

NORMAN B. WAITE, PH.D.
9 FOX RUN
WAPPINGERS FALLS, NY 12590
(845) 592-0678
sigmawaite@optonline.net

Wednesday, November 12th, 2008

The Honorable Stephen L. Johnson
Administrator
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20460
E-mail: a-and-rDocket@epa.gov

Dear Mr. Johnson:

Regarding your Docket Number

EPA-HQ-OAR-2008-0318

on EPA regulation of greenhouse gasses, here is my comment:

To me, the idea of the EPA regulating greenhouses gasses is outrageous and worse. My position is simple:

Absolutely, positively do NOT do it.

For more, I am not concerned at all about human caused *global warming* or *climate change*. For some of why, I did read carefully nearly all of

Committee on Surface Temperature Reconstructions for the Last 2,000 Years,
National Research Council, *Surface Temperature Reconstructions for the Last
2,000 Years*, ISBN 0-309-66264-8, 196 pages, National Academies Press,
2006, available at

<http://www.nap.edu/catalog/11676.html>

In particular I carefully studied the graph on page 2 and from that saw:

- The temperature of the Earth in year 1950 was essentially exactly the same as in the year 1000.
- The increase in the temperature of the Earth since 1950 has been less than 1° C.
- The rate of increase of temperature since 1950 has been much like that from the years 900 to 1000.

So, since year 1000, all of the greenhouse gasses emitted by humans from wars, industrial activity in the industrial revolution, agriculture, breathing, etc., by the year 1950 had no effect at all on the temperature of the Earth.

As the graph does make clear, the temperature of the Earth does change, and for thousands of years has changed without any significant cause from humans. We have little need or hope of stopping natural climate change, and we have no need of reducing greenhouse gasses emitted by humans.

I strongly deny that CO₂ is a *pollutant* in the sense of the Clean Air Act or, from human activity, will significantly warm the Earth.

Clearly one of the most prominent spokespersons for stopping human caused global warming from CO₂ is Mr. Tom Friedman of *The New York Times*, and I did listen to him explain how CO₂ causes global warming:

Light from the Sun passes through the atmosphere of the Earth and is absorbed by CO₂ which then becomes hotter and warms the Earth.

I conclude that Mr. Friedman knows nothing at all about global warming.

Instead, if CO₂ absorbed visible light, then we would be able to see CO₂, but we cannot. Actually, CO₂ does absorb electromagnetic radiation, in three very narrow bands in the infrared, one band for each of stretching, twisting, and bending of the molecule. Of course, as any good student in freshman college physics should know, the *greenhouse effect* is from (1) visible light striking the surface of the Earth and heating it, (2) the surface of the Earth radiating in the infrared, and (3) and a *greenhouse gas*, e.g., CO₂, in the atmosphere absorbing the infrared instead of just letting it escape into space.

Since one of the main spokespersons afraid of human caused global warming is so ill-informed, the whole fear seems ill-informed. I trust my knowledge and judgment in science much more than that of Mr. Friedman, and I am not concerned at all.

But we need an explanation: There is a start of an explanation on the home page of the EPA Web site: You people are on a *mission*, are *wound up*, are obsessed with the *environment* as some new religion. Obsession is an anxiety disease; you people have anxieties, are afraid, just spontaneously afraid, without any cause. But rationality says that you need a cause, so you have selected threats to the environment. You sense that if you protect the environment, then you will obtain security against your anxieties. In addition, you want to join a group of other people who share your religion so that you can feel more secure as a member of that group.

Net, what you are doing is not science but religion from irrationality from an anxiety disease.

You are not nearly the first to have anxieties and, thus, look to saving the environment in irrational ways. The Mayans killed people to get human blood to pour on a rock believing that otherwise the Sun would stop moving across the sky. You people are doing much the same, want to kill the industrial revolution believing that otherwise CO₂ will overheat

the Earth. Those Mayans were charlatans with an insane, destructive religion, and so are you.

There is more: In the movie *The Music Man* we heard:

Oh, we got trouble,
Right here in River City.
Trouble starts with a *T*,
And that rhymes with a *P*,
And that stands for *pool*.

and you have changed the last two lines to:

And that rhymes with a *G*,
And that stands for *global warming*.

The Music Man was a charlatan passing out flim-flam, and so are you. The Music Man just wanted to sell some band instruments and uniforms, but you want to destroy the industrial revolution.

Do all of us a big favor: Go on a long vacation and take with you a big supply of that funny stuff you've been smoking, get really high, and float out into the ozone. You'll be much happier there, and so will the rest of us.

I don't want the EPA restricting CO₂ from a coal fired plant that provides my electric power, my car that provides my transportation, my lawn mower that cuts my grass, my fireplace that warms my family room, my oil fired furnace that heats my house and provides my hot water, my compost pile that takes in my shrubbery clippings, my kitty cat who keeps me company, or me as I breathe. I don't want a *cap and trade* system that increases my costs. And I don't want massive investments in plants for production quantities of *renewable* energy, which is not yet nearly ready for production.

For electric power, we should pursue nuclear fission, coal, and, for peak loads, natural gas. We should use electric power to replace many uses of oil and natural gas. For motor fuel we should pursue gasoline from oil, natural gas, and, in research, gasoline and/or methane from synthetic sources.

For CO₂, we should f'get about it.

Sometimes the best thing to do is nothing, and for the EPA this is very much one of those times.

Sincerely yours,

Norman B. Waite