of Venus being “*the hottest planet in the Solar System,*” is directly correlated to its high carbon dioxide atmosphere! **But nothing could be further from the truth.** Similar to others of its kind, note that this Ithaca, New York display is targeting and afflicting the innocent passerby . . . the common woman and man and child.

We are far beyond this nonsense being merely astronomical rubbish; **we are well into outright fraud.** This is especially egregious for Cornell University’s otherwise unmatched and laudable contributions to Space Science.

The outrage is further justified by the fact that Cornell University astronomers and cosmologists are all in receipt-of or have access-to the enormous amounts of data and detailed reports that resulted from the American and Russian probes to the planet Venus; the planet that currently occupies the second orbital position from the Sun.

For example, in a recent news program, Cornell B.S. degreed mechanical engineer Mr. Bill Nye, who is not a climate scientist, posed the following implicitly fraudulent, diversionary, hype-filled question:



“Do you agree that the planet Venus is warm because it has a lot of carbon dioxide in its atmosphere? And when I say warm, I mean warm enough to melt lead on its surface. Do you agree with that?”

No Mr. Nye, we do not . . . no person with basic understanding of modern planetary science does. But again, in the context of my ‘Simple Question,’ Mr. Nye is proclaiming correlation!

But to understand that Nye’s question is a ruse, as is similar hype that Al Gore is “*saving us from the hellish fate of Venus and its runaway greenhouse effect!*” . . . that such a ruse is laughable . . . the following four-point introduction to basic Venusian science is offered.

Point 1 : As kindergarteners know, hot air rises. When greenhouse manufacturers offer temperature control, their primary mechanisms are vents located AT THE VERY TOP where the temperature reaches maximum, and control is most effective.

When measuring the temperature gradients inside a greenhouse, one finds that the highest readings are at the top, and the lowest are at the floor.

Is this what the American and Russian probes showed regarding the hyped “runaway greenhouse effect” forcefully alleged as the cause of high temperatures on planet Venus?



Of course not . . . in fact . . . **as is WELL-KNOWN to Cornell astronomers** . . . the Venusian probes confirmed the exact opposite! As the probes approached the outer/upper atmosphere of Venus, initial temperature readings were taken; as the probes descended, the temperature data acquisition continued . . . and these showed increases, **not** a decrease ala the expected thermodynamics of a greenhouse.

Point 2 : The other data acquisition conducted by the Venusian probes, **and this is very important**, was measurements of the solar irradiance or energy arriving from the Sun . . . the alleged culprit that heats Venus, allowing the other culprit, CO₂, to trap that solar heat; the so-called greenhouse effect.

As is well-known to Cornell astronomers, the behavior of solar heating of any planet or moon relies on the physical concept called albedo . . . NASA defines albedo as follows:

“Albedo is ratio of the light received by a body to the light reflected by that body. Albedo values range from 0 (pitch black) to 1 (perfect reflector).”

NASA lists the albedo of Venus as 0.84 . . . in my opinion a low estimate . . . this value states that of the 100% solar radiation reaching Venus (from the Sun), a full 84% is NOT absorbed to effect a greenhouse effect, but is instead reflected. **It would be like painting the roof of the greenhouse pictured above with a nice thick coat of white paint!**

Point 3 : Perhaps the most important rebuttal, to the fraud that Venus is suffering from a “runaway greenhouse effect,” is what is called energy flux. Applied to the planet Venus, this term refers not only to a magnitude of energy flow, but also to its direction.

As is well-known to Cornell astronomers . . . the amount of energy that is arriving from the Sun **TO** Venus is miniscule when compared to the energy, especially heat energy, that is being transmitted **FROM** Venus. In fact . . . the amount of heat energy coming from Venus is orders-of-magnitude higher than what is alleged to be sourced/caused by its alleged greenhouse effect:

Specifically, **the amount of heat pouring from Venus is internally generated . . . not externally stimulated by the 16% solar albedo / CO₂ greenhouse effect thesis. Venus is its own heat source!** To understand Venusian physics, its true genesis must be understood; Point 4 follows.

Point 4 : A recent headline/article in the NGO news media stated:

Hawking attacks Trump: US president will cause '250 degree temperatures - like VENUS'

Professor Stephen Hawking has sent a strong warning to President Donald Trump by stating the businessman-turned-politician's stance on environmental issues could DESTROY Earth and leave it with similar conditions to Venus.

Utterly shameless . . . the underlying implication promoted by Hawking, and the global warming condominium, is that 'Venus is a Sister Planet to Earth.' **It is not.** This scientifically baseless but highly subjective deployment amounts to psychosociological exploitation to the point of ponerology.



As a very brief introduction to this scientific fact, I have enclosed a dvd copy of a talk given by science writer and investigator Mr. Charles Ginenthal:



Mr. Ginenthal's talk is also widely available on the internet, please search: Charles Ginenthal on Venus.

The Farce that Venus is a “Sister Planet” to Earth - CONCLUSION

Perhaps the most compelling aspect of his presentation:

Mr. Ginenthal's talk was **not** in-refutation-to the “*Venus is a Sister Planet to Earth*” fairy tale. He was merely presenting the hard evidence regarding Venus' present state, and what that hard evidence reveals regarding its unique evolution.

But what is the learned position of Big Academia regarding these well-known, widely available facts about Venus? Given its status as a premier research university, with an enormous reputation for making substantive contributions to astronomy and cosmology, what is the historical source of the public position of my alma mater regarding Venus?

One prominent example, in his 1990 film *Cosmos*, Cornell Professor of Astronomy Dr. Carl Sagan refers to Venus as “*our sister planet*.” He openly admitted knowledge of the data from the Venera probes to Venus; a Soviet era program spanning 1961 to 1984. Despite this admission, Sagan falsely claimed:


“ The reason Venus is like Hell, seems to be what's called the Greenhouse Effect. Ordinary visible sunlight penetrates the clouds and heats the surface. But the dense atmosphere blankets the surface, and prevents it from cooling off to space. An atmosphere 90 times as dense as ours, made of carbon dioxide, water vapor, and other gases, lets in visible light from the Sun, but will not let out the infrared light radiated by the surface. So the temperature rises, and from the infrared radiation trickling out to space; just balances the sunlight reaching the surface. The Greenhouse Effect can make an Earth-like world into a planetary inferno ! ”

This self-contradictory yarn came from the person who admonished, “*Extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence!*” It is no surprise that atheist **Sagan was a notorious consort to Al Gore**, appearing innumerable times with him, asserting the ‘*CO2 equals global warming*’ dogma.

Directly refuting Sagan, we once-again could reference the book of Mr. Charles Ginenthal, ‘*Carl Sagan and Immanuel Velikovsky*’ provides details on what he called “**Sagan's Problems**,” dedicating nearly one hundred pages to Sagan's provably incorrect assertions **about Venus**, including but not limited to those involving Venusian evolution, its temperature, and the Sagan notion that the latter resulted from a “*runaway greenhouse effect*.” It did not.

The paper by Australian cosmologist, Wal Thornhill, ‘*Venus Is Not Our Twin*’ quotes many scientists, including Dr. Ross Taylor:

“ **You are not looking at a twin to the Earth at all. There are very many substantial differences ...The differences are so great it makes you wonder whether you could ever produce a twin of the Earth in some other solar system when you can't do it in your own.**”



A so-called “*runaway greenhouse effect*” did **not** take place on Venus. Venus is **not** a “*Sister Planet to Earth*.” And Venus is **not** an “*Evil Twin*.”

As an aside . . . the pundits that promote otherwise are the same that continue to promote the preposterous notion that comets are “*dirty snowballs*” made out of frozen carbon dioxide.

The Infrastructure and True Sustainability

I included the Cornell University Center for Sustainability (page 4) and a photo of a nearby nuclear power plant (page 12) as a segue into these related topics. But perspective on how these are denigrated by the NGO news media is needed.

After our withdrawal from the Paris Climate Accord, CNN ran a story:

India to sell only electric cars by 2030

by Jackie Wattles @jackiewattles

While the United States is walking away from the historic Paris Climate Agreement, India is making a bold vow to start selling only electric cars by 2030.

Note the insidious wording conveys (to the innocent) that withdrawal from the Paris Accord obviates our ability to electrify the fleet (!?). There is no connection whatsoever.

Is CNN reporter Jackie Wattles convinced that transportation manufacturers will cease-and-desist their electric vehicle engineering, manufacturing and marketing efforts because President Trump withdrew from a wealth transfer scheme that has zero impact on true environmental protection? Such as;

General Motors Company
Volkswagen Group
Hyundai Motor Company
Ford Motor Company
Daimler AG
BMW AG
Toyota Motor Corporation
Tesla Incorporated
SAIC Motor Corporation Limited
Honda Motor Company
FAW Group Corporation
Mazda Motor Corporation
Geely Holding Group (Volvo)
Fiat-Chrysler Automobiles
Kia Motor Corporation
Tata Motors
Dongfeng Motor Corporation
AvtoVAZ

This is a short list of those offering or are planning to offer full electric vehicles . . . regardless of the unrelated NGO media diatribe regarding withdrawal from the Paris Accord:

In truth, the Paris Accord does nothing to incentivize execution of the electric vehicle. As we will see below, given its irrelevance to true environmentalism, and made worse by its advocacy of a false energy sustainability strategy, Paris may even sabotage all three . . . The exact opposite of what CNN not-so-slyly promotes.

The notion vigorously promoted, in behalf of their suiters, by the NGO news media, that either of the following represents “sustainable energy,” especially in the context of the virtues and benefits of the full electric vehicle efforts is ludicrous at the level of grammar school arithmetic:



But it should not surprise you that this is exactly what the CNN attempts to do in connection with the recent and laudable headlines from India. In the article above, CNN embedded the following video:



My point is narrow and practical. The NGO news **innuendo** that India's *National Electric Mobility Mission Plan* will rely on solar or wind, as the energy sources for conversion of its transportation fleet to full electric, **is farcical**. The sun or the wind is no more robust in India than any other similar locations, the total energy from those sources on the most favorable days might energize 10% of their Plan.

The NGO news notion that conversion from the enormous energy contained in the hydrocarbon fuel (stored on-board the current vehicles which energize their internal combustion engines) will be accomplished with solar or wind sources is preposterous; at the level of grammar school arithmetic.

Again, my context is ‘the virtues and benefits of the full electric vehicle.’ I am not merely an advocate of electrifying the fleet, I am adamant about these efforts, and for many reasons.

But, contrary to the NGO media, if solar and wind is not the crux of India's *National Electric Mobility Plan*, what is? What is a truly sustainable energy source for these electric vehicle efforts?

To answer the question we must keep in mind what many pundits just gloss-over:

- The hydrocarbon fuels, used by the internal combustion engines of today's transportation fleet, contain **enormous** amounts of energy. The experts use terms such as Gasoline Gallon Equivalent (GGE) or Gasoline-Equivalent Gallon (GEG) to arrive at meaningful comparisons to what an electric vehicle would require for an equivalent transportation utility.
- As an estimate, a typical automobile has an on-board storage of gasoline of 20 gallons. Using the GGE conversions, this is an energy equivalent of 36,111 watt-hours, or 36 kwh.
- The US fleet of Vehicles-In-Operation (VIO), comprising passenger cars, light trucks, and heavy vehicles, is projected to be 269.7 million units in 2017. Of these, roughly 200 million comprise the first two categories, and are energized by hydrocarbon fuels.
- If these 200 million "light" units were converted to full electric, a single recharged to a GGE of 20 gallons of gasoline would require 7,200,000,000 kwh, or 7.2 tera-watt-hours.

Granted, the total fleet in India is miniscule by comparison, but even at their vehicle population levels, I am confident that Prime Minister Narendra Modi possesses superior arithmetic skills versus CNN.

One could ask, who might be opposed to a plan to convert the US fleet to full electric?



But in answer to the questions posed atop, I offer the following typical headlines, which the NGO media, such as CNN, overtly avoids:

Kudankulam Phase III enters design stage

02 August 2017

Russia and India's project to build units 5 and 6 at the Kudankulam nuclear power plant has entered the "practical implementation phase", ASE Group, the engineering division of Russian state nuclear corporation Rosatom, said yesterday. ASE Group includes Atomproekt, Atomstroyexport and ASE Joint Stock Engineering Company (formerly Atomenergoproekt).

China connects fourth unit at Fuqing

31 July 2017

Unit 4 of the Fuqing nuclear power plant in China's Fujian province has been connected to the grid, China National Nuclear Corporation (CNNC) announced today. The 1087 MWe CPR-1000 unit becomes the country's 37th operational power reactor.

Nuclear capacity could more than double by 2050, says IAEA

08 August 2017

The long-term potential of nuclear power remains high, according to the International Atomic Energy Agency's latest high case projection, which sees global nuclear generating capacity increasing 123% by 2050 compared with its current level.

Ghanaian reactor at full power after fuel conversion

11 August 2017

Ghana's research reactor has achieved full power operation following its conversion to run on low-enriched uranium (LEU) instead of highly-enriched uranium (HEU). It is the first of five such Chinese-supplied reactors outside of China to be converted.

US nuclear construction project to be abandoned

01 August 2017

Scana Corporation subsidiary South Carolina Electric & Gas (SCG&E) yesterday announced its decision to cease construction of two AP1000 reactors at VC Summer. The announcement followed co-owner Santee Cooper's decision to suspend construction because of projected completion delays and cost overruns. Scana is to file for regulatory permission to abandon the project.

On Saturday July 22, 2017, you commissioned for fleet service in 2020, “the 100,000-ton message to the world,” the USS Gerald R. Ford . . . the aircraft carrier CVN-78:



During tour of that technological marvel you observed that nearly all on-board systems are electrical or involve electrical energy. Everything from the touch-screen control panels, to the water desalinization and purification system, to the LED lighting systems, to . . . and this is truly indicative . . . the impressive new Electromagnetic Aircraft Launch System (EALS) . . . all require electrical energy.

The EALS was designed by General Atomics. A not-so-subtle fact is that the EALS is an electric motor; what we call a *linear motor*. Whereas, electric motors for conversion of the surface transportation fleet are rotary motors. But, at the level of electromagnetism, these two configurations are equivalent.

Probably the most impressive, and most relevant to this discussion, is on-board energy creation system, used to power all those electrical devices. Two all-new Bechtel Corporation A1B nuclear reactors are installed aboard the CVN-78. The A1B is 25% improved versus the A4W reactors they replace, with a total on-board energy generation capacity of 1.4 gigawatts! The expected refueling cycle is fifty . . . **that's 50 years!** The total capabilities of the A1B are classified, but these are cheaper, simpler, safer, more reliable, and lighter than its predecessors; which were already remarkable demonstrations by the American nuclear power industry and the United States Navy:

The twin A1B equipped CVN-78 makes it the most powerful Ford ever built.

(Admiral Hyman Rickover would be proud.)

But let us put that energy generation capacity on-board the USS Gerald R Ford of 1.4 gigawatts in perspective . . . the total *rated* nuclear power capability of the entire nation of Mexico is 1.6 gigawatts. The total number of registered automobiles and light trucks in Mexico is over 35 million:

With these two facts in mind, the (hypothetical) notion that Mexico could convert its ground transportation fleet to full electric, given that such would be recharged with electricity sourced to coal, natural gas, or petroleum fueled power plants is preposterous; such would portend an airborne pollution catastrophe.

But, again, pollution is not the priority of those that are tethered to the lunacy that “CO2 equals Global Warming,” and the even more absurd lie that CO2 is a pollutant. But even these pundits have begun to

understand the problems their zealotry has created . . . especially their derived notion that wind mills and solar panels are “sustainable.”

<http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/industry/energy/power/indias-answer-to-donald-trump-on-climate-is-nuclear-power/articleshow/59063067.cms>

Like Trump, Modi came into office promising to boost local manufacturing, and he wants to use nuclear power to further his “Make in India” campaign. India has 22 reactors, almost all designed by state-owned Nuclear Power Corp. of India Ltd. (NPCIL) and built by companies such as L&T. “Our domestically designed reactors are the core of our nuclear strategy,” says Atomic Energy Secretary Sekhar Basu.

The world’s third-biggest producer of carbon emissions, India sees nuclear power as a way to reduce dependence on coal-burning power plants, which supply almost 60 percent of its electricity. (Nuclear accounts for less than 2 percent at present.) Modi wants to position himself as a leader in the fight against climate change at a time when the global effort is under attack from President Trump. In his June 1 announcement that the U.S. will withdraw from the Paris agreement, Trump said the deal fa ..

Arctic and Antarctic Ice

Demostarte the dishoenty of ngo media

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BOjLOgH-ZHc>

To the unfamiliar it could seem that I am being harsh on my alma mater, Cornell University. Perhaps, but only to the extent that we should not “spare the rod.”

As any Cornellian will tell you, our alma mater is a very special place, it is cherished, and has a very special place in our hearts.

In other words, my alma mater is not merely worthy of saving from misdeeds, it openly seeks that input from its alumni in-particular, and does so like no other.



Far ahead of educational institutions, if not the world at-large, Cornell is world famous for its pursuit of equality for all . . . a pursuit that is not merely some recent trendy phraseology, but an actual steadfast practice that was implicit to its founder and founding in 1865.

In fact its openness to criticism is completely consistent with and implicit-to its founding creed:

“I would found an institution where any person can find instruction in any study,”

In the documentary that celebrated Cornell University's 150th Anniversary, Dean of the Law School, Eduardo Peñalver explains:



“ When A. D. White was helping Ezra Cornell, he talked about founding a university that would make the most highly prized instruction available to anyone regardless of sex or color. He said that in 1862 (!) when there is a war being fought over whether one human being could own another human being because of their color, and when women could not own property if they were married, and could not vote.

The inclusion of things like engineering and agriculture in the founding vision of the University, I think really grounded the unpretentiousness, the practical concerns. It is an elite school but it is an inclusive school at the same time, and it lacks that sort of pretentious air of other elite institutions, and I think it really gives it a distinctive identity and a distinctive culture that I find very appealing . . . ”



There are many speakers featured in the documentary '*Glorious to View*,' including Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg. But my connecting of these matters to the Cornell Law School begins, and is merely introduced, by sections of the cover letter:

- Their Unbridled Vileness Pages 14 thru 18
- Upcoming Tyrannical Censorship of Climate Science Instigated by NGOs (Yad Vashem, Climate Bolsheviks, and Big Academia) Pages 19 thru 24
- Personalized Observations Pages 27 thru 28
- Personalized Question Page 28

The latter repeated here:

What would motivate Yad Vashem, Big Academia, and the NGO media to tolerate the vile exploitation demonstrated by the charlatans sampled on page 15 thru 18 and 22 above? What would be the overriding motivation of these interests, which permit them to tolerate the denigration of the "Holocaust"? A denigration through the blatant misuse of such regarding a subject area (climate science) that is utterly unrelated? **This complicit behavior, which is most egregious by-definition at Big Academia, has been going on for decades . . .**



Your last breath ??

Then connect to the next attachment

END OF DOCUMENT

15 August 2017

President Donald J. Trump
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Ave NW
Washington, DC 20500
202-456-1111

- Subject 1: Withdrawal from the Paris Climate Accord**
- Subject 2: My “Simple Question” Remains Officially Unanswered**
- Subject 3: Upcoming Tyrannical Censorship of Climate Science Instigated by NGOs**
- Subject 4: Proposal for True Sustainability : Electrification of the Ground Transportation Fleet**

Electronic Copy Available at: <http://pvsheridan.com/Sheridan2Trump-4-15August2017.pdf>