Copy of White 122723
===

[00:00:00]

Introduction and Guest Background

they keep it secret, they won't tell you the longitude and latitude of any CO2 station I contacted the guy who's in charge of those.

I said, where is there one around here? I could take one of my sensors over. And get the data and then get your data and compare it. He's like, well, I can't tell you that

Climate Change Skepticism and Early Career

My guest today is Dave White

I'm a chemical engineer with graduate in statistics, 22 credits from a PhD 3. 44 GPA. I'm applying to finish my PhD in environmental science. And teach the college textbook we wrote, Climate Crisis Changed, The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Reports, or Deliberate Science Fiction.

And since the 1990s, one of our board members, he's a physicist, and I would take my RV up to Mt. Hood Meadows and snow ski, [00:01:00] and, uh, on a Friday night, we'd open up a single malt bottle of scotch and debunk everything we've heard about climate change or global warming. Since we had gotten together before, and we did that, you know, in the early 1990s until, uh, 2015, 2016.

Climate Change Truth and Tree Planting Initiatives

Then in 2016, I started Climate Change Truth, saw what they were doing wasn't having any effect on, uh, CO2. So I published a manuscript, Discovery Reduction of Photosynthesis Correlation to Atmospheric CO2 Rise, and saw the need to plant trees. And then after I presented that at a climate change conference, I called the U.

S. embassies in India, Pakistan, and China, and South America. And so their environmental scientists saw the truth about what I presented, and they told their countries to start planting trees. [00:02:00] And so now China, India, and Pakistan are planting billions of trees, three trees per second now, worldwide, are being planted.

And they're lowering CO2 quickly. Trees release terpenes, which induce rain. So the more trees we plant, the more rain we get. And that cools the earth, and blocks the sun, and has all kinds of benefits.

CO2 Measurement and Data Accuracy

So you've done some detailed studies, have you, about measuring CO2 levels, uh, if you have trees in a median versus not trees in the median or things like that?

Yeah, I have, uh, two NIST, National Institute of Standards and Technology certified carbon dioxide sensors. And that, if anybody doesn't know what NIST is, you can look it up, but they guarantee measurement equipment data.

As long as you certify them, uh, every, you know, six months or a year, whatever they require for that equipment. Um, [00:03:00] as long as you keep it in certification, they guarantee the data from it. And so like, if you, I don't know if you've ever been to Portland, Oregon.

CO2 Absorption by Trees and Roadside Planting

But the zoo in Portland, Oregon, the trees by the zoo are consuming more CO2 than the vehicles are putting out.

And there's 160, 000 vehicles average that go through that area on US 26. And those trees are consuming. So that went, that experiment for two years went from hypothesis with almost 5 million data points. To theory with almost 5 million data points to scientific law that we can do that plus or minus 50 degrees of the equator is plant native shrubs and trees next to roads and in 10 years, they'll consume all the CO2 from the vehicles.

And do you have a peer reviewed study on that one?

Challenges in Climate Research Funding

[00:04:00] Yes, and also I put in a proposal to confirm the data on the East Coast and the National, I call them the National Political Science Foundation. Those guys are woke and screwed up. They wouldn't give me any money for it, but I applied to NIFLA, which is Department of Agriculture.

It went through peer review. And looks like they're going to give me the funding in, um, April. So then I'll take the censors and the boxes that I keep the censors in to the East Coast, uh, someplace around Illinois somewhere. I forget, I had it in the proposal, but we'll take it there, we'll set it up. And run an experiment for a year this time, at least funded last time.

I didn't get any funding for it.

Impact of COVID on CO2 Levels

And have you done some, uh, looking carefully at, uh, what happened during COVID when the economy was kind of shut down and what happened to CO2 [00:05:00] levels globally then?

Yeah, well, uh, yeah, this, the emissions went down during COVID, but then came back up, uh, plus COVID.

But, uh, did you see anything in the, uh, like the Keeling curve? That reflected that.

Um, no, you can't see that in the, in the Keeling curve.

Critique of the Keeling Curve and CO2 Data Manipulation

The Keeling curve is a bunch of nonsense. The flask method that they use to measure CO2 isn't any good. You know, they should be using NIST certified CO2 sensors like I have.

If they use those, for example, even the non treed area in the Portland, Oregon, The non treat area was consistently about 15 parts per million lower than what the Keelan curve says the worldwide number is. Okay. [00:06:00] I mean, there's

this whole idea that the worldwide number should be pretty much the same because it's a well mixed gas, but is that not true?

No, it's not true. There's actually 19 parts per million of fraud in the CO2 data. Manual measurements. And I've gotten about 50 scientists at NOAA fired for making manual adjustments when they shouldn't have. They, they don't like how 40 billion trees we have planted are lowering CO2. So when it goes down, they, uh, push it back up by making manual adjustments.

Yeah, I often wondered

about that. With the Keeling Curve, are they free to throw out numbers that they don't like and adjust them?

Yep, I put in a complaint against the, with the Commerce Department against NOAA, and that's why those scientists got fired.

Is there any, uh, competitive, uh, anyone, anybody else who's trying to [00:07:00] do the same thing elsewhere that's getting different numbers other than

you?

No.

Scientific Belief Systems and Climate Change Consensus

No, nobody, the problem, the problem in the world today with scientists and I'm, I don't know if you're a scientist or not, but scientists throughout the world have started operating maybe 20 years ago on a belief system, scientific belief system. Instead of a scientific open mind system, you know, every scientist must keep themselves from having a belief system, scientific belief system.

And I'll give you some examples, you know, people believe this 97 percent of scientists agree with the UN global warming nonsense. But the actual scientific consensus on the consensus page. Of the fake [00:08:00] climate.nasa.gov. Uh, that's the only truth on that site. And what they did is they interviewed, uh, 300 or so, I think it was 330 something, uh, scientists on the, or no, it was 330 manuscripts published during 2009 and 2011 or 12 that were pro the UN agenda.

And they interviewed those scientists. and got 97%. But during that same time, and you can web search this, I've done this, during that same time, there was like a little over 700 manuscripts published against the UN agenda. And so the actual consensus then is 33%. But, you know, these scientists believe that it's not, well, if 97 percent of scientists believe this, then I must believe this too.[00:09:00]

But they're believing nonsense, non science. We're junk science slayers.

Greenhouse Gases and Climate Models

So do you think there is a lot of groupthink in the mainstream climate science that they just believe, uh, generally that someone else has proved that CO2 is the climate control now?

Yeah, yeah, but water vapor is the biggest greenhouse gas, 88%.

CO2 is 9%. Methane is 0. 3%, you know, the, the, uh, well, part of our review of the intergovernmental panel, a climate change reports for working group one, they have that garbage global warming potential model in their model. And I can say something about models worldwide. Most models out there, like the climate.

Uh, modeling and all this stuff that's done by Noah. And NASA. None of those [00:10:00] models are benchmarked with available data, and any model that's not benchmarked with available data is a fake model, just like their global warming potential model. It assumes equal greenhouse gas concentrations, which will never happen in reality.

You know, if you had, for example, nitrous oxide, the same level as CO2, everybody would be walking around with a smile on their face, because that's laughing gas. You know, it's It's nonsensical. And we found in, they call it Annex 2, or we call it Appendix 2, 14, uh, a table of greenhouse gas. Um, levels at, uh, from 14 published manuscripts that showed the correct order of greenhouse gases, like I just said.

So, when we did the way we do review, we get together, we decide what we're going to review, what we're going to put, and then we [00:11:00] all upload the same comments. And we told them that that was fake and that they, they didn't benchmark it with that table data. In NX2. Well, in the final report for AR6, they deleted the table in NX2.

That's how corrupt they are. Instead of getting rid of their model, and just going with the table data, they, they deleted the table. That's utter, that's how crooked and corrupt the UN IPCC nonsense is.

Climate Change and Deforestation

Well, the first chapter in the college textbook is the only manuscript for net zero CO2e. We've deforested so much in the world. That we only have 8. 6 billion tons of photosynthesis left. And this is why carbon dioxide is increasing. [00:12:00] Not what the UN has been lying about for 40 years.

And so, you know, there's no way to get to 8. 6 from 35 billion tons which we're at. We have to plant trees. And then the another chapter is astrophysical warming on the data page on cctruth. org. We have a graph and we have a script that goes out and gets the data temperature data from 28, 000 temperature stations worldwide, and then makes graphs.

And it clearly shows the warming we have is not caused by greenhouse gases anyway, it's astrophysical warming. And that's one of the chapters in the college textbook. Another chapter is greenhouse gases, like I said. Uh, another chapter is the experiment I did. And the, um, you know, we'll get [00:13:00] that funding in April, hopefully.

Um, anything donated on cctruth. org is tax deductible. We're a 501c non profit research corporation. Oh, and predatory journals. The predatory journal list is complete nonsense. The real predatory journals are Nature Climate Change and the American Meteorological Society. They're the ones who started this predatory journalist, and they put the well known, well respected International Journal of Chemical Engineering on the predatory journalist.

But that's, that's a very good, I mean, I'm a chemical engineer, that's One of the best journals in the world and I'm a board member and chief editor of three three journals two of them are on the predatory journalist and I can tell you they're not predatory journals. We get a [00:14:00] manuscript in. We, um, I check it to make sure that the abstract of the title and the body of the manuscript match.

Not like Nature Climate Change. Nature Climate Change had Adam Yeeley as their chief editor until June of 2022. His PhD was in political science, and he was there to let the IPCC write BS, you know, like their global warming potential, loosely referenced manuscripts, and publish them in Nature's Climate Change so they could circular reference them in their reports.

But in June of 2020, we saw that, we contacted their board and they fired him the next day. But now Bronly Woke, or Bronly Wake, I call her Bronly Woke, um, is the chief editor. And she won't let anything go in there that doesn't [00:15:00] match. The false agenda of the U. N. So our equilibrium manuscript instead of published there was published in the top climate change journal by impact factor, which is how they're rated.

So, that's, you know, that's what that is. And so that's why it's a much better journal, and our Equilibrium manuscript has 35 external references, and it's so well written and so well referenced, that now, two years old in February, No one has written anything against it, because no one can.

Okay, I'm curious, for you as a chemical engineer, would you say you've come at this problem, uh, very much through the, uh, the carbon cycle, and looking at, uh, the atmosphere itself, or have you been

down all the other rabbit holes, too, in terms of trying to figure out how the climate actually does, uh,

change?[00:16:00]

Yeah. Yeah, Dr. Peter Tans, who retired, of NOAA, was in charge of the CO2 level, um, but he and I made a graph that shows, and that's, um, in the first chapter, I think, made a graph that shows that atmospheric CO2, excuse me, And all greenhouse gases are equal concentration throughout the latitudes.

Climate Change and Ocean Acidification

So, uh, that's one thing, is the ocean is not a sink.

And that's actually one of the chapters in the book, too. The ocean is not a sink for atmospheric CO2. The PMEL manuscript that started that nonsense in the 1990s said that it was diffusion flux. But I'm a chemical engineer, I know how to calculate diffusion flux. And it's not diffusion flux. [00:17:00] And the only place in the world that CO2 is increasing in the water is Mauna Loa, Hawaii.

And that's the graph you see on websites when they talk about the ocean as a sink. They show that graph, but they take off the label that says, Hawaii time series. They take off that label. But the, uh, location where that actual graph is, um, there's several other graphs they have. and the other graphs show no acidity change in any other place in the world.

And Tony Heller explains this in, um, C, uh, let's see, what is it called? Ocean stupefication. He's got a YouTube video, ocean stupefication. So I copied some things out of that. You know, he shows clearly, he does scuba diving, he goes, I think it was Monterey Bay, goes one side of the bay, oh [00:18:00] look, here's a coral reef that's devastated by ocean acidification, but then let's swim over here a hundred yards, well here's one that's thriving, you know, it's just life cycle, this one is younger, so it's thriving, the other one's dying, it's old, you know, that's, it's in the same bay.

You know, 100 yards apart, so it's not from ocean acidification, and he shows that the bottom of the ocean, he's a geologist. He said that the bottom of the ocean is all basalt, which is very basic, you know, maybe like a pH of 11 or 12. He said you could dump tons and tons of tons of acid into the ocean, and it wouldn't change the pH at all.

Okay, so what do you think the, uh The correct chart of CO2 levels over the last 600, 000 years would look like, I mean, was it really pegged at 280 ppm pretty closely for [00:19:00] hundreds of thousands

of years? And has CO2 risen since 1959? And if so, is, are humans the reason for that? Well, I

don't do that kind of research, but I've seen the graphs.

And certainly 1, 500 years ago, the CO2 levels were 800 ppm from ice core samples. And there was no warming at that time, you know, and actually, if you look at actual, the actual temperature information, first of all, there was a huge shift in the tilt of the earth.

Climate Change and Earth's Tilt

In the 1970s, and some scientists told this to the UN, and the UN knew that 90 percent of the people live in the northern hemisphere, and they called it global warming as an experiment to control people.

That's all climate change and global warming is, is an experiment to control people, and it's about removing people from the earth. [00:20:00] That's all it's about. All right.

So you think the earth has warmed since the 1970s global cooling scare, but the tilt of the earth is the

reason for that? Yes, yes, that's why it's warming in the Northern Hemisphere and cooling in the Southern Hemisphere.

I went to a little conference, and this is, I explained this on the data page of cctruth. org. Went to a little conference where this guy Jasper, I forget his last name, he was a UN correspondent for the New York Times. From like the 1980s to 2010 or so, showed us all kinds of pictures of him with Kofi Annan and, um, some other dignitaries and stuff like that, and showed us a, uh, image from a book of the UNs from 1984 that said exactly what I just said.

They knew it. They, they're, they're a bunch of liars, [00:21:00] you

know? So, uh, knowing what you know, do you have any predictions as to what's going to happen with, uh, the temperatures in either hemisphere, between now and 2050?

Climate Change and Temperature Data

Um, well, the graphs that I make every January, they'll, I'll update it on the data of page in January.

The last few I've made, what I do is I just go to the graphing page,

pull up the graph and get the final number and put it on the. The spreadsheet and then make a new graph, but the, the northern hemisphere has been cooling the last several years, not warming higher. And that's, you know, based on actual data from temperature stations.

Climate Change and Sea Ice

And you think, uh, is that reflected in Arctic sea ice? I'm seeing some updates right now that the Arctic sea ice is, uh, is relatively high right now over the last 20 years.

Um, it's growing a little bit, but the, the bigger issue to understand is the Antarctic. The Antarctic [00:22:00] glaciers are, have been growing and growing and growing, and there's data for that.

But NASA puts out this fake data about that, and let me talk for a minute about heat maps.

Climate Change and Heat Maps

Heat maps are utter nonsense. The government, NASA, NOAA, nobody makes heat maps. They send the data to a heat map company and say, I want a heat map of this data. Well, what's that company going to give them but a heat map of that data?

And if they have to delete some data or whatever to make it look like a heat map, that's what they're going to, that's what they're getting paid to do. So the heat maps. Or utter nonsense, um, because whenever I've seen a, a heat map of certain area of the United States, I go look at the actual graph of that area and see it's not true.

Yeah, that's an important point. I have [00:23:00] believed those heat maps. You look at all the different colors and you think that's based on real data, but it's model data, right? Well, it's

Is it? It's somewhat actual data. The problem is, is that of the 28, 000 stations, and my tech guy just went through this, but I haven't got the number, but there's about I would venture to say 3, 000 or 4, 000 stations that have been decommissioned, but NOAA keeps putting fake data on those stations, and they, they fake the data on their stations, but, um, I forget the guy's name, he's retired now from NOAA, he was in charge of all the temperature stations, and that's explained on the data page.

So the script we wrote and that he confirmed, he ran it on their, um,

servers and got the same data we did and said [00:24:00] it was correct. The script we have, uh, goes out and gets the temperature data from a station, then gets the temperature data from surrounding stations and does statistics. And if that doesn't fall within a confidence interval, then that data is ignored.

And if five times the data isn't there, then that, um, that data station is removed from the script. So this way, our script goes out and only gets the actual data, not any of the fake data, and makes those graphs. And it's been running for seven years now. And so I have 100 percent confidence in those graphs.

On the data page and on the graphing page, which you can get to from the

data page. So if you're looking at the data from 28, 000 stations, let's say, do you have a sense as to how many of those stations or what percent of [00:25:00] those stations actually show cooling over the last, let's say, 30 plus

years? Well, everything in the southern, he, every one of those data stations in the Southern hemisphere.

The typical one, yeah, go ahead. Well, most of those stations are in the Northern Hemisphere, but maybe 30% are in the Southern hemisphere. Those certainly show cooling.

And do you think that cooling, that they're, they're actually showing cooling even enough to overcome, uh, the urban heat island?

Well, there, uh, well, the problem with the temperature stations, and there's YouTube videos on this, like the ones in the United States, I think at Yale University, you know, 40 years ago, was sitting at the edge of the soccer field or the football field.

Now, the university has grown, and that data station is sitting outside of, uh, some, a dormitory. With a, uh, air conditioner blowing on it, [00:26:00] you know, there's a picture of that. So, and those are the stations that by our statistics, we eliminate, but, uh, most of, you know, the southern hemisphere is a lot more sparse than the northern hemisphere.

And so those temperature stations in the southern hemisphere are not likely to be. Um, at heat islands, but even if they are, um, and let's say all of the temperature stations, except for very few are on heat islands, then they're all going to register the same amount of heat. Uh, put out by the electric or gas or whatever burning in that area or wood burning, you know, in that area for heat or for, uh, cooking and things like that.

So in, in a, when you look at it in terms of a global sense, you can see that, you know, plus or [00:27:00] minus a little bit, those are going to have generally the same effect. But again, you know, we have statistics and stuff that goes out and checks for all those kinds of things. And eliminates that kind of spurious or heat island effect.

Okay, I'm curious to who's, uh, which other climate skeptics or realists, who's work do you really like or think they're on the right track? Or are you keeping track of what Willie Soon and the Connellys are doing? Sounds like you're keeping track of what Heller's doing.

Oh, yeah. Heller's a good guy. Um, the guys on our review team, um, I'm drawing a blank.

Let me pull up my, uh,

news email addresses. So, um, Nicholas Draper, Bernard Edwards. Uh, Edmund, Philip [00:28:00] Foster, um, Judith Curry, Terry Oldberg, Connor, who did the, uh, well that's one thing I should say. I'll say that in a second. Stephen Coonan, Anthony Watts, all these guys.

And, oh, and also, uh, Lakeley at Heartland and Taylor at Heartland, Burnett at Heartland, Jay Lehrer, and Roy Spenson, David Legates. Those are the scientists on the IPCC review team. And Connor, Connor, uh, McMinney, he lives in Scotland.

Climate Change and Storm Patterns

He's on our review team, but also one of the chapters. In the textbook is why the storms [00:29:00] stopped coming into southeastern United States from West Africa, and that's one of the chapters.

Um, what, what, what happened is he and, um, Tom Weissmuller, a meteorologist. And unfortunately, Tom passed away of cancer last year, but, uh, he and Tom and some NASA scientists found the solution for those storms coming from West Africa. And what it was, was in the 1960s, they put in the Aswat Dam on the, um, On the Nile River, and when they put that dam in the area below the dam downstream that used to flood every June was no longer flooding and that flooding before the dam was put in was create was evaporating and [00:30:00] creating clouds that would go over and shield West Africa.

Okay. So this is, they call it the Nice Fix for Southeast USA Storms. And, um, this is the, the Aswat Dam is upstream of here. And in this area here, this, into this valley of the Nile River, that's where they put the dam and backfilled this area right here that used to flood

every June, every June. But it's not flooding anymore.

And I was on a team and saw a zoom meeting and a zoom meeting, which they showed that, but see, this is where all those storms come from right here that we're coming into the United States. All those hurricanes, all that coming right here. There's some coming from here, but most of them coming from here.

And the reason why is the clouds weren't there to cool this. When this is cool, these storms go right up here. When this is warmer, they [00:31:00] come over here. So there's an atmospheric river that's constant right here that they go up if it's cool. And so that's, you know, the floodplain. It is showing it evaporates faster.

And this is the difference in the rainfall. They had less rainfall until they put the dam in. Now they have more clouds and rainfall. And that's the, uh, fix for it.

Analyzing Weather Patterns and Storm Tracks

And so this was, uh, last year, not, uh, that was 2022. You can see that this one going straight up. This Fiona and stuff that said it was coming over here.

Ended up instead of going this way, went straight over here and, um, you know, all the Gaston's going up here. Fiona's going up there. This new one is going up there. And, uh, this one also, Ian was from South America. So I talked to Connor about fixing this too, but [00:32:00] he's kind of burned out. So I have to wait for him.

The Need for a New Meteorologist

And plus we need a new meteorologist. Um, somebody who's got, you know, either a master's or PhD in meteorology to get on a team and figure out the ones from South America. Um, anyway, that's, that's that.

Global Sea Rise and Climate Change

And then this is, uh, global sea rise.

Yeah, let's go back to that. So, uh, how long has this been going on that these storm tracks have changed in the Southeast U.

S.? How much data do we

Well, when we had that Zoom meeting, the NASA scientists and Connor and Tom said that they expected they would stop in 2027. But actually they stopped this year, you know, there's no storms came from West Africa and I watched this every day. I have the, I have, uh, the five day tropical outlook for the Atlantic on my, uh, [00:33:00] on my, uh, edge.

One of my tabs on Microsoft edge that I look at it every day to see if anything's coming. And I can swear to you that nothing came from West Africa to the eastern United States this past fall.

Okay, and your feeling is this might be a permanent change? It's not just a cyclical thing, it'll go back the

other way?

Yeah, well as long as they keep this dam right here and backfill this area to get it to flood every June the way it did before, and then make these clouds and these clouds See, that's like right here or so. So these clouds form and the winds. Blow this direction so that blows them over the ocean and these clouds sit here and cool this off.

And when this cools, these go straight up here. I've watched some of them this [00:34:00] fall go straight up there. So I have, and I have those images, but I don't have them. I put them in the high school textbook and I'll put them in the second edition that we're making of this book.

Yeah. And that current book you're talking about is a college

textbook, right?

Yes. Yes. Yeah. Yeah. It's all nonsense out there. We're junk science slayers and there's a lot of junk science out there.

The Impact of Deforestation on Oxygen Levels

Do you have any opinion on the greenhouse effect itself or whether the humans have heated up the earth at all since 1850?

No, there's no effect of anything humans have done except for deforestation and putting in that Aswat Dam.

And things we've Things we've done worldwide and we haven't looked to see whether they actually are going to affect anything. You know, I'm more [00:35:00] into, uh, lowering the CO2 because it's tied to the

oxygen level. You know, the oxygen, if you look at oxygenlevels. org, the oxygen levels Cycle the same way the CO2 Keeling curve goes up, the oxygen levels are going down with the same cycle, so they're tied together and that's tied together in photosynthesis.

So is it true that globally there is more a leaf area right now than there was maybe 10 or 20 years ago, or is that not true? Uh,

The Greening of Earth and Photosynthesis

---

um, NASA has an article and I tend to agree with it. The CO2 is greening the earth, you know, plants take in CO2 and they take 40 percent of the carbon from that, put it down through their roots, back into the ground, and then the rest of the carbon makes more plant and then they give off oxygen.

But, you know, our equilibrium manuscript shows that we only have 8. 6 [00:36:00] billion tons of photosynthesis. left in the world. And that's alarming. You know, that should be, that's the emergency that people need to know about. There's no, there's no climate emergency except for getting our, uh, oxygen level back.

The Amazon Rainforest and Oxygen Production

We have an article in the Rio times that shows because the amazon rainforest has switched.

Then, um, we've lost 20 percent of our oxygen production and they're the cause of it. And Peru stopped deforestation in, in 2020. And now the new president of Brazil is stopping deforestation. When they stopped deforestation, the two of them is about 75 percent of the Amazon. The rest will follow and the Amazon will switch back to be an oxygen producer and a carbon dioxide sink.

In three years that fast, [00:37:00] and it will, uh, increase photosynthesis to over a hundred billion tons annual and we'll get our oxygen levels will start going back up. So that's the solution. If you want more oxygen.

The Impact of Decreasing Oxygen Levels

Right now the oxygen level you're breathing and this happened over a long period of time So you don't really notice it the oxygen level you're breathing was the oxygen level a thousand feet above you That's

how much the oxygen levels have decreased in the earth It'd be neat to do have a have a doctor do a study on how many Um, per capita, you know, change in ventilators or, you know, older people wearing these oxygen masks and having to have a wheelchair with an oxygen tank, you know, see if that's increased because those would be the most, um, the most affected by the oxygen levels decreasing.[00:38:00]

And do you have

numbers to attach to that? Like how, what percent are oxygen levels down over the last 30 years or so? Anything like that?

I did. I calculated it and looked up the numbers about three years ago, but I just look at oxygen levels dot org and you can see the levels decreasing. Um, and I know that for example, if you look at the concentration that it was.

At a thousand feet above you, that's the concentration it is at sea level now.

Okay. And you think that the Amazon deforestation is a major part of that, right?

Yeah. Okay. Oh, I, I, I don't think it, I know it.

Yeah. Cause in the U S itself, there's way more, uh, forest area now than there was at the minimum.

Isn't, is that correct?

Um, in, in places, yes, but the, the way to look at deforestation is global forest watch. [00:39:00] And look at the map and you see that and you see the United States is guilty of non sustainable deforestation, like in the south southern part of the United States. They're just raping the land down there, clear cutting and getting rid of that, and that needs to stop.

And they need to do strip logging instead of clear cutting. That way, strip logging is sustainable, clear cutting

is not. Yeah, there is some, I don't know if it's clear cutting going on in the southeastern U. S., and they're turning the trees into pellets and shipping them to the U. K. That's still happening.

Isn't that right? Yeah. Yeah.

Not a great idea. Not a great idea at all. We need to, uh, reforest that area with native shrubs and trees. And again, do strip logging. If you do strip logging, if you take a strip out of a forest, this was developed by Oregon State University [00:40:00] Forestry in 1990. You

do strip logging, the trees on the side will repopulate the area there, and those are native to that microclimate right there, so they will grow the best right there.

And you do strip logging, and that prevents a forest fire from jumping over it because your strip is maybe like the width of a three lane freeway. And you can do strip logging around 20, 000 acres and never have a forest fire more than 20, 000 acres. And once you get strip logging done around 20, 000 acres, you can move over a couple hundred yards and do another strip around it.

And you can keep doing that around 20, 000 acres forever. Because by the time you get done with several of them, you can go back and do the first one again.

Is there much strip logging going on right now yet, worldwide

or no? No, it's all, it's all clear [00:41:00] cutting because it's a lot easier. They're not, all of the equipment for logging, you know, I grew up in a logging area in West Eugene.

All the equipment for logging is geared for clear cutting. You know, they would need to have developed different, I mean, they can use the equipment they have now, but it's not optimal. Let's put it that way for strip logging. Okay.

Let's see, what other points would you like to make? I think we have maybe 20 minutes or so left here.

I want to make sure all of your big points get made here.

The Salmon Protection Device and its Impact

Yeah, well, um, I'll talk about the salmon for a minute. Salmonprotectiondevice. com We're putting in for a grant for a million dollars from Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife to build a cage. that goes on the west end of Bonneville Dam, uh, fish ladder. [00:42:00]

You know, these people say, well, we need to remove the dams to help the salmon. You know, that's nonsense.

The Role of Sea Lions in Salmon Population

The problem with the salmon is the sea lions. The sea lions aren't supposed to be in the Columbia River and the sea lions wait at the

bottom of the fish ladder. I've seen this with my own eyes, and other people have told it to me.

They wait there, and the salmon have to go, they've been going in this fish ladder, I think it's been there since the 50s. Going in this fish ladder every year, and as they go in there, the sea lion just grabs one and eats it, and grabs one and eats it, grabs one and eats it, when that one's full, another sea lion comes and takes its place.

And so they're easily removing 30 percent of the salmon that are going into the fish ladder and going up to spawn. So what we're going to make is that what we propose to make, and I put in for a patent for this design, is a [00:43:00] cage. That fits over the entrance to the to the fish ladder that only has holes in it.

The salmon can go through. And when the, when that's built with stainless steel 316 and put in there, then the salmon will have multiple, you know. They can come in from the top, the sides, the bottom, the end, um, and holes big enough for them and strong enough one inch bar, solid bar of stainless steel 316 welded so that the sea lions can't damage it.

So then the salmon will be able to get in there and go up and spawn. Then that will prevent the, the salmon won't be able to eat there anymore. And so you take away their food, they're gonna go downstream. And then I'm con then I'll contact, uh, department of Fish and Wildlife in Washington and Oregon, [00:44:00] which I've already sent both of them an email about it.

Um, and ask for a moratorium on salmon fishing in the Columbia River downstream of Bonneville Dam for a year. Because I know for a fact, I've bank fished from Sauvies Island on the Columbia. And, uh, every about second or third time you start reeling in a salmon, a sea lion comes and chews it off your line and takes it right off your line.

So if we take away that the salmon are fast enough that the sea lions can't catch them, so you take away their food. They're going to head back out to the ocean where they belong and stay out there. So that's the solution for the salmon problem. These idiots, you know, they want to buy, drive electric cars.

Which won't do anything to lower CO2 for 150 years. That's the residence time of CO2. That's one of the chapters in the college textbook, you know, [00:45:00] and that's the reason why the residence time is so high is because we don't have any consumption remaining. And so any, you know, solar panels, windmills, all that stuff are utter nonsense, you know, Australia.

There's a video on the YouTube that's also on the website called How to Ruin an Electric Grid in 3 Easy Steps. Joe Nova, you may have seen

it. And she's, Australia already tried this. They blew up their coal fired power plants. put in solar panels and windmills and had rolling blackouts. And that's what these people in the Northwest, you know, they believe all this nonsense and the media just lies like they do.

And they blew up the Boardman coal fire power plant. And now these other people are told by the media that, well, the salmon problem is the dams. We have to get rid of the dams. Well, the dams are 80 percent of our, we got rid of 20 percent of our power. Now we're [00:46:00] going to get rid of the other 80%. And you want everybody to drive EVs, they're not going to be able to charge their car.

Actually, the grid, um, and I'll put this, I'm going to scan this, I went to a meeting with a grid expert. The grid in the northwest is negative, uh, 927 megawatts starting next year because of all these people driving EVs and charging them. And what the guy said, he, he attends these grid meetings. For the Northwest, what they're talking about doing is called virtual generation.

Virtual generation, if somebody has a smart meter on the side of their car, they have an EV charging in their garage, they're going to suck the power out of the EV and add to the grid. So somebody's going to go out in the garage, bye honey, I'm heading to work. And, uh, they got no power in the car, [00:47:00] but that, and he said, they're actively discussing that.

Amazing. So

is that, is, are they using the salmon as a major reason to try to get rid of those dams? That's the reason.

Okay. Yeah. Mm hmm. Yeah, that's the reason. But the solution is to get rid of the sea lions. They don't belong there anyway. And they're not

normally there. They're there because of the dams,

you think?

Yeah, they're not normally, you know, I've lived here all my life. There's never been sea lions in the Columbia River until the last 20 years. You know, the sea lions have learned that there's this place up by the Bonneville Dam where they can just chow down. As much as they want,

Climate Drivers and the Role of Volcanoes

---

okay, let's see before we wrap up, this might be too complicated a

question, but do you have thoughts on what the top natural climate drivers are either in the short term or long term, you talked about the tilt of the earth, [00:48:00] are you looking into geothermal or all cosmic rays, all sorts of other things,

well, there's, you know, the volcanoes, volcanoes, volcanoes, Put out sulfur dioxide and carbon dioxide, massive amounts of carbon dioxide.

And Noah is so woke the, you know, the, uh, volcano in, in, uh, Mauna Loa blew up last year, a year ago, December, I think it was. And I contacted those guys and I offered, I said, I'll bring my sensors and. And measure the CO2 levels. Oh, they wouldn't have that. They don't want that. But they said that the sulfur dioxide levels were 200 and something ppm close to the, um, to the volcano.

So I calculated, and that means that the, [00:49:00] because the ratio, it's fairly well known when a volcano erupts, that the ratio, and I forget the ratio, but there's a certain ratio of carbon dioxide to sulfur dioxide, and that's fairly constant throughout any eruption. So I found out what that number was, and I multiplied that times the CO2 and like the carbon dioxide levels were like 2000 PPM from that volcano

But they didn't, they didn't want that to be known. So they didn't want me to go there with my sensors and find that out .

So you think they might, for a while at least, have been measuring numbers, like 2000 there in Monte Loa, but they throw 'em out and they tell us it's four 15 or something,

or what?

Right. Yeah. Yeah, well, they on their site, they said they moved 40 miles north to some other location where they're measuring. But still, I mean, that island's not that big. That kind of CO2 level anywhere is going to permeate throughout the [00:50:00] atmosphere and then finally get permeated through the whole atmosphere.

But it's going to be mostly higher concentrations all the way around there. But Mauna Loa, yeah. You know, they call it NOAA Mauna Loa. It's actually in Boulder, Colorado. That's where the scientists are, and that's where all of the flask measurement is done, which is fake. And now Katherine McCain, who, Dr.

Katherine McCain, who was in charge of that, was fired. Um, but that's where they do the manual adjustments of the CO2 level. For the 19th PPM of fraud and that's, that's where all of the CO2 level stuff is done. But, you know, it's not, not just Mauna Loa, they have CO2 levels. Uh, stations and I think the same temperature stations that we get our temperature data and have CO2 [00:51:00] levels, although they

keep it secret, they won't tell you the longitude and latitude of any CO2 station because they don't, they don't want you, you know, like I contacted the guy who's in charge of those.

I said, where is there one around here? I could take one of my sensors over. And get the data and then get your data and compare it. He's like, well, I can't tell you that. Really? Wow. Yeah. They won't, they, they keep it secret where these stations are. Sounds pretty fishy to me. It's very fishy. Um, I mean, I, I start to think maybe they don't have any stations at all, and they're faking all the data.

I don't know. I mean, it's the temperature station data. I know the longitude and latitude of everyone that we get the data from, because it's in the data set, you know, when we strobe it for data, it gives out its longitude and latitude. We [00:52:00] strobe it by the station number. And it gives out its longitude, latitude, and then the CO, or the, um, temperature data for the last 30 days.

And, uh, stuff, and it gives some other data. And so we get that data, summarize it once a month, and make those graphs.

Wrapping Up and Future Research

But I don't know, and it's hard to tell. I've had my tech guy looking at it, but he's busy doing other things. But hard to tell where whether what other data is on those same stations, but what I have him doing right now.

See the graphs on the graphing page on after from the data page on cctruth. org only have temperature change since 1980. Well, I'm going to we're, we're going to make change the script. Well, we have the script that runs, but it takes a couple of hours to run. So we're going to make a script that [00:53:00] only does each 10, 10 degrees latitude so that somebody can run just the script for their latitude and see the temperature as it is outside right now, and then verify that the script is correct by knowing that the temperature outside is the same as what the script says.

So that's what we're working on right now. And that's taken up most of this time.

Uh, dropping back to something you said earlier, uh, did you say that maybe CO2 levels might have been 800 parts per million back around the medieval warm period thousand years

ago? Yeah, I think it was. I've seen the graph, but I think it was around 800 ppm back maybe like a year 1300 or something like that.

I've seen the graph, but I don't remember the exact numbers, but Anybody, uh, Tony and, uh, John, I'm gonna butcher his last name, Cedric, or something like that. I follow [00:54:00] him. He, he puts fake, he puts the fake data stations data on Twitter, but he also puts the C level, I mean the CO2 level. Data on Twitter also.

So I follow

him as John Shewchuk, maybe.

Yeah. Something like that. Yeah. I follow him and sometimes repost what he repo, what he posts. So if you're following me, it sounds like you'll see that. Yeah.

Okay. All right. Anything else you'd like to, uh, say before we go ahead and wrap

this one up? I think my Twitter handle is Dave CC truth org or something like that.

They can find me and follow me. All right. Yeah. I'll

put that in the show description as well. Okay. Very good. So thank you for your time. You're a very interesting guy doing a lot of interesting research. So thanks for your work.

Well, I appreciate it and thank you for the time and you guys have a great rest of your week.