

**President's Letter**  
**Al Squire**  
**April, 2016**

In 2012, U.S. Senator James Inhofe from the state of Oklahoma wrote a book entitled *The Greatest Hoax*. This book effectively reveals the undeniable fraud behind the efforts of certain climate scientists and politicians to use concocted data about temperature increases to frighten the American people into acceptance of a massive plan to redistribute their wealth on a global scale. The proposed plan to deal with climate change, while already unfair enough on the surface, may be one of the biggest assaults on personal property ownership and individual freedoms in history. As if to justify their positions, climate change alarmists use statements and talking points such as, "The science is settled." or "There is no more debate." or "97% of scientists agree that this is happening." Scientific principles, to the best of my knowledge, have never been established or clarified by any voting process. Exactly why are we supposed to buy into this shoddy, biased, government-sponsored, "democracy-based" protocol for scientific inquiry?

I am finally beginning to realize that it is a useless waste of time to try to debunk the so called "scientific evidence" put forth by the global warming/climate change movement. As a farmer, I understand that all living things on this planet are carbon based life forms. I also understand that the equation defining photosynthesis is the exact and opposite counterbalance to the equation defining combustion or respiration. Carbon based residues and by-products will degrade or compost in the soil when plants die or when animals defecate, urinate, die and degenerate and the next growing season, these organic materials and substances, along with carbon dioxide from the air, will produce abundant new plant life. It has been shown that as carbon dioxide levels rise in the atmosphere, plants respond with exuberant increases in growth. The uptake and sequestration of carbon is a necessary part of the process of building roots, stems, and foliage. The availability of carbon is a key factor in plant growth and when plants are growing, they are taking in carbon dioxide while oxygen and water vapor are being released into the air to start the cycle all over again. Wetlands serve to clean the system, detoxifying many potentially harmful chemicals and producing methane in the process. As a farmer, I have a hard time believing that the role of the farmer or his cows, in the big picture of this immensely complex, intricate, self balancing system could be harming the environment or changing the world's temperature.

But the climate change debate is not about carbon dioxide, oxygen, methane, or composting. It is about furthering the goals of a movement. Fear over climate change is being manipulatively used as a weapon of destruction against the American people, selectively punishing them for their prosperity, using them as taxpayers, and bringing about the forced redistribution of their wealth. The implementation of any plan regulating carbon emissions will wreak havoc on the U.S. economy, creating conditions for possible collapse of the entire system.

Inhofe fought several bills and stopped proposed global warming/climate change legislation that advocated some methods of "Cap and Trade" including McCain-Lieberman, Lieberman-Warner, and Waxman-Markey. It was obvious to him that these bills would have caused massive increases in energy costs for electricity and gasoline, estimated at \$6-7 trillion dollars. In addition, 2-4 million jobs would be lost and a crumbling or stagnant economy would almost certainly ensue, but only in the U.S. China, India, Mexico and other "developing" nations were to be exempted from the pain of mitigating the effects of "climate change."

We do live in a world that forces us to share the atmosphere and the oceans. Undeniably, when one country pollutes air or water with heavy metals, man-made chemicals, radioactivity, or certain products of combustion, the impact will be widespread. Most developing countries have few air or water quality controls and businesses operate with a much lower burden of regulation and interference. Inhofe knew that the end result of U.S. participation in any agreement that required one sided sacrifice would be that global air and environment quality would be far worse in the end. There would be economic pain for the American people and no gain in air quality.

Even if a carbon regulation scheme were to be imposed on "developed" countries, fossil fuel-powered barges would still be crossing oceans to deliver U.S. coal to burn "dirty" in China and India, while U.S. industry would be struggling with increased costs for energy and power. The U.S. coal industry has already been severely hurt because domestic coal consumption has been restricted. Recently on a trip to southern Ohio, I viewed many shut-down coal fired power plants along the Ohio River, while China was reportedly building a new coal burning electrical generating facility on average every three days during that same time period.

One needs only look at the areas to the immediate south of the U.S.-Mexico border at the location of any large sized U.S. city to get a glimpse of the results of allowing politicians to "protect the environment, run the economy and create jobs for American citizens." At each location, you will find a Mexican "sister" city with flourishing heavy and light manufacturing industries, along with metal smelting, refining, and chemical industries.

Businesses of all types have located south of the border for several reasons. With the implementation of NAFTA, trade regulations are favorable to send finished goods back into the U.S. Further, there are millions of willing workers that can be easily hired for pennies on the dollar of what U.S. workers would demand. Taxes are not punitive and environmental regulations are almost non-existent. Relocated companies do not face the crippling costs of defending their businesses against excessive litigation and insurance premiums are much lower as well. None of this would change under proposals to mitigate climate change. Recent information from the besieged business community of California shows that the California Air Resources Board has mandated that dairies reduce their methane emissions by 75% and their cows' burps or "enteric fermentation emissions" by 25% by 2030. The California Dairy Industry will certainly be faced with some hard choices in the ensuing years if this mandate is allowed to stand.

There are nagging, undeniable problems associated with the idea of regulation of carbon emissions only in developed countries. Polluted air knows no borders. The flowing rivers and the underground water tables meander in and out of all geographical areas, showing no respect for man made boundary lines drawn on a map. Wouldn't it make more sense to design and implement solutions to prevent industrial pollution here in the U.S. and then export this technology at a reasonable cost to businesses all over the world? With American ingenuity and our "can-do" attitude, surely we could figure out how we can continue to do all the things we humans need to do, but in reasonable, environmentally sound ways, instead of sacrificing ourselves for an impractical and illogical plan that will only hurt the U.S. For example, finding clean ways to scrub out the impurities of burning coal at reasonable cost would be a great place to start.

Senator Inhofe refers to the words of a fictional character from Dr. Michael Crichton's book, *State of Fear*. The character argued that "global warming" became "climate change" because throughout the winter in North America, people view a little global warming as beneficial. By replacing the phrase, "global warming" with "climate change," any and every weather event could be blamed on "climate change." Droughts, tornadoes, hurricanes, floods, blizzards, the rising of the seas, terrorism, mosquitoes, and recently, viruses, are featured daily on the news media. "The more methods you can use to scare people, the more money you can raise for your cause. It's a business."

I cringe when I hear the President and the presidential hopefuls say that "climate change" is the greatest threat to the security of our country. I believe that the greatest threat to national security is not "climate change," but "fear of climate change." A far greater threat takes shape when fear and security concerns over-rule common sense and we allow politicians to make major decisions for us without our input, consent, or oversight.