



Contract with Central Ohioans

Where I stand:

Global Warming and Carbon Taxation

With friends like Al Gore, working Americans don't need enemies. Just as the coal, steel, auto, mining and manufacturing sectors of our economy begin to regain their footing, Al Gore and the environmental extremists threaten to take it all away. Just when consumers and the economy are pushed to the point of breaking due to record high food, gas and electric prices, Al Gore and the environmental extremists promise to make matters worse. Will the Unions and poor once again sit back silently while the Democrats betray their base, or will they support candidates like me that will help protect their interests? We have already seen how the environmentalists' opposition to drilling in ANWR has prevented the creation of thousands of high paying and secure union jobs, as well as a funding source for alternative energy research. One only needs to look at the catastrophic decline of union job opportunities as they have blindly given their support to the Democrats and their anti-free-market, anti-growth, anti-competitive policies. In his book "Earth in the Balance" Al Gore dreams of eliminating the internal combustion engine and with it all those high paying union jobs and workers. I support global warming policies that put America first, not some highly speculative science supported and promoted mainly by scientists that stand to gain research grants and the UN which is an organization that stands to benefit richly from its man-made cause conclusion. It appears to me now that the Food-for-Oil money has run out, the UN needs another source of money to fund their corruption. It isn't cheap to run an organization that sits back and debates while genocide occurs in Darfur, opposes our efforts in Iraq and provides a platform for third world dictators to foment hatred of America.

How does America benefit? I can see how Al Gore, the UN and the Democratic Party benefit, but my question is how does America benefit from signing these global agreements were we pay nearly all the costs? How does America benefit from paying more for a gallon of gas? How does America benefit from lower coal sales and higher electric bills? How does America benefit from lowered competitiveness and loss of job opportunities? How does America benefit from higher inflation and unemployment? How does American benefit for sitting back and watching as China and India race past us on the world economy? The benefit are purely speculative, but the costs are huge and 100% certain.

Global warming supporters are fond of talking about the “benefits” of lowered carbon emissions, but has anyone bothered to look at the costs? I have seen estimates all over the place, and history proves that cost estimates of government programs are almost always greatly underestimated, so keep that in mind when I use the estimate I found most frequently; 5% of GDP annually. In real terms that is \$700 billion, or \$2,333/year for every man, woman and child EACH YEAR. The question to American isn't do we want to save the environment, we all do, the real question is, are there better uses for that 700 billion dollars annually than pulling CO2 out of the atmosphere and putting our workers out of their jobs? 700 million dollars a year could go towards creating new jobs, not destroying them, funding a school scholarship program for our inner-city children, funding alternative energy research, preserving forests and wetlands, providing health care for our needy, shoring up entitlements, paying down the federal debt, supporting a tax cut, funding the war on terror, buying Barbara Streisand a small environmentally friendly shack in Montana to replace her ecoun-friendly mansion or Al Gore a Prius so he doesn't have to pollute so much flying in his Jet, or a whole host of other higher priority and socially beneficial programs. In fact I can't think of anything that should be lower on our national priority list than removing CO2 from the atmosphere, and yet it is a top priority to Democrats. That is understandable because if I were like the Democrats and didn't have an answer to education, entitlements, the federal deficit, the war on terror and almost any other pressing issue I would make one up where I could claim to have an answer, an answer that can't be tested and occurs 50 years in the future, and that in my opinion is just what the Democrats have done.

Carbon dioxide is the essential byproduct of LIFE. We are as Spock describes us “carbon life forms.” Mother Nature produces over 95% of all atmospheric CO2, and regulates it based on natural principles, not politics. For the last three plus years I have studied the “science” behind global warming, and authored “The Twenty Nine (and growing) Smoking Guns of Global Warming” downloadable from our website, so I don't just make these claims without providing the evidence to support my position. I, unlike Al Gore, have sought out public debate on this issue so as to educate the public on the truth behind the “science” of global warming. I have given countless presentations, appeared on radio talk shows and numerous Manhattan Neighborhood Network cable access shows debating UN scientists and Harvard physicists on this issue. My research has lead me to one conclusion---that the theory of global warming caused by increased manmade atmospheric CO2 is far from proven, and the claim that there is any “consensus” on a any forecast model, climate or not, is absurd. Having been a portfolio manager who reads countless market forecasts, I can assure you, forecast models aren't worth the paper they are written on. Wall Street spends billions of dollars and hirers the world's greatest minds trying to model the relatively simple Dow Jones Industrial Index and fail miserably. If we can't forecast the Dow Jones Industrial Index or even the weather one week into the future, there is no way anyone can forecast the infinitely more complex climate 100, 50 or even 10 years into the future. Believe me, if these climatologists could model something as sophisticated as the global climate anywhere near the 90% accuracy they claim, they would all be multi-billionaires from trading weather futures in a manner that would make Hillary's success in trading cattle futures look like child's play.

I know all this is contrary to what you have been told to believe, so don't take my word for it, simply download my presentation and make your own conclusions.

http://www.robertwagner08.com/global_warming.php

In closing, I offer you a way for you to prove to yourself the problem with the “consensus” global warming theory, and all it takes is a two liter bottle of Pepsi.

Step 1) Chill a two liter bottle of Pepsi

Step 2) Ensure the room is completely quiet

Step 3) Listen very carefully as you unscrew the cap on the bottle. You should hear a “pssst” as the CO₂ escapes.

Step 4) Screw the cap back on the bottle and wait 5 minutes. You may shake it or warm it a bit if time is short.

Step 5) Ensure the room is completely quiet

Step 6) Listen very carefully as you unscrew the cap on the bottle a second time. You should hear a “pssst” as the CO₂ escapes.

What that second “pssst” represents is 700 billion dollars annually being flushed down the proverbial environmentally friendly low flow toilet. What you just witnessed was Henry’s Law in action. Henry’s Law defines the absorption of a gas in a liquid. If there is too much CO₂ in the atmosphere of the bottle, the Pepsi absorbs it, if there is too little, the Pepsi releases it until a steady state or balance is reached. The oceans are the world’s Pepsi bottles, and they act as the globe’s hemoglobin, but instead of adjusting the level of O₂, they adjust the atmospheric concentration of CO₂. Unless Al Gore has somehow found a way to repeal Henry’s Law, any reduction of atmospheric CO₂ by man will simply be balance by Mother Nature releasing more CO₂ from her oceans. America can’t afford to spend 700 billion dollars a year only to discover that our chemistry books were right all along, and Henry’s and other natural laws trump politics every time. If the Democrats want to be known as the “party of science” then they might want to brush up on the basics.

WWW.RobertWagner08.COM
WWW.robertwagner08.com/contribute.php

Paid for by Robert Wagner for Congress, Bill Jacob Treasurer