


"An occasional newsletter to share ideas and insights on current topics."

Energy Policy Planning Stalls Out...

The past several issues discussed a 10-year plan for Energy Self-Reliance. It had three parts: 1) For the long term, we need alternate energy sources. 2) For the medium term, we need to find more oil and develop better sources of supply. 3) For the short term we need **solid** science and to let the market run its course, not subsidies and tariffs to promote corn-based ethanol. Copies of these newsletters are posted on my website.



Eventually, America must move to affordable energy alternatives. The trick is when and how to do this in a way that makes sense and can be implemented without bankrupting us. As it turns out, none of this matters. Discussion of energy or economic policy is blocked by Gore's widely accepted Dangerous Anthropogenic Global Warming (DAGW) end-of-the-world theory.

Gore's message of fear is primarily emotional – few favor drowning polar bears or polluting the planet – but it comes wrapped in an envelope of pseudoscience and has a huge political and economic impact. My next few issues will take a skeptical look at energy and climate realities.

The inconvenient truth about *An Inconvenient Truth*

You'll probably be surprised to learn Al Gore's Oscar-winning movie was a pirated remake. Gore used Hollywood special effects (borrowed from a high-budget film, [The Day After Tomorrow](#)) for political propaganda. It worked, but global warming is timeworn.



[1958 - Global Warming - It's NOT newly known](#)

For **FIFTY YEARS** scientists have known about global warming. This excerpt is from the well known educational documentary [Unchained Goddess](#) produced by Frank Capra for Bell Labs for their television program "The Bell Telephone Hour." It was so well made that it went on to live a continued life in middle school science classrooms across the nation for decades. It's the same theme as Gore's movie.

An interesting question is, "Why did this film fade from public awareness?" Probably because there was exceptional cold in the late 60s and the public shifted from fearing global warming to worrying about an ice age. History repeats. When you get past the headlines, most stories labeled "global warming" are about hurricanes, floods, bird migrations, blizzards, etc.

The Earth warmed about 0.8 degrees Fahrenheit during the 20th Century as we recovered from the Little Ice Age of the 19th Century. There has been no dangerous global warming, nor is it likely.

In the United States, the warmest recent years were during the Dust Bowl of the 1930's. Since 2001 there has been a decrease in global temperature. It's getting cooler, not warmer.

The Political Situation

There are many scientists who are skeptical of Gore's theory, so many that there is a book about the nasty efforts to discredit and suppress skeptics, [The Deniers](#). Thousands have signed petitions opposing the Kyoto Treaty. Despite this both political parties, the UN, the media, and most of the public believe Gore's propaganda. Demagoguery trumps debate.

Carbon-Based Stealth Taxes

Given that the future is not "provable," the key question is if **you** should be concerned enough to become a skeptic and judge truth for yourself. Complicating this task is that our educational system is now training children to believe CO₂ (the gas of life) is a "pollutant" (it's not) and that Gore's extraordinary claims of impending global destruction are based on real science. Both these claims are debatable: An honest debate is urgently needed if we are to save the environment and Western civilization from the environmental extremists and socialists.

If Gore is correct that a Global Apocalypse caused by DAGW is imminent, well, then, perhaps the extreme measures he suggests are justified. In that case reasonable questions would be 1) What could we do to prevent this? 2) What effect is action likely to have? and 3) What's the cost?

Alternately, if Gore's assertions are false, then we must ask why the people in power are putting so much effort into spreading fear to allow radical policy. That answer is becoming clear: It's about taxes to fund massive socialism. One good book is [Blue Planet in Green Shackles](#).

"Carbon Cap and Trade" is planned to be the biggest, broadest tax system since the Roman Empire. Implementing this policy is near at hand. It is how Washington plans to get \$ trillions in new taxes (on 100% of Americans) to pay for big government, and how the UN seeks to fulfill its dream of eliminating national sovereignty and forcing major global wealth redistribution.

<http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,510937,00.html> ; <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB123655590609066021.html>

A History Lesson

"Imagine that there is a new scientific theory that warns of an impending crisis, and points to a way out. This theory quickly draws support from leading scientists, politicians, and celebrities around the world. Research is funded by distinguished philanthropies, and carried out at prestigious universities. The crisis is reported frequently in the media. The science is taught in college and high school classrooms.

I don't mean global warming. I'm talking about another theory, which rose to prominence a century ago. Its supporters included Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and Winston Churchill. It was approved by Supreme Court justices Oliver Wendell Holmes and Louis Brandeis, who ruled in its favor. The famous names who supported it included Alexander Graham Bell, inventor of the

telephone; activist Margaret Sanger; botanist Luther Burbank; Leland Stanford, founder of Stanford University; the novelist H. G. Wells; the playwright George Bernard Shaw; and hundreds of others. Nobel Prize winners gave support.

Research was backed by the Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations. The Cold Springs Harbor Institute was built to carry out this research, but important work was also done at Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Stanford, and Johns Hopkins. Legislation to address the crisis was passed in states from New York to California. These efforts had the support of the National Academy of Sciences, the American Medical Association, and the National Research Council.

It was said that if Jesus were alive, he would have supported this effort. All in all, the research, legislation, and molding of public opinion surrounding the theory went on for almost half a century. Those who opposed the theory were shouted down and called reactionary, blind to reality, or just plain ignorant. But in hindsight, what is surprising is that so few people objected. Today, we know that this famous theory that gained so much support was actually pseudoscience. The crisis it claimed was nonexistent. And the actions taken in the name of this theory were morally and criminally wrong. Ultimately, they led to the deaths of millions of people.

The theory was eugenics, and its history is so dreadful—and, to those who were caught up in it, so embarrassing—that it is now rarely discussed. But it is a story that should be well known to every citizen, so that its horrors are not repeated.

The theory of eugenics postulated a crisis of the gene pool leading to the deterioration of the human race. The best human beings were not breeding as rapidly as the inferior ones—the foreigners, immigrants, Jews, degenerates, the unfit, and the “feeble minded.” Francis Galton, a respected British scientist, first speculated about this area, but his ideas were taken far beyond anything he intended. They were adopted by science-minded Americans, as well as those who had no interest in science but who were worried about the immigration of inferior races early in the twentieth century—“dangerous human pests” who represented “the rising tide of imbeciles” and who were polluting the best of the human race. The eugenicists and the immigrationists joined forces to put a stop to this.

The plan was to identify individuals who were feeble-minded—Jews were agreed to be largely feeble-minded, but so were many foreigners, as well as blacks—and stop them from breeding by isolation in institutions or by sterilization. As Margaret Sanger said, “Fostering the good-for-nothing at the expense of the good is an extreme cruelty...there is no greater curse to posterity than that of bequeathing them an increasing population of imbeciles.” She spoke of the burden of caring for “this dead weight of human waste.” Such views were widely shared. H. G. Wells spoke against “ill-trained swarms of inferior citizens.” Theodore Roosevelt said that “Society has no business to permit degenerates to reproduce their kind.” Luther Burbank: “Stop permitting criminals and weaklings to reproduce.” George Bernard Shaw said that only eugenics could save mankind.

There was overt racism in this movement, exemplified by texts such as **The Rising Tide of Color Against White World Supremacy**, by American author Lothrop Stoddard. But, at the time, racism was considered an unremarkable aspect of the effort to attain a marvelous goal—the improvement of humankind in the future. It was this avant-garde notion that attracted the most liberal and progressive minds of a generation. California was one of twenty-nine American states to pass laws

allowing sterilization, but it proved the most forward-looking and enthusiastic—more sterilizations were carried out in California than anywhere else in America. Eugenics research was funded by the Carnegie Foundation, and later by the Rockefeller Foundation. The latter was so enthusiastic that (support continued) even after the center of the eugenics effort moved to Germany, and involved the gassing of individuals from mental institutions....

After World War II, nobody was a eugenicist, and nobody had ever been a eugenicist. Biographers of the celebrated and the powerful did not dwell on the attractions of this philosophy to their subjects, and sometimes did not mention it at all. Eugenics ceased to be a subject for college classrooms, although some argue that its ideas continue to have currency in disguised form.

But in retrospect, three points stand out. First, despite the construction of Cold Springs Harbor Laboratory, despite the efforts at universities and the pleadings of lawyers, there was no scientific basis for eugenics. In fact, nobody at that time knew what a gene really was. The movement was able to proceed because it employed vague terms never rigorously defined. “Feeble-mindedness” could mean anything from poverty and illiteracy to epilepsy. Similarly, there was no clear definition of “degenerate” or “unfit.” Second, the eugenics movement was really a social program masquerading as a scientific one. What drove it was concern about immigration and racism and undesirable people moving into one’s neighborhood or country. Once again, vague terminology helped conceal what was really going on. Third, and most distressing, the scientific establishment in both the United States and Germany did not mount any sustained protest....”

Michael Crichton, [State of Fear](#), 2004
APPENDIX I, Why Politicized Science Is Dangerous
Note: The Kindle Version is available now

Show Me the Money

Those of us who are skeptical of Gore’s theory are frequently accused of being paid off by large corporate interests. I’ve spoken with scientists about this and have discovered I have a problem. I can’t locate these lucrative payoffs. ***If you find some of this money, please send it over.***

I’ll be writing more about “climate confusion” in the future. Here are some links to ponder:

http://www.americanthinker.com/2009/01/co2_fairytales_in_global_warmi.html

<http://www.petitionproject.org/>

http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/comment/columnists/chris_ayres/article6011157.ece

You are encouraged to copy or forward this newsletter...

The Business Innovation Newsletter is published by The Trudel Group, 1102 N. Springbrook Road, # 281, Newberg, OR 97132. Telephone 503-538-1169; email <mailto:jtrudel@trudelgroup.com> or <http://www.trudelgroup.com/>. ©2009, John D. Trudel. **Forwarding or quotation with attribution including contact information is encouraged.**

All information is of a general nature and is not intended or presented to replace individual counsel or services. Sources of information are reliable, but accuracy cannot be guaranteed. We welcome comments and strive for objective nonpartisanship.



“Kyoto is essentially a socialist scheme to suck money out of wealth-producing nations.”

Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper, 2002

“The best way to destroy our nation without bullets and bombs is to attack our energy producing facilities. This agenda is masked in stories of doom and fear regarding the risks of energy production. What is left out of the discussion are the benefits of energy to our society.”

Dr. Mike Fox, *The Fox Report*
Private Communication 3/27/09

John D. Trudel -- Consultant and Professor Emeritus, Inventor, Engineer, Author, and Novelist.

Note: If you got this by post or forwarded, please send us an email address. **To get full information and citations, you need an electronic copy with the links.** Our mail lists are confidential, and you will be immediately removed upon request. THANK YOU.

The Trudel Group
1102 N. Springbrook Road, # 281
Newberg, OR 97132

Forwarding and Address Correction is Requested.