

A Vote Against the New York State Climate Action Council Draft Scoping Plan
By
Jed Dukett

I agree; unregulated pollution from fossil fuels causes our society to suffer. Toxic air and water pollutants like mercury, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, lead, and others cause asthma, other breathing difficulties, brain damage, heart problems, cancer, neurological disorders, and premature death.

In addition to the adverse health impacts on humans, these pollutants also degrade our environment. The 1990 Clean Air Act legislation led to significant reductions in toxic emissions. Yes, now, some 30-plus years later, our region, state, and Country's air and water are the cleanest since industrialization began.

The other good news is that our fossil fuel energy sector has been able to continue supporting our way of life while helping curb the toxic pollution they ignored throughout the 20th century. However, since the mid-2000s, advocacy to add carbon to the mix of toxins has gained significant traction with our leaders. In 2007, a 5-4 vote in the Supreme Court effectively labeled carbon as a pollutant and was a considerable achievement for climate change advocates.

Yet, in 1990, reasonable scientists did not accept the precept that carbon could significantly affect our planet's energy and climate processes. And as such, support for adding carbon as a pollutant to clean air laws did not rise to the level of other criteria toxins.

Many of these scientists, who now keep to themselves, support the premise that human-made and natural carbon in our atmosphere are in constant flux. The day-day, week-week, month-month, and annual changes from cloud formation to volcanic activity and natural aerosols drive what we see as a dynamic global energy process. Examining our climate in this regard leaves little concern for human-made carbon in our atmosphere as it is an insignificant part of much larger climatic interactions.

We also see the uncertainty in climate models and the indoctrination of extreme weather events placed upon the people as a perversion of the scientific method. And it is with this understanding you realize that talk of carbon footprints is an unfortunate pursuit of fear placed on the public.

A belief in climate change requires assuming that global atmosphere energy processes never change. That premise allows the imagination to pretend the weather is more extreme than at any other time in history. It is not; for example, look honestly at the temperature from the 1930s.

Nevertheless, once you accept this unperturbed, perfect natural climate precept, you can shelve macro and massive sun-driven processes and tinker with nonsensical climate models associated with human carbon footprints.

Dr. Roy Spencer says that *"climate scientists simply assume that the climate system has been in perfect, long-term harmonious balance, if not for humans. This is a pervasive, quasi-religious*

assumption of the Earth science community for as long as I can remember. But this position is largely an anthropocentric statement of faith."

And you know what, when you accept precepts and assumptions about our climate system and place humans and carbon as the villain, one can see the precision of the argument. It might be wrong, but at least precise.

So when you hear that climate change science is "settled," please know that a requirement at the core of this understanding is faith, along with some weather imagination, regarding uncertain fundamental processes of our climate system.

In addition, the irony I have found in examining climate change is that climate change scientists will report the massive complexity and uncertainty of our climate system while claiming that the Science is "settled!"

Further, another interesting find in the climate change literature is the acknowledgment that it is NOT even fossil fuels that lead the way as the primary carbon source. Nope, what the literature says is that we humans are the issue. Just being born is the most significant contributor of carbon to our planet.

The journal of environmental research letters concluded¹ that population control is far more effective relative to the next closest carbon reduction choice. Not having children overshadows buying green energy, a more efficient car, eating a plant-only diet, upgrading light bulbs, etc.

A few years ago, a news agency printed the opinion piece: *"Science proves kids are bad for Earth. Morality suggests we stop having them."* The author says that scientists have determined that having a child *"is one of the worst things you can do for the environment."*

Yet, New York State does not mention population control and birth reductions in the 341-page draft scoping climate action plan to save us from ourselves. Did our climate leaders fail to do a thorough state of the science review?

Climate change science points to population control as the leading carbon reduction tool. So, why is New York State tinkering with heat pumps and windmills? Why is population control not in the draft scoping plan?

Is it to keep quiet because of a concern, such as the defamation of fellow climate change advocate and famed documentary filmmaker Michael Moore suffered at the hands of his peers? Apparently, in his 2020 release of the film *Planet Of The Humans*, Moore didn't follow the tribes talking points on climate change. He pulled the curtain back too fast and subsequently took the logic of increasing carbon to its precise place. Yes, Moore did his homework and correctly chased the rabbit down the hole.

So what will our kids be taught in schools as time goes on relative to the "Clean Green Schools" and the "outreach," "education," and "awareness" which is in the New York plan? Will they be shamed from starting families?

July 1st is the deadline for comments² as New York State leaders are about to take us off a cliff regarding our energy needs. You don't scrub the carbon from natural gas like we did the sulfur from coal and still get energy. Once our leaders demonize carbon, it is game over for fossil fuels. And that is when the poorest among us suffer the most. And what comes after that is even more concerning. I suggest you comment!

1. Wynes, Seth and Nicholas, Kimberly A. The climate mitigation gap: education and government recommendations miss the most effective individual actions. *Environmental Research Letters*. 12 (2017) 074024.
2. <https://climate.ny.gov/Draft-Scoping-Plan>