

Making America Greater by Approving the PCCS

Not to date myself, but in my day, the “\$64,000 Question” represented a lot of money!

Today I’m proposing to you a \$64 Trillion question:

“Should the US do a scientific investigation of the Global Warming issue?”

That’s what is being proposed by President Trump’s Senior Director for Emerging Technologies, National Security Council. Specifically, a brand new *Presidential Committee on Climate Science* (PCCS) will do this analysis. I’m writing this as the decision about the PCCS will be made in the next few days.

(BTW, for the sake of brevity – and to use the term commonly employed – when I say “Global Warming” here, I’ll mean climate changes primarily caused by man-made activities.)

It seems like the obvious answer to the \$64 Trillion question is YES, of course – but several parties are saying NO. What are their arguments, and do they hold water?

1) It’s a waste of money. If the US was about to spend an enormous amount of money, would you say that an investigation costing *one-billionth(!)* of the expenditure, would be a waste of money? That’s what we are talking about here.

2) It’s a waste of time. President Trump has already stated that (without new facts) he’s not going to do anything consequential regarding Global Warming. So since the US is in a holding period on this issue, how is any time being wasted?

In fact, since the President is asking for an independent investigation, the end result could be that the PCCS would recommend that the President take a *different* Global Warming policy position. One would think those clamoring for exactly that would be ecstatic!

3) It has already been scientifically resolved. Simply not so. FYI a genuine scientific assessment has four necessary components: **a)** comprehensive, **b)** objective, **c)** transparent, *and* **d)** empirical. There has never been a true scientific assessment of the Global Warming issue, anywhere on the planet.

What about the position of 97% of the world’s scientists? A good question. **Fact one:** there never has been a survey of the world’s 2+ million scientists on anything.

Fact two: There may indeed be a majority of certain subsets of scientists that hold an opinion about Global Warming. However, none of them has done a genuine scientific analysis of the Global Warming matter. **Fact three:** Science is never determined by a vote. Do you think that Einstein’s *Theory of Relativity* was accepted due to a poll – or because of scientific proof?

What about the UN IPCC's voluminous [Assessment Reports](#)? Another good question. If we compare the reports to the four necessary Science requirements, they actually fail on at least **three** of the four criteria!

If the Global Warming proponents' scientific arguments are as unassailable as they say they are, then would relish this high-profile opportunity to publicly upstage the skeptics. *On the other hand...*

4) Global Warming is a national security threat. This is another three-card-monte trick being played on the technically-challenged public. For example, studies have concluded that there is little correlation with extreme weather events (e.g. hurricanes, tornadoes, floods) and Global Warming.

On the other hand one of the key "solutions" to Global Warming (industrial wind energy), has a well-documented history of interfering with the missions and operational readiness of our military. *Where is the outcry against that?*

5) President Trump is acting irrationally regarding Global Warming. Surprisingly, President Trump, as a skeptic, is actually taking a more scientific position than many scientists who hold PhDs. Skepticism is the primary pillar of Science, so being labelled a "skeptic" is high praise to real scientists.

Unless we pay close attention, it may not be apparent that the Left is frequently in favor of exactly the **opposite** to what they are saying. For example:

The people who say they want more unity — are actually instigating divisiveness.

The people who say they are protectors of the environment — are (if truth be told) ravaging the environment.

The people who say immediate extraordinary changes are needed to prevent global catastrophe — are promoting feeble, inadequate solutions (like wind energy).

So when these same people clamor that they want President Trump to *reverse* his position on Global Warming (and the *Paris Climate Accord*), in reality they actually want President Trump to *continue* with his present climate policies.

Why is that? Because they think that will give them some political ammunition against him in the 2020 election.

The bottom line is very simple here: The President should be applauded for proposing the PCCS, *and* for being open-minded enough to reconsider the important Global Warming matter.

john droz, jr.

physicist North Carolina "aaprjohn" at "northnet" dot "org" 3-7-19