Subject: State of Fear
Posted by Tufa on Tue, 20 Nov 2012 05:04:40 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

This is a book by Michael Crichton

The story, which is fictional, is about an environment-lawyer, who find out about the "Global Warming"; his questions and thoughts on the subject, and how he slowly learn that this is a complete hoax, used for fund-raising. The fictional part of the manuscript describe a scenario where some criminals generate natural catastrophes, to improve their case that "Global Warming" is dangerous.

The author express an intelligent view, where consequences has been thought through, and he is confident to express a view where the "Global Warming" is merely an example on a larger Evil of lies and media-manipulation of the people.
He touch upon the subject of the "9/11" of 2001, which is thought to be genuine, and also upon the Nazi+"Gas Chambers", where the mass extermination is thought to be real.

A physical book is recommended, but a computer version is here, and a link to a "mobi" file reader, that install on Windows.
Crichton, Michael
Mobi-Reader-Magik_420.msi

"State of Fear"
"We are indebted to Mr. Morton's generosity. We strive to be worthy of his support."
"I'll tell him that, sir."
"I'm sure you will. You were speaking of global warming, Mr. Evans. Is it a subject that interests you?"
"Yes, sir, it does. And every concerned citizen of the planet."
"I certainly agree. But tell me. What is global warming, as you understand it?"
Evans tried to conceal his surprise. He hadn't expected to be quizzed. "Why do you ask?"
"We ask everybody who comes here. We're trying to get a feel for the general state of knowledge. What's global warming?"
"Global warming is the heating up of the earth from burning fossil fuels."
"Actually, that is not correct."
"It's not?"
"Not even close. Perhaps you'd try again."
Evans paused. It was obvious he was being interrogated by a fussy and precise legal mind. He knew the type only too well, from law school. He thought for a moment, choosing his words carefully. "Global warming is, uh, the heating up of the surface of the earth from the excess of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere that is produced by burning fossil fuels."
"Again, not correct."
"Why not?"
"Several reasons. At a minimum, I count four errors in the statement you just made."
"I don't understand," Evans said. "My statement--that's what global warming is."
"In fact, it is not." Balder's tone was crisp, authoritative. "Global warming is the theory--"
"--hardly a theory, anymore--"
"No, it is a theory," Balder said. "Believe me, I wish it were otherwise. But in fact, global warming is the theory that increased levels of carbon dioxide and certain other gases are causing an increase in the average temperature of the earth's atmosphere because of the

so-called 'greenhouse effect.'"
"Well, okay," Evans said. "That's a more exact definition, but..."
"Mr. Evans, you yourself believe in global warming, I take it?"
"Of course."

File Attachments

1) Crichton_state_of_fear.jpg, downloaded 6351 times

Subject: Re: State of Fear
Posted by Tufa on Tue, 20 Nov 2012 05:17:30 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

AUTHOR'S MESSAGE
A novel such as State of Fear, in which so many divergent views are expressed, may lead the reader to wonder where, exactly, the author stands on these issues. I have been reading environmental texts for three years, in itself a hazardous undertaking. But I have had an opportunity to look at a lot of data, and to consider many points of view. I conclude:

We know astonishingly little about every aspect of the environment, from its past history, to its present state, to how to conserve and protect it. In every debate, all sides overstate the extent of existing knowledge and its degree of certainty.
Atmospheric carbon dioxide is increasing, and human activity is the probable cause.
We are also in the midst of a natural warming trend that began about 1850, as we emerged from a four-hundred-year cold spell known as the "Little Ice Age."
Nobody knows how much of the present warming trend might be a natural phenomenon.
Nobody knows how much of the present warming trend might be man-made.
Nobody knows how much warming will occur in the next century. The computer models vary by 400 percent, de facto proof that nobody knows. But if I had to guess--the only thing anyone is doing, really--I would guess the increase will be 0.812436 degrees C. There is no evidence that my guess about the state of the world one hundred years from now is any better or worse than anyone else's. (We can't "assess" the future, nor can we "predict" it. These are euphemisms. We can only guess. An informed guess is just a guess.)
I suspect that part of the observed surface warming will ultimately be attributable to human activity. I suspect that the principal human effect will come from land use, and that the atmospheric component will be minor.
Before making expensive policy decisions on the basis of climate models, I think it is reasonable to require that those models predict future temperatures accurately for a period of ten years. Twenty would be better.
I think for anyone to believe in impending resource scarcity, after two hundred years of such false alarms, is kind of weird. I don't know whether such a belief today is best ascribed to ignorance of history, sclerotic dogmatism, unhealthy love of Malthus, or simple pigheadedness, but it is evidently a hardy perennial in human calculation.
There are many reasons to shift away from fossil fuels, and we will do so in the next century without legislation, financial incentives, carbon-conservation programs, or the interminable yammering of fearmongers. So far as I know, nobody had to ban horse transport in the early twentieth century.
I suspect the people of 2100 will be much richer than we are, consume more energy, have a smaller global population, and enjoy more wilderness than we have today. I don't think we have to worry about them.

The current near-hysterical preoccupation with safety is at best a waste of resources and a crimp on the human spirit, and at worst an invitation to totalitarianism. Public education is desperately needed.

I conclude that most environmental "principles" (such as sustainable development or the precautionary principle) have the effect of preserving the economic advantages of the West and thus constitute modern imperialism toward the developing world. It is a nice way of saying, "We got ours and we don't want you to get yours, because you'll cause too much pollution."

The "precautionary principle," properly applied, forbids the precautionary principle. It is self-contradictory. The precautionary principle therefore cannot be spoken of in terms that are too harsh.

I believe people are well intentioned. But I have great respect for the corrosive influence of bias, systematic distortions of thought, the power of rationalization, the guises of self-interest, and the inevitability of unintended consequences.

I have more respect for people who change their views after acquiring new information than for those who cling to views they held thirty years ago. The world changes. Ideologues and zealots don't.

In the thirty-five-odd years since the environmental movement came into existence, science has undergone a major revolution. This revolution has brought new understanding of nonlinear dynamics, complex systems, chaos theory, catastrophe theory. It has transformed the way we think about evolution and ecology. Yet these no-longer-new ideas have hardly penetrated the thinking of environmental activists, which seems oddly fixed in the concepts and rhetoric of the 1970s.

We haven't the foggiest notion how to preserve what we term "wilderness," and we had better study it in the field and learn how to do so. I see no evidence that we are conducting such research in a humble, rational, and systematic way. I therefore hold little hope for wilderness management in the twenty-first century. I blame environmental organizations every bit as much as developers and strip miners. There is no difference in outcomes between greed and incompetence.

We need a new environmental movement, with new goals and new organizations. We need more people working in the field, in the actual environment, and fewer people behind computer screens. We need more scientists and many fewer lawyers.

We cannot hope to manage a complex system such as the environment through litigation. We can only change its state temporarily--usually by preventing something--with eventual results that we cannot predict and ultimately cannot control.

Nothing is more inherently political than our shared physical environment, and nothing is more ill served by allegiance to a single political party. Precisely because the environment is shared it cannot be managed by one faction according to its own economic or aesthetic preferences. Sooner or later, the opposing faction will take power, and previous policies will be reversed. Stable management of the environment requires recognition that all preferences have their place: snowmobilers and fly fishermen, dirt bikers and hikers, developers and preservationists. These preferences are at odds, and their incompatibility cannot be avoided. But resolving incompatible goals is a true function of politics.

We desperately need a nonpartisan, blinded funding mechanism to conduct research to determine appropriate policy. Scientists are only too aware whom they are working for. Those who fund research--whether a drug company, a government agency, or an environmental organization--always have a particular outcome in mind. Research funding is almost never open-ended or open-minded. Scientists know that continued funding depends on delivering the results the funders desire. As a result, environmental organization "studies" are every bit as biased and suspect as industry "studies." Government "studies" are similarly biased according to who is running the department or administration at the time. No faction should be given a free pass.

I am certain there is too much certainty in the world.

I personally experience a profound pleasure being in nature. My happiest days each year are those I spend in wilderness. I wish natural environments to be preserved for future generations. I am not satisfied they will be preserved in sufficient quantities, or with sufficient skill. I conclude that the "exploiters of the environment" include environmental organizations, government organizations, and big business. All have equally dismal track records. Everybody has an agenda. Except me.
