

Nobel Laureate Al Gore Is a Threat to Peace

By John Dendahl

This article by Rocky Mountain Foundation president John Dendahl originally appeared at www.FamilySecurityMatters.com on December 17, 2007

One of the great ironies of 2007 was Al Gore's sharing the Nobel Peace Prize. I argue below that Gore's climate change crusade is *a threat* to peace. In fact, if the Nobel Committee's current members could be transported back in time to about 1938, one might see another master propagandist, Leni Riefenstahl, similarly honored. Maybe sharing the prize with Neville "Peace in Our Time" Chamberlain.

(Riefenstahl produced *Triumph of the Will* and other propaganda for Adolph Hitler, but avoided conviction at Nuremberg for war crimes by convincing judges that her fascination with Hitler's Nazis didn't include knowledge of their Final Solution or concentration camp atrocities.)

The point here isn't to compare Gore to Hitler. It's that history is riddled with wishful thinking as to what will lead to peace. To be generous, let's just say the Nobel Committee's track record of late has been spotty.

#

I drafted the paragraphs above on November 28, while ruminating on Gore's astonishingly successful deceit (about which more below). While I would love to claim clairvoyance, I won't. About two weeks later, however, on December 10, Gore actually received his prize in Oslo and gave a speech in which a *Wall Street Journal*/Web newsletter reported he "[warned] that world leaders who give short shrift to the issue of global warming are the equivalent of 'those who ignored Adolf Hitler's threat' in the 1930s." Adolph Hitler, eh?

There can be little doubt that the world leader first and foremost in Gore's mind there is the man who defeated him in 2000 to become President of the United States, George W. Bush. His mention of Hitler is a clever reminder of slanderous comparisons of Bush to Hitler made from time to time by Gore's political teammates like George Soros and MoveOn.org.

Gore has opened a huge question as to which position on climate change is the better fit for recalling Hitler, his or Bush's. Leave aside the Nazis' Final Solution of which Riefenstahl claimed no knowledge, and consider only Hitler's quest for world domination. According to the source cited above, in his December 10 speech Gore "called for ratification of a United Nations treaty capping carbon emissions worldwide that would take effect everywhere at the start of 2010. Heads of state from every major country, he insisted, should meet every three months until the treaty is brought into effect. A worldwide tax on CO₂ would also be required ..." Does this not sound like someone seeking world domination for his environmentalist views?

Gore is the cheerleader for a pernicious worldwide fraud, a 21st century threat that must not be ignored.

One reads ad nauseam these days that “the debate is over,” that scientific consensus now includes all but an insignificant fringe, that Earth is warming with apocalyptic potential, and that the warming is caused by mankind (mainly producing the dreaded “greenhouse” gas carbon dioxide – CO₂ – by burning carbonaceous fuels like wood, methanol, oil, natural gas and coal). Hmmm. Sounds to me like the diversionary tactic of a bunch of scoundrels about to get whipped in debate by opponents who are just now getting warmed up (not intended here as a pun).

Item: In April 2006, Richard Lindzen, Alfred P. Sloan Professor of Atmospheric Science at MIT, wrote in *The Wall Street Journal* (www.opinionjournal.com/extra/?id=110008220) about shocking corruption among some in the scientific community, hell bent on silencing science-based challenges to the government-grant-rich orthodoxy of global warming.

Item: At the end of his brilliant novel *State of Fear*, the scientifically trained Michael Crichton presents 1) an Author’s Message thoughtfully addressing how “astonishingly little” we know “about every aspect of the environment ...” and 2) an Appendix discussing “Why Politicized Science Is Dangerous.” In the latter, Crichton reminds readers of the overwhelming scientific and political consensus that surrounded the “science” of eugenics a century ago. Those, like me, in need of a refresher can read it at www.michaelcrichton.net/essay-stateoffear-why politicized science is dangerous.html. Crichton says,

“... [eugenics’] history is so dreadful—and, to those who were caught up in it, so embarrassing—that it is now rarely discussed. But it is a story that should be well known to every citizen, so that its horrors are not repeated.”

Item: Political scientist and author Bjørn Lomborg, Director of the Copenhagen Consensus Center (www.copenhagenconsensus.com/Default.aspx?ID=788), lines up with those who believe human activity contributes to global warming but exposes Gore as an alarmist selling snake oil. Here is Lomborg in an article published recently in *The Vancouver Sun*:

“The fear of Armageddon stifles sensible dialogue. Those who dare question the alarmist rhetoric are labeled ‘climate change deniers.’ This is typically used as a catch-all for anybody who doesn’t accept the standard interpretation that mankind is to blame for global warming and that we should cut CO₂ emissions dramatically.

“Proponents of such drastic cuts seldom mention their cost. Read Al Gore’s entire book and watch his whole movie: You won’t find a single mention of the cost of seriously addressing global warming.

“The best estimate is that the Kyoto Protocol will stop about 4,000 heat-caused deaths in developing nations by the middle of this century. This will come at the humongous cost of \$180 billion a year. Without the Kyoto Protocol, there would be many, many fewer cold-related deaths.”

Item: Gore's film *An Inconvenient Truth* got him nominated for the Nobel and won him an Oscar from the Motion Picture Academy for "Best Documentary." Some documentary. Christopher Monckton of Brenchley, an advisor to Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, has published an analysis titled "35 Inconvenient Truths, The Errors in Al Gore's Movie" (<http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/monckton/goreerrors.html>). In there, we find that Gore exaggerated by up to 10,000 percent potential sea level changes; lied that global warming is melting the snow on Africa's Mount Kilimanjaro; lied that global warming caused Hurricane Katrina; lied about polar bears drowning while seeking ice melted away by global warming; and so on.

Pure, unalloyed deceit.

Stewart Dimmock, the parent of two school-aged children, sued education authorities in England, alleging they illegally distributed Gore's "documentary" to classrooms throughout the country. Noting the film's serious errors presented to him, Judge Michael Burton ordered that a revised "Guidance Note" accompany the film, presumably in the hope that teachers would correct for their students the gross misimpressions it creates. Burton said, "... as will be seen, some of the errors, or departures from the mainstream, by Mr Gore ... do arise in the context of alarmism and exaggeration in support of his political thesis."

Exaggeration in support of a political thesis is, by definition, propaganda. So much for the myth that *An Inconvenient Truth* is documentary. Gore is simply a better-groomed Michael Moore.

What does all this have to do with security?

Diversion. Remember Gore's December 10 speech insisting on a U.N. treaty and quarterly meetings among the heads of state of every major country until it is brought into effect? Most reading articles at this site are riveted on today's challenges, like Islamofascism and nukes coming into the hands of megalomaniacal dictators. Gore's alarmist coterie of scientists haven't even validated the models on which their predictions are based, let alone demonstrated that the remedial actions they propose are likely to succeed, economically practical, and best among alternatives – or any of the three.

Leaders of the world's major countries need to keep their focus (and our resources) on the right urgent problems.

International rivalries. Just who is going to command, say, China and India to curtail use of CO₂-producing fuels during this period of their rapid economic growth and prosperity? Are

other countries supposed to stand down to compensate for their emissions? It is evident after ten years that most signatories to Gore's beloved Kyoto Protocol aren't meeting their own agreed CO₂ emission targets. What kind of real international trouble would follow Gore's new directive at a time of quite fierce international competition for energy resources?

Prosperity. The suffering that accompanies poverty is among the drivers of insecurity around the world. Vaclav Klaus, president of the Czech Republic, has written eloquently that "ambitious environmentalism is the biggest threat to freedom, democracy, the market economy and prosperity." See <http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/reprint/freedomatrisk.html>.

Al Gore, zealous environmentalist and master propagandist, is a threat to world peace.

John Dendahl is a retired businessman living in Littleton, Colorado. He is president of The Rocky Mountain Foundation (www.therockymountainfoundation.org), a not-for-profit institute organized for the purpose of conducting research and education on public policies and trends affecting citizens' freedom, security and prosperity.