

“Nine Articles About Climate Change”

This collection of nine articles is from the “Edifying the Body” section of the Church of God Big Sandy’s website (churchofgodbigandy.com). It was posted for the weekend of Dec. 30, 2023.

By John Stossel

NEW YORK CITY—As we approach the end on 2023, here is a collection of nine articles that discuss different aspects about the subject called climate change.



An article by John Stossel titled “Driving Electric Cars Produces Little Carbon; Making the Batteries [Produces] a Lot” was posted at reason.com on Nov. 2, 2022.

Many politicians who want to ban gas-powered vehicles appear to misunderstand the science.

Electric cars sales are up 66 percent this year.

President Joe Biden promotes them, saying things like, “The great American road trip is going to be *fully* electrified” and, “There’s no turning back.”

To make sure we have no choice in the matter, some left-leaning states have moved to ban gas-powered cars altogether.

California Gov. Gavin Newsom issued an executive order banning them by 2035. Oregon, Massachusetts, and New York copied California. Washington state’s politicians said they’d make it happen even faster, by 2030.

Thirty countries also say they’ll phase out gas-powered cars.

But this is just dumb. It will not happen. It’s magical thinking.

In my new video, I point out some “inconvenient” facts about electric cars—simple truths that politicians and green activists just don’t seem to understand.

“Electric cars are amazing,” says physicist Mark Mills of the Manhattan Institute. “But they won’t change the future in any significant way [as far as] oil use or carbon dioxide emissions.”

■ Inconvenient fact one: Selling more electric cars won't reduce oil use very much.

"The world has 15, 18 million electric vehicles now," says Mills. "If we [somehow] get to 500 million, that would reduce world oil consumption by about 10 percent. That's not nothing, but it doesn't end the use of oil."

Most of the world's oil is used by things like "airplanes, buses, big trucks, and the mining equipment that gets the copper to build the electric cars."

Even if all vehicles somehow did switch to electricity, there's another problem: Electricity isn't very green.

I laugh talking to friends who are all excited about their electric car, assuming it doesn't pollute. They go silent when I ask, "Where does your car's electricity come from?"

They don't know. They haven't even thought about it.

■ Inconvenient fact two: Although driving an electric car puts little additional carbon into the air, *producing* the electricity to charge its battery adds plenty. *Most* of America's electricity is produced by burning natural gas and coal. Just 12 percent comes from wind or solar power.

Auto companies don't advertise that. "Electric vehicles in general are better and more sustainable for the environment," says Ford's Linda Zhang in a BBC interview.

"She's a Ford engineer," I say to Mills. "She's not ignorant."

"She's not stupid," he replies. "But ignorance speaks to what you know. You have to mine, somewhere on earth, 500,000 pounds of minerals and rock to make one battery."

American regulations make mining difficult, so most of it is done elsewhere, polluting those countries. Some mining is done by children. Some is done in places that use slave labor.

Even if those horrors didn't exist, mining itself adds lots of carbon to the air.

"If you're worried about carbon dioxide," says Mills, "the electric vehicle has emitted 10 to 20 tons of carbon dioxide [from the mining, manufacturing, and shipping] before it even gets to your driveway."

"Volkswagen published an honest study [in which they] point out that the first 60,000 miles or so you're driving an electric vehicle, that electric vehicle will have emitted more carbon dioxide than if you just drove a conventional vehicle."

You would have to drive an electric car "100,000 miles" to reduce emissions by just "20 or 30 percent, which is not nothing, but it's not zero."

No, it's not.

If you live in New Zealand, where there's lots of hydro and geothermal power, electric cars pollute less. But in America, your "zero-emission vehicle" adds lots of greenhouse gases to the atmosphere.

Politicians and electric car sellers don't mention that. Most probably don't even know.

In a future column, three more inconvenient facts about electric cars.



An article by John Stossel titled "Electric Cars Are Good, but We Still Need Fossil Fuels" was posted at reason.com on Nov. 16, 2022.

Politicians praise electric cars. If everyone buys them, they say, solar and wind power will replace our need for oil.

But that's absurd.

Here is the rest of my list of "inconvenient facts" about electric cars.

"The future of the auto industry is electric," says President Joe Biden. He assumes a vast improvement in batteries. Better batteries are crucial because both power plants and cars need to store lots of electric power.

■ But here's inconvenient fact three: Batteries are lousy at storing large amounts of energy.

"Batteries leak, and they don't hold a lot," says physicist Mark Mills.

Mills thinks electric cars are great but explains that "oil begins with a huge advantage: 5,000 percent more energy in it per pound. Electric car batteries weigh 1,000 pounds. Those 1,000 pounds replace just 80 pounds of gasoline."

But future batteries will be better, I point out.

"Engineers are really good at making things better," Mills responds, "but they can't make them better than the laws of physics permit."

■ That's inconvenient fact four. Miracle batteries powerful enough to replace fossil fuels are a fantasy.

"Because nature is not nice to humans," explains Mills, "we store energy for when it's cold or really hot. People who imagine an energy transition want to build windmills and solar panels and store all that energy in batteries. But if you do the arithmetic, you find you'd need to build about a hundred trillion dollars' worth of batteries to store the same amount of energy that Europe has in storage now for this winter. It would take the world's battery factories 400 years to manufacture that many batteries."

Politicians don't mention that when they promise every car will be electric. They also don't mention that the electric *grid* is limited.

This summer, California officials were so worried about blackouts they asked electric vehicle owners to stop charging cars!

Yet today, few of California's cars are electric. Gov. Gavin Newsom ordered that *all* new cars must be electric by 2035! Where does he think he'll get the electricity to power them?

"Roughly speaking, you have to double your electric grid to move the energy out of gasoline into the electric sector," says Mills. "No one is planning to double the electric grid, so they'll be rationing."

Rationing. That means some places will simply turn off some of the power.

■ That's our final inconvenient fact: We just don't have enough electricity for all electric cars.

Worse, if (as many activists and politicians propose) we try to get that electricity from 100 percent renewable sources, the rationing would be deadly.

"Even if you cover the entire continent of the United States with solar panels, you wouldn't supply half of America's electricity," Mills points out.

Even if you added "Washington Monument-sized wind turbines spread over an area six times greater than the state of New York, that wouldn't be enough."

This is just math and physics. It's amazing supposedly responsible people promote impossible fantasies.

"It's been an extraordinary accomplishment of propaganda," complains Mills, "almost infantile distressing because it's so silly."

Even if people invent much better cars, wind turbines, solar panels, power lines, and batteries, explains Mills, "you're still drilling things, digging up stuff. You're still building machines that wear out. It's not magical transformation."

Even worse, today politicians make us pay more for energy while forcing us to do things that *hurt* the environment. Their restrictions on fossil fuels drive people to use fuels that pollute more.

In Europe: "They're going back to burning coal! What we've done is have our energy systems designed by bureaucrats instead of engineers," complains Mills. "We get worse energy, more expensive energy, and higher environmental impacts!"

I like electric cars. But I won't pretend that driving one makes me some kind of environmental hero.

"There'll be lots more electric cars in the future," concludes Mills. "There should be, because that'll reduce demand for oil, which is a good thing. But when you do the math, to operate a society with five or six billion people who are living in poverty we can't imagine, when you want to give them a little of what we have, the energy demands are off the charts big. We're going to need *everything*."

That includes fossil fuels.



An article by John Stossel titled "No, the World Is Not Heading Toward 'Mass Extinction' " was posted at reason.com on Jan. 25, 2023.

Have you heard? The world is about to end!

60 Minutes recently featured Paul Ehrlich, author of the bestseller, *The Population Bomb*. "Humanity is not sustainable," he said.

Why would *60 Minutes* interview Ehrlich?

For years, Ehrlich said, "We are very close to a famine" and, "In the next 15 years, the end will come." He's been wrong again and again.

Yet, *60 Minutes* takes him seriously. "Paul Ehrlich may have lived long enough to see some of his dire prophecies come true," intoned reporter Scott Pelley. Now, *60 Minutes* says, "scientists say" the earth is in the midst of a "mass extinction!"

Doom sells.

Ehrlich's book sold an amazing three million copies. It claimed the Earth's rising population would lead to worldwide famine.

The opposite happened.

The world's population more than doubled. But today there is *less* famine!

60 Minutes did mention that Ehrlich was wrong about widespread starvation, but they ignored his many other silly predictions. One was that by the year 2000 (because of climate change), England will not exist.

Ehrlich won't talk to me now, but seven years ago, when my producer asked him about his nonsense, Ehrlich said, "When you predict the future, you get things wrong."

The media should ignore doomsayers like Ehrlich, and pay more attention to people like Marian Tupy, editor of HumanProgress.org.

In my new video, Tupy points out that “life is getting better.” The modern era has brought much longer lives and the greatest decline in poverty ever.

Of course, universities, media, and politicians say capitalism is destroying the earth, so young people throw soup on famous paintings. It’s the moral thing to do, they believe, because we face an apocalypse!

“If you sell the apocalypse,” says Tupy, “people feel like you are deep and that you care” But “if you are selling rational optimism, you sound uncaring.”

Uncaring? It’s the doomsayers who are anti-people. Ehrlich once even floated the idea of sterilizing people and reducing population growth by having government poison our food.

“Ehrlich sees human beings as destroyers rather than creators,” says Tupy, “no different from rabbits. When they consume all grass around us, their population explodes, but then it’s going to collapse. But human beings are fundamentally different. We have the capacity to innovate.”

It’s counterintuitive to think that people can be good for the environment. “We use stuff,” I say to Tupy.

“We use stuff, but we also grow stuff,” he responds. “What matters is new knowledge. Think about something as simple as sand. When we started melting down sand to create glass, we used the first glass for glass beads. Now we create microchips.”

Similar innovation in farming, transportation, and genetic engineering is why our growing population doesn’t destroy nature.

“Forests have grown by 35 percent in North America and Western Europe in the last 20 years,” Tupy points out.

That’s because innovative humans found ways to produce more food on less land. Also, prosperous countries can afford to protect nature.

But this idea that human innovation *helps* nature is nowhere near as popular as the idea that humans destroy earth.

Many young people are so misled that many don’t want to have kids.

But that would *hurt* the world! Fewer women having babies today is probably more of a threat than climate change. Not only do we need young people to take care of the growing number of us old people, we need them to invent the things that will solve the Earth’s problems.

More children means more people who might grow up to cure cancer or invent a carbon-eating machine.

However, more people by itself is not enough to provide the innovation we need.

“Certainly not,” says Tupy. “If the number of people was all that mattered, China would have been the richest country for centuries. What you need is people, and freedom. If you let human beings be free, they will create more value for everyone.”



An article by John Stossel titled “The Push to Eliminate Fossil Fuels Is Hurting Poor People” was posted at reason.com on April 19, 2023.

Earth Day is Saturday! Hooray?

“Saving humanity from the climate crisis,” says EarthDay.org, requires us to “push away from the dirty fossil fuel economy.”

Sounds logical.

But my latest video explains why doing that is cruel to poor people.

“Three billion people in the world still use less electricity than a typical refrigerator,” explains Alex Epstein, author of *The Moral Case for Fossil Fuels*. If they’re going to have “their first well-paying jobs . . . their first consistent supply of clean water . . . a modern life . . . that’s going to depend on fossil fuels.”

But the greens say we have a better replacement: wind and solar power.

So I push back at Epstein: “Solar is getting cheaper all the time. It’s already cheaper than fossil fuels.”

“When we look at solar and wind around the world,” he answers, “it always correlates to rising prices and declining reliability. Why? Because solar and wind are intermittent. At any time, they can go near zero.”

That means wind turbines and solar farms don’t replace fossil fuel plants. You have to build them *in addition* to fossil fuel plants.

“We spent trillions of dollars in subsidies and mandates putting solar panels and wind turbines everywhere,” Epstein points out, “Yet we’re still having shortages of fossil fuels.”

Germany invested heavily in solar and wind power. Elites around the world praised German politicians for creating record renewable power. But that didn’t work so well when the winds slowed and clouds appeared.

Germans now pay much more for electricity, triple what Americans pay.

Germany has even turned to *coal* for energy. Coal! Coal is the filthiest fuel. Yet Germany now imports coal from Russia and America.

OK, say the activists, even if renewables have problems, soon we’ll have bet-

ter batteries so we can bank wind and solar energy and store it until it's needed!

Batteries are "getting continually better and cheaper," I say to Epstein.

Backing up all solar and wind with batteries would cost "multiples of global GDP," responds Epstein. "This is a total fantasy."

"You say unaffordable," I push back, "but who's to determine what that is?"

"The general narrative is we're destroying the planet with fossil fuels, so who cares how much energy costs?" Epstein says. "The truth is, the planet is only livable because of low-cost, reliable energy from fossil fuels."

Before fossil fuels, "Life expectancy was below 30. Income was basically non-existent. The population was stagnant because people had such a high death rate. The basic reason is that nature is not a very livable place for human beings."

By contrast, thanks to cheap fossil fuels, "We make it unnaturally safe by producing all forms of climate protection. We produce drought relief . . . sturdy buildings. We produce heat when it's cold, we produce cold when it's hot. We have this amazing, productive ability. That's the only reason we experience the planet as livable."

Unfortunately, because of today's foolish hysteria over fossil fuels, energy prices will climb. "When you threaten an industry, you scare investors and producers. Massive threats to industry have definitely cut down production."

America's affluent protesters can afford the higher prices. But poor people will suffer. Allowing billions of the world's poor to live a modern life requires energy from gas, oil, and even coal.

The United Nations now puts pressure on countries to stop using fossil fuels. Governments in poor countries, eager for UN handouts, often listen.

"Their whole population is going to suffer," warns Epstein. "People who have by far the least in the world [are] most subject to today's international pressure against fossil fuels."

If we want more of the poorest people to have decent lives, we need to invest in both fossil fuels and nuclear power.



An article by John Stossel titled "Socialism Is Bad for the Environment" was posted at reason.com on June 7, 2023.

"Greed of the fossil fuel industry" is "destroying our planet," says Sen. Bernie

Sanders (I-Vt.). Young people agree. Their solution? Socialism.

Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (D-N.Y.) says socialism creates “an environment that provides for *all* people, not just the privileged few.”

“Nonsense,” says Tom Palmer of the Atlas Network in my new video.

Palmer, unlike Ocasio-Cortez and most of us, spent lots of time in socialist countries. He once smuggled books into the Soviet Union.

What he’s seen convinces him that environmental-movement socialists are wrong about what’s “green.”

“We tried socialism,” says Palmer. “We ran the experiment. It was a catastrophe. Worst environmental record on the planet.”

In China, when socialist leaders noticed that sparrows ate valuable grain, they encouraged people to kill sparrows.

“Billions of birds were killed,” says Palmer.

Government officials shot birds. People without guns banged pans and blew horns, scaring sparrows into staying aloft for longer than they could tolerate.

“These poor exhausted birds fell from the skies,” says Palmer. “It was insanity.”

I pointed out that, watching video of people killing sparrows, it looked like they were happy to do it.

“If you failed to show enthusiasm for the socialist goals of the party,” Palmer responds, “you were going to be in trouble.”

The Party’s campaign succeeded. They killed nearly every sparrow.

But “all it takes is two minutes of thinking to figure, ‘Wait. Who’s going to eat all the bugs?’” says Palmer.

Without sparrows, insects multiplied. Bugs destroyed more crops than the sparrows had.

“People starved as a consequence,” says Palmer. “People confuse socialism with . . . a ‘nice government’ or a ‘government that’s sweet’ or ‘made up of my friends.’”

Socialism means central planning. That ends badly.

“What AOC wants to do is basically give the Pentagon, or similar agencies, control over the entire society. She thinks that’s going to turn out well,” says Palmer. “It’s a joke.”

China’s central planners keep making mistakes.

Many Chinese lakes and rivers are bright green. Fertilizer runoff created algae blooms that kill all fish. A study in *The Lancet* says Chinese air pollution kills

a million people per year.

Wherever socialism is tried, it creates nasty pollution.

In the Soviet Union, Joseph Stalin wanted cotton for his army. His central planners decided it should be grown near the Aral Sea. They drained so much water that the sea, once the fourth biggest inland lake in the world, shrank to less than half its size.

"Soviet planners caused catastrophic environmental costs to the whole population," says Palmer.

I push back. "That was then. Now the rules would be different. Now the rule would be: 'green.'"

"All the time we hear socialists say, 'Next time, we'll get it right.' How many next times do you get?" asks Palmer.

Yet American media still sometimes say socialists protect the environment. A *New York Times* op-ed claims "Lenin's eco warriors" created "the world's largest system of most protected nature reserves."

"These are not nature preserves," Palmer responds. "They use it as a dumping ground for heavy metals, for radioactive waste—in what sense is it a nature preserve?"

Capitalists destroy nature, too. Free societies do need government rules to protect the environment.

But free markets with property rights often protect nature better than bureaucrats can.

Private farmers, explains Palmer, are "concerned about the ability of the farm to grow food next year, year after year, [even] after that farmer is gone. Why? Because the farm has a *capital value*. That's the 'capital' in capitalism. They want to maximize that."

Capitalism also protects the environment because it creates wealth. When people aren't worried about starving or freezing, they get interested in protecting nature. That's why capitalist countries have cleaner air.

Also, capitalists can afford to pay for wild animal preserves.

"When no one has property rights and people are poor, tigers and elephants are considered a burden . . . They kill them," says Palmer. "When you're wealthier . . . you care about the environment."

Socialists say they care, but the real world shows: To protect the environment, capitalism works better.



An article by John Stossel titled "Fearmongering Won't Solve Climate Change" was posted at reason.com on June 28, 2023.

Global warming is an issue. But there are other pressing problems that deserve the world's attention.

For my new video, I asked people on the street, "If you could spend \$30 billion trying to solve the world's problems, how would you spend it?"

"Build houses . . . address homelessness," said a few. "Spend on health care," "redistribution." The most common answer was "fight climate change."

Really? Climate change is the world's most important problem?

"It's not surprising if you live in the rich world," says Bjorn Lomborg, president of the Copenhagen Consensus Center.

Lomborg has spent the last 20 years consulting with experts from the United Nations (U.N.), nongovernmental organizations, and 60 teams of economists, seeking consensus on how to address the world's biggest problems.

"The point is not that climate change is not an issue," says Lomborg, "but we just need to have a sense of proportion."

He says that while climate change may cause problems someday, "if you live most other places on the planet, you're worried that your kids might die from easily curable diseases *tonight*."

That's why, he says, it's important to ask ourselves, "Where can we spend dollars and do a lot of good versus . . . just a little good?"

Twenty years ago, the U.N. issued development goals. Surprisingly, Lomborg says they actually helped people.

"They basically said, let's get people out of poverty, out of hunger, get kids into school, stop moms and kids from dying."

That effort, plus global capitalism, lifted millions out of poverty.

Unfortunately, now the U.N. pushes "sustainable" goals that promise everything to everyone.

"Get rid of poverty, hunger, disease, fix war, corruption, climate change," says an exasperated Lomborg.

But a Bank of America report estimates that fighting climate change alone would cost trillions. Even that might not affect the climate very much.

"If we spend way too much money ineffectively on climate," Lomborg points

out, “not only are we not fixing climate, but we’re also wasting an enormous amount of money that could have been spent on other things.” Better things.

Lomborg’s new book, *Best Things First*, says “\$35 billion could save 4.2 million lives in the poor part of the world each and every year.”

For example, screening people for tuberculosis, giving medicine to people who have it, and making sure they complete their treatment would save up to a million lives a year.

“Nobody in rich world countries die from tuberculosis, but in poor countries, they still do,” says Lomborg. “Spend about \$5.5 billion, you could save most of those people.”

Hundreds of thousands more die from malaria. Buying bed nets with insecticides that kill mosquitoes would save lots of lives. So would spending on basic vaccines for kids.

These ideas are common sense. They cost much less than what we spend now pretending to manage the climate.

“You want to help people,” I say to Lomborg, “yet people hate you.”

“Well, some people hate me,” he laughs.

One shoved a pie in his face. Others call him “the devil incarnate,” a “traitor” who “needs to be taken down.” All because he points out that the world has bigger problems than climate change.

“Climate change might kill poor people, too,” I point out.

“It certainly will. And climate change is more damaging for poor people!” Lomborg replies. “But remember, *everything* is worse for poor people—because they’re poor.”

“Unmitigated scaremongering leads to ineffective political action,” says Lomborg. “We need to have a conversation about where we spend money well, compared to where we just spend money to feel virtuous about ourselves.”



An article by John Stossel titled “This Scientist Used to Spread Climate Change Alarmism; Now, She’s Trying to Debunk It” was posted at reason.com on Aug. 9, 2023.

We are told climate change is a crisis, and that there is an “overwhelming scientific consensus.”

"It's a manufactured consensus," says climate scientist Judith Curry in my new video. She says scientists have an incentive to exaggerate risk to pursue "fame and fortune."

She knows about that *because she once spread alarm about climate change. Media loved her when she published a study that seemed to show a dramatic increase in hurricane intensity.*

"We found that the percent of Category 4 and 5 hurricanes had doubled," says Curry. "This was picked up by the media," and then climate alarmists realized, "Oh, here is the way to do it. Tie extreme weather events to global warming!"

"So, this hysteria is your fault!" I tell her.

"Not really," she smiles. "They would have picked up on it anyways."

But Curry's "more intense" hurricanes gave them fuel.

"I was adopted by the environmental advocacy groups and the alarmists and I was treated like a rock star," Curry recounts. "Flown all over the place to meet with politicians."

But then some researchers pointed out gaps in her research—years with low levels of hurricanes.

"Like a good scientist, I investigated," says Curry. She realized that the critics were right. "Part of it was bad data. Part of it is natural climate variability."

Curry was the unusual researcher who looked at criticism of her work and actually concluded "they had a point."

Then the Climategate scandal taught her that other climate researchers weren't so open-minded. Alarmist scientists' aggressive attempts to hide data suggesting climate change is not a crisis were revealed in leaked emails.

"Ugly things," says Curry. "Avoiding Freedom of Information Act requests. Trying to get journal editors fired."

It made Curry realize that there is a "climate change industry" set up to reward alarmism.

"The origins go back to the . . . U.N. environmental program," says Curry. Some U.N. officials were motivated by "anti-capitalism. They hated the oil companies and seized on the climate change issue to move their policies along."

The U.N. created the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).

"The IPCC wasn't supposed to focus on any benefits of warming. The IPCC's mandate was to look for dangerous human-caused climate change."

"Then the national funding agencies directed all the funding . . . assuming there are dangerous impacts."

The researchers quickly figured out that the way to get funded was to make alarmist claims about "man-made climate change."

This is how "manufactured consensus" happens. Even if a skeptic did get funding, it's harder to publish because journal editors are alarmists.

"The editor of the journal *Science* wrote this political rant," says Curry. She even said, "The time for debate has ended."

"What kind of message does that give?" adds Curry. Then she answers her own question: "Promote the alarming papers! Don't even send the other ones out for review. If you wanted to advance in your career, like be at a prestigious university and get a big salary, have big laboratory space, get lots of grant funding, be director of an institute, there was clearly one path to go."

That's what we've got now: a massive government-funded climate alarmism complex.



An article by John Stossel titled "California Environmental Regulations Are Driving Truckers Out of Pennsylvania" was posted at reason.com on Oct. 18, 2023.

Pennsylvania's Peter Brothers Trucking delivers goods all across America. Owner Brian Wanner says Pennsylvania bureaucrats now are driving him out of his home state.

"We have no say," complains Wanner in my new video. "We can't do anything about it."

"No say" because Pennsylvania's new rules don't come from Pennsylvania. They come from California.

"I don't want to be anything like California!" complains Wanner.

Too bad for him and other Pennsylvania truck owners, because Pennsylvania's Environmental Quality Board decided their state will automatically copy California regulations.

California's rules will raise the price of a new truck by about one-third. Trucks that once cost \$190,000 will now cost about \$260,000.

California regulators said this new air-pollution regulation is needed because the trucks Wanner drives “contribute greatly to . . . serious health and welfare problems.”

That’s ridiculous, says Wanner. “We have come so far in the last 40 years. In 1980, one truck produced as much [pollution] as 60 trucks today.”

“So to reduce pollution, we *want* people to buy *new* trucks,” I point out.

“But if you put these costs on us that we cannot afford, we’re going to just run the older trucks!” responds Wanner.

“The regulators don’t think about that?” I ask.

“They do not!” Wanner replies. “They do not see the consequences of what they’re doing.”

Now truckers like Wanner will just buy trucks in neighboring states.

“We can go to Ohio and get cheaper trucks,” he says.

So there won’t be any pollution reduction. The new rule will just hurt Pennsylvanians who sell trucks.

Who are these regulators? Pennsylvania’s Environmental Quality Air Board is mostly made up of people from unrelated departments, like the Fish and Boat Commission, the Game Commission, the Historical and Museum Commission. I doubt that many know much about air pollution.

“The whole idea of having a regulatory board like this is, ‘Oh, these people are experts,’” says attorney Caleb Kruckenberg of the Pacific Legal Foundation. “They know what they’re talking about. They’re smarter than the lawmakers.’ But if you look at the board, that’s not true. These are just random bureaucrats who work in the government, and they say, ‘I don’t know. Let’s follow California.’”

Kruckenberg is suing Pennsylvania on behalf of truckers like Wanner, arguing that what Pennsylvania does violates the Constitution.

“Nobody in Pennsylvania has ever voted for the standards that now control Pennsylvania.”

I push back. “So what? California seems to have a lot of money. I could see a state saying, ‘Yeah, let their regulators figure out how we reduce pollution, and we’ll save money doing what they do.’”

“If people want something,” Kruckenberg replies, “their legislature is supposed to pass it.”

California’s rules will soon get still more expensive because Gov. Gavin Newsom has decreed that soon, all new vehicles must be electric.

“But electricity comes from fossil fuels!” Kruckenberg points out. In Pennsylvania, some comes from coal, and most comes from natural gas.

So to power all-electric trucks, Pennsylvania will burn more fossil fuels.

Still another problem: electric trucks are heavier.

“That’s harder on the roads,” says Wanner. Also, “electric trucks have a very low mileage radius, so you can’t work all day. It’s nothing that you can take across the United States.”

Pennsylvania’s regulators don’t seem to care. They just want to do what California does.

“Why would we allow our state to give away their lawmaking procedures to California?” asks Wanner. “That’s not the American way. If we want to follow California, we can move there! I don’t want to be anything like California.”



An article by John Stossel titled “The Media’s Misleading Fearmongering Over Climate Change” was posted at reason.com on Dec. 13, 2023.

United States Special Presidential Envoy for Climate John Kerry says it will take trillions of dollars to “solve” climate change. Then he says, “There is not enough money in any country in the world to actually solve this problem.”

Kerry has little understanding of money or how it’s created. He’s a multimillionaire because he married a rich woman. Now he wants to take more of your money to pretend to affect climate change.

Bjorn Lomborg points out that there are better things society should spend money on.

Lomborg acknowledges that a warmer climate brings problems. “As temperatures get higher, sea water, like everything else, expands. So we’re going to maybe see three feet of sea level rise. Then they say, ‘So everybody who lives within three feet of sea level, they’ll have to move!’ Well, no. If you actually look at what people do, they built dikes and so they don’t have to move.”

People in Holland did that years ago. A third of the Netherlands is below sea level. In some areas, it’s 22 feet below. Yet the country thrives. That’s the way to deal with climate change: adjust to it.

“Fewer people are going to get flooded every year, despite the fact that you have much higher sea level rise. The total cost for Holland over the last half-century is about \$10 billion,” says Lomborg. “Not nothing, but very little for an advanced economy over 50 years.”

For saying things like that, Lomborg is labeled “the devil.”

“The problem here is unmitigated scaremongering,” he replies. “A new survey shows that 60 percent of all people in rich countries now believe it’s likely or very likely that unmitigated climate change will lead to the end of mankind. This is what you get when you have constant fearmongering in the media.”

Some people now say they will not have children because they’re convinced that climate change will destroy the world. Lomborg points out how counter-productive that would be: “We need your kids to make sure the future is better.”

He acknowledges that climate warming will kill people.

“As temperatures go up, we’re likely to see more people die from heat. That’s absolutely true. You hear this all the time. But what is underreported is the fact that nine times as many people die from cold . . . As temperatures go up, you’re going to see fewer people die from cold. Over the last 20 years, because of temperature rises, we have seen about 116,000 more people die from heat. But 283,000 *fewer* people die from cold.”

That’s rarely reported in the news.

When the media doesn’t fret over deaths from heat, they grab at other possible threats.

CNN claims, “Climate Change is Fueling Extremism.”

The BBC says, “A Shifting Climate is Catalysing Infectious Disease.”

U.S. News and World Report says, “Climate Change will Harm Children’s Mental Health.”

Lomborg replies, “It’s very, very easy to make this argument that everything is caused by climate change if you don’t have the full picture.”

He points out that we rarely hear about positive effects of climate change, like global greening.

“That’s good! We get more green stuff on the planet. My argument is not that climate change is great or overall positive. It’s simply that, just like every other thing, it has pluses and minuses. Only reporting on the minuses, and only emphasizing worst-case outcomes, is not a good way to inform people.”