

Proposal: A War on Global Warming

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.chem/2004-12/1074.html>

From: R Philip Dowds (*rpdowns_at_earthlink.net*)

Date: 12/18/04

Date: Sat, 18 Dec 2004 20:47:47 GMT

In a prior post (Little Green Idiots ...) I tackled the related topics of "theory", "science", "proof", "certainty", and so on. I will not repeat that material here, but instead I will originate a new topic: I propose that the United States launch a War on Global Warming.

I make this proposal because we like war. In terms of finding good wars to fight, this War on Global Warming, I assert, will be even better than the War on Terrorism and the War in Iraq. Why? Well ...

(1) The current evidence for, or the "proof" of, the existence of human-induced global warming is significantly better than the pre-invasion evidence of Mr Hussein's WMD's. And,

(2) Plagiarizing the reasoning of the Bush Administration, we can't afford to be wrong. In other words, while the magnitude of the threat may be difficult to estimate or "prove", the horrific consequences of underestimating global warming will be even more devastating than the horrific consequences of underestimating Iraq.

So, to start this war, we don't need certitude or "proof", we just need circumstances at least as threatening as those of the Hussein regime. These, we have. So let's get started.

What will we do? Invade General Motors, and halt the production of the private automobile? This may be too extreme even for aggressive conservatives, so I would propose we ramp up in a more systematic way.

First, bureaucracy: Just as we've created a Department of Homeland Security, let's create a Department of Climate Stabilization, having pretty much comparable powers and funding.

Second, information management: Just as we've reformed and coordinated foreign intelligence gathering (ask the President, we done did it!), let's do the same with climate data. Let's centralize data gathering and analysis on climate change, pulling in information from all over the world, and start to assemble a comprehensive national database that will settle once and for all what's really going on with the climate.

Third, funding: We're spending \$50 billion a year on the War in Iraq. We should be spending the same amount, or more, on the War on Global

sci.chem: Proposal: A War on Global Warming

Warming. If Chicago gets several million a year from the feds to thwart terrorists, it should get at least that amount to help thwart dependence on fossil fuel combustion.

Fourth, public relations and awareness: A soldier thinks his ride doesn't have enough armor? Well, OK, but if this is front page news, then let's see a equally prominent companion story about a techno-geek who thinks maintenance of African weather monitoring stations is inadequate. Every story about killed marines should be accompanied about by another dramatizing the premature death of people afflicted by bad air (15,000 a year, according to some sources — let's support both our troops and our lung breathers).

Well, it's a start. Can we win the War on Global Warming? I'd say we can do at least as well as we're doing in Iraq, where no matter what happens, we insist we're winning. At least with global warming, we'll have some actual, verifiable metrics to monitor. Who says we can fight only one war at a time?

RPD / Cambridge

“The enemy isn't conservatism. The enemy isn't liberalism. The enemy is bullshit.” Lars-Erik Nelson.