

Dave Collum transcript PDF 030724

===

[00:00:00]

Introduction to the Podcast and Guest Dave Collum

Dave: The pathological lying is spectacular in this field.

Tom: Welcome to Tom Nelson podcast number 200. I guess today is Dave Collum.

And Dave, do you want to tell us a little bit about you and what you're doing here today?

Dave Collum's Journey into Podcasting and Climate Change Skepticism

Dave: I never know what I'm doing. Um, my name is Dave Collum. I am, uh, I am a podcaster of a higher order at this point in my life. Someone called me the, the, the, the, the, the godfather of podcasting.

Um, I, I now have a rule that says one per day. I've already broken it today. Um, and, uh, And I started podcasting about things about Um, economics it got more geopolitical and then, and then it's gotten into other things.

And then I think the first time I ever did a full climate change podcast was with you. And as I recall, you were surprised that I'd actually taken it as seriously as I had. Um, and, uh, and I'm now fully Kool Aid swilling climate denier of [00:01:00] the higher order, but as a scientist, I had had great faith in the scientific community to try to, you know, work out the deep this pre pandemic.

I should add, right? If you get through the pandemic and you think the scientific community will do their job, you're really on another planet at this point.

Start of presentation

Dave: I'm going to talk about the talk and give the talk. And so it's going to be an odd hybrid.

Uh, so I, of course, open with the fact that, um, this is a Crichton

sort of moment where Time Magazine said we're going to have an ice age and then, and then we're going to have, uh, global warming. Which is what science can do, right? You can think you're getting a nice age and realize you blew it and change your mind.

Uh, now it is up to the global burning or global boiling theme. And, uh, you know, somehow global boiling strikes me as a bit hyperbolic. Um, Greta Thunberg promised us, Greta, or the Queen Greta, promised us five years ago that five years from now, um, that, that it'll wipe out all of humanity, um, [00:02:00] I would argue based on what I'm seeing in the United States, she was correct at some level.

Um, but, but, but I think it's not due to climate change. I think it's due to the 2024 campaign. Um, one of the true newits of the climate change story turns out to be John Kerry. Now, when I give When I give talks, I, I really discourage, I, I discourage my students from giving talks with lots of writing, but I, I'm showing quotes for a very specific reason, and I will be paraphrasing them, so if someone's watching this as a, as a video and you want to read the quote, get ready to pause it, but I'm going to just paraphrase it by pointing out what, at some level, why the quote is there, and that's how I would do it during the talk, too, um, so here's John Kerry basically saying that, uh, The one point to get to 1.

5 degrees of global warming. All we need is money, money, money, money, money, money, money, uh, that turns out to be as truthful as he can get. I think it's all about money. Uh, below that it shows a [00:03:00] picture of Uh, for the bigger clowns houses, um, including Gore, Obama, Kerry, and Romney. And you'll notice there are no solar panels on them, which, uh, suggests that maybe they forgot to, to, to practice what they preach.

Um, here is a statement by, uh, Otmar Eidenhofer, who is an IPCC official, um, stating that, uh, um, that the climate policy is really about, um, redistributing world's wealth. So I'd say that he's probably being pretty factual there too. Uh, what I'd like to point out here, and this is something that drives me pretty crazy when I'm having a debate with people, is that they smuggle in ideas from other subjects.

As a climate change story. My wife used to do this. I finally broke her the habit. But but there is climate change to be discussed today. There's resource depletion, which I'm a big hawk on. So I think we are consuming the world's resources. But, um, [00:04:00] but but people who say you should address climate change because it'll solve the resource depletion problem.

I said, No, no, no, no, no, no. If you want to solve resource depletion, focus on resource depletion. Don't focus. So you won't solve the problem if you don't define it clearly. Uh, there's the

pollution argument, which, which I think there's pretty self correcting as shown by the deep water horizon. When we thought we opened the gates of hell, the Gulf of Mexico, and a couple of years later, we're okay.

So the world does self cleanse, but again, You're also smuggling in another story altogether, because if pollution was the problem, they'd say, well, we should be using natural gas and, and, and the climate change crowd refuses to accept that overpopulation gets at all of the issues, all of the above. And then.

And and again, but don't make climate change arguments when you want to talk about the world being over populated with people. And then lastly, there is what is referred to as the 150 trillion opportunity, which is a phrase that Goldman [00:05:00] Sachs came up with. And we know that their job is to make money. And so that probably is really getting at the heart of the matter.

The Misuse of Scientific Data and the Climate Change Debate

Dave: Once again, um, this is really the start of it. Um, I have an email trail that I've gone through And my growth, my entry to the climate change world. And so this was an email to my brother in which I pointed out that, um, he challenged me, two guys challenged me, him and a guy named David Walker were poking at me saying, how do you know it's true?

And as a scientist, I had faith in science. And, and so here's an email that I wrote to my brother where I I'd had, um, I'd had dinner with the Secretary of, former Secretary of Energy, Stephen Chu, and he said there are no credible scientists who doubt the global warming, none, right? And so that was me, you know, using the pushback against the, you know, only an idiot would believe the denial model.

Uh, it shows a picture of a globe and there's red all over it, and I'm going to remind the listeners that, um, I could make that [00:06:00] globe any color I wanted, and so when someone uses a lot of red, You should be aware of the fact that that is just a computer setting on their screen. Um, it looks really bad if you make it bright red, but it doesn't mean it is.

Um, Um, here's a great quote from Marcia McNutt, the editor of Science, saying the debate has ended, the science has settled, even a political opinion is not. Marcia Nutt is a moron. Um, she is obviously, knows nothing about how science works, and she, she obviously is unaware of You know, sort of the impact that Einstein had on Newtonian physics when they thought they'd resolved that problem.

And then there's the famous 97 percent of climate scientists think climate change is a crisis. And, and as you know, Tom, um, that comes from a bizarre survey of papers, which they looked at just the abstracts and threw away something like all but 0.4%, according to Crichton. So they sifted through it. They found only those papers of in [00:07:00] climate scientists science in which they made an explicit statement in the abstract, which narrowed it down from thousands to 79 papers.

Um, and, and as Crichton put it, you know, they took 0.4 percent of the sample and turned it into a 97 percent number, uh, of those four that made an explicit statement in the, in the, in the abstract. Uh, 77 of them said it was a crisis, and they said, and from that point on now, climate scientists, I presume, know that this is a farce, and therefore the ones who cite this number, we all know, are liars, and so, uh, so when, I will challenge anyone who uses that number, and I'll say, you know it, I watched the debate once afterwards, I went after the guy, I didn't do it in public, I said, you know you're lying when you quoted that number, and he was doing this Hammond and Hahn shit on me like there was no tomorrow, you But it's appalling.

So that number is bullshit. We know that. Um, classic photo. Um, here's Will Happer, one of your [00:08:00] favorites, as I'm well aware of. Not only a physicist at Princeton, director of the Department of Energy's Office of Science, advisor to many presidents, saying, by the way, CF2 is really good for life on Earth. Uh, Happer also claims to have been the first person to actually write a book about the influence of greenhouse gases on climate.

He claimed he said that in one of his talks. I didn't know that. Um, Happer is really good about pointing out the physics of greenhouse gases and pointing out it's very nonlinear and that by adding more CO2 that there's this terrible law of diminishing returns and it does not increase the risk of Greenhouse gas based global warming.

But but as he as this picture points out that we will get a lot of nice growth of our green materials. Uh, if if we have more CO2 in the atmosphere, of course, will happer is just an old white guy. So he's dismissible.

Exploring the Controversies and Misinterpretations in Climate Science

Dave: Um, Here's the one, uh, fairly recently I saw Thomas Sowell, who's a bit of a recluse [00:09:00] because he likes to write books and he can't if he's being pestered, but he's one of the great, great economists of the 20th century.

And he actually, when asked about climate change, drew, drew, without

showing it, he drew attention to this picture and said, until you can explain this, that, that debate's stupid. And, um, And so this is a quote from Richard Linsin ~saying who is the not only a geophysicist at, at, uh, at MIT, but the former head of the National Academy of Sciences, uh, and if you, if I get something wrong, point it out, because I don't want to get something wrong.~

~And you know, the facts, um, and ~he points out that, um, Then it's one of the greatest mass delusions in history. So the, the idea that there, uh, there is, uh, there are no credible scientists who don't believe the narrative. Well, I've already found a couple so far in this talk, and we'll, we'll keep hitting them.

Um, this particular plot's an interesting one because it shows that what is an undeniable correlation of CO2 and temperature Earth's temperature. And so this is often showcased by the climate climate. Um, uh, catastrophists is showing how, how can you refute this? What an amazing correlation it is. The problem is, as you know, there's, there's an 800 year offset that's [00:10:00] statistically significant.

And the offset is, is that the temperature rises 800 years before the CO2 rises. And so, so the causality is, uh, as used by the catastrophists. causally backwards. Uh, and it turns out it makes sense. The, the temperature rises, the oceans de gas, which is freshman chemistry. And, uh, and, and, and so as the world gets hotter, then the CO2 comes out of the oceans and goes in the atmosphere and shows up in greenland ice cores and things like that.

So, uh, so, so the fact is warming causes CO2 not vice versa. Um, that's kind of entertaining. Uh, any of it can see that the days are getting hotter, And here's a plot of, um, I have to squint, but it's about 25 years of, uh, of, of global mean temperature. And as you can see, it's flat in a pancake. Now, what I like to draw people's attention to, especially, uh, the people who have thoughtlessly not even wondered about this topic.

I said, [00:11:00] so, so let's say climate change is roaring along. Let's say it's really, it is a problem and it's rising, you know. some fraction of a, of a degree per year to get to this awful four degree rise at the end of the century. Um, do you really think that you can see that? And it would be the equivalent of me looking out the window and say, you know, of course those trees are growing.

Look, it's obvious those trees are growing and you go, it's not obvious to me because, you know, I looked at them last year and they kind of look the same. So if you think that, that, that, that you walk outside and you Develop a serious sweat because it's August and it's 98 degrees that you're detecting a tenth of a degree From the previous year then you really have to get a CT scan Um, that's a recurring

theme Everyone says all the flooding to this to that even if it's roaring along the naked I can't detect it very sophisticated scientific measurement is the only way to detect it But [00:12:00] so the idiots, they can see it though.

They can say, oh, it's hot. This winter was warm. Oh, of course, this climate change is, the winter's way warmer. You know, well, good luck with that one. Um, the global mean temperatures before 1980 are based on trustworthy data that I think you and I probably agree on. It shows here a growth. Now, if you squint at the very top of this plot, you can actually see the flatness up there.

But if you pan back and say, oh, that, that, that looks pretty good. But the problem is, um. The temperature measurements prior to 1980 are, are baloney due to, you know, base effects and all, uh, and what's, say heat. Heat island effects.

The Role of Money and Politics in Climate Change Discussions

Dave: And, and, and as, as your audience already knows, um, you know, you put a, you put a, a, a thermometer out somewhere.

Admittedly, a, a thermometer from 100 years ago. So heaven only knows how it correlates with today. Um, and you put it out somewhere in the middle of nowhere. And now it's in the middle of a shopping center. Um, because it hasn't [00:13:00] been moved. Um, you are going to get an erroneous reading and so, so this guy who happens to be an oceanographer in Hawaii, uh, uh, uh, uh, uh, a physicist in Hawaii, um, says she can't believe anything prior to 1980.

Um, here's 100 years of recorded highs in February, now it turns out to be February 12th. So someone picked an arbitrary day, but over over a century, you can see that the high on February 12th for 100 years is going down, not up. And, uh, and if there was a trend, you would expect to see it here, especially because this is sort of a single point reading.

So you're, you're not averaging a lot of stuff. This is across the country, but it's, um, it's, it's, it's not a bad depiction of what's really happening. Here's a plot. I'd like to find a better one of this plot, um, [00:14:00] showing many, many years, but you see the earth just gets warmer and colder over many, many years.

Um, I love this headline, vintners in France haven't seen such a succession of hot weather and dry harvest since the 14th century. Yeah. Oh my God, that's awful. I would like to rewrite that headline a little bit. It is say it was this goddamn hot in the 14th century. And, uh, and that's what you, you know, is the medieval warming

period.

Now, here's where it gets really tricky. And again, Happers mentioned this. This has been known for many decades, that the Middle Ages were warmer than the world now. And so the climate narrative for Almost gets destroyed by that one fact alone. The climate narrative, um, architects, um, had been working over time to decrease the temperature of the mediaeval period.

and Hapur, Hapur Point Society said, slowly but surely, they've been knocking down [00:15:00] the temperature of the mediaeval period to To about To get it such that that's no longer as embarrassing. So there might be modern plots that have somehow removed the medieval warming period. We'll see this again. The pathological lying is spectacular in this field.

Um, Oh, um, here's Patrick Frank, physicist at Stanford University, says that, um, anthropogenic, meaning human based air temperature, uh, cannot have been nor presently be evidenced in climate observables. And as I recall, that's that's That's the same guy who did the statistical analysis and said the error bar is five times bigger than the, uh, than the measurement, uh, just using error propagation arguments.

I think he's in the synchrotron at Stanford. And there's some, you know, there's some failed models that shows what they predicted and actually what happened. And you can see they didn't work, but I, you know, I can forgive stuff like that. If they were, if they were trying to get it [00:16:00] right, you will still see stuff like that.

So.

Analyzing Climate Change Models and Predictions

Dave: Um, here's the IPCC report that says that basically the climate system is an extraordinary complex nonlinear system and therefore long term predictions are not possible. That was in 2001. That is subsequently somehow disappeared from that report. Um, that was starting to get embarrassing, and even though it was 2001, so, we're, in 2001, we're still painting our hands, painting our hands on cave walls, so, uh, so that, that should throw away somehow.

Um, and then here's Steve Koonin saying that the media's portrayal of what we, what's going on is so out of touch. Uh, that it's absurd and, and demonstrably false, right? Now, who's Steve Koonin? Well, Steve Koonin is a former Caltech physicist, former provost of Caltech, and he chaired the American Physical Society's committee of elite physicists.

They put [00:17:00] together this to address this question, say, is climate change Real and so they put 12 real rock stars together. I bet you Harper was on the committee Although I haven't gone to the trouble proving it but Freeman Dyson was on it There were some big names there and they came out of there all deniers That was a committee of 12 who said this stuff is total bullshit And now they're just all white men.

We're back to that story Then you get Michael Mann. Michael Mann is at Penn State. I know someone who knows him, who has nothing good to say about him. Um, here is a quote by one of his, um, by one of his co authors on a paper in which he says, uh, better that nothing appear than something acceptable to us.

Excuse me while I puke. So Michael Mann was at the center of what is referred to as Climategate. And it was where there were emails that got leaked that showed that they were just making shit up. [00:18:00] Um, it turns out Mark Stein got sued for calling him out in various ways, and unfortunately in the court of popular opinion, which sometimes leaks into the courts, um, Michael, uh, Stein lost that case, even though scientists look and say to lose the case, they had to demonstrably prove that man was right or wrong and no one was qualified to do so.

So it was just a disagreement. Stein, on the other hand, who's, who's a colorful character, certainly didn't, didn't mince words every chance he got to make man look like an idiot. Um, so this is the famous hockey stick that made man famous that got Um, help get Al Gore the Nobel Prize and turns out to be questioned by his collaborators.

Um, here's another physicist at Oxford. Oxford, I'm told, is an important institution. Uh, do I expect you to publicly denounce the hockey stick as obvious dribble? Well, yes. Right. So the, the, the serious [00:19:00] players are out there going, Michael, you're full of shit. Here's a climate scientist at Edinburgh. Um, did man get it all?

Man, and I'll get it wrong. Yes, man. It all got it all wrong. Right. And so there, there really are now there's this really interesting Michael Mann blocked me. I've never said anything to him on Twitter, but I think I'm on a block list. I bet you you're blocked by Michael Mann. Yeah, I am. I think there's a list that goes around.

So what's her name? Hayho or something? Hayho. Hayho blocked me after I beat her senseless in a, in a minor debate, she decided that blocking me was better than having to face the truth. We'll see that one in a minute. Um, And she should be able to own me, right? The climate scientists really ought to be able to take me to the cleaners.

Debunking Popular Climate Change Myths and Misconceptions

Dave: Um, so, um, here's one from the IPCC on the ocean acidification fraud, which it was only a year or two ago turned out to have been shown to be baloney. And, [00:20:00] uh, and, and some set of such a controversy gets outside the community. It's harmful because the whole community loses credibility. And to them, I say, look, you shouldn't worry about that.

That ship has sailed. Um, but I'm not sure they'd be satisfied by that. Um, here's Jimmy Dore saying you have to lie to make your point. You don't have a very good point, which I agree with. Jimmy Dore being up to his ass in controversial stuff now as a comedian. Um, oh, there it is again. I was working on it yesterday and I duplicated it.

Um, World's top climate scientist told to cover up the fact that the Earth's temperature hasn't risen for the past 15 years. Mail online, is it a credible headline? I don't know, but it's out there.

Here's John Klauser. 2022 Nobel Prize in physics was fairly quiet, is my understanding, before he won it. Is that correct? I believe that is correct. Was he off your radar until he won the Nobel Prize? He [00:21:00] was. Yep. He was. And then he shows up and says, you know, dishonest information, breach of dishonesty.

We're talking about trillions of dollars, powerful people don't want to hear that they've made trillion dollar mistakes. He is a complete climate denier. He was supposed to give a talk at, I think the World Health Organization or something like that. They canceled his talk because he denied climate change.

Um, and a climate activist referred to him as just another old white physicist, which is why I keep referring to these guys as old white physicists with, I should add, Nobel Prizes under on their resumes now. Um, and I asked you in the last time we got together. Do you know any? Uh, solar physicists who are climate believers and you could not come up with one and I trust you to tell me the honest answer and I can't either.

The Impact of Solar Activity on Climate Change Theories

Dave: So the solar physicists are all pointing to that big ball of fusion in the sky going, you know, you know, all that heat we're feeling. That's where it's coming from. That big orange thing up there. [00:22:00] Um,

Tom: Well, I just found it here. It was, uh, Klauser got canceled from

an IMF speech.

Dave: Okay. Yeah. Yeah. Pretty close.

High level. IMF, International Monetary Fund, right? Of course, a climate denier should never talk to the International Monetary Fund. Um, and as I like to be, uh, facetious, any idiot can see hurricanes are getting worse. And here's a plot of, um, the global major hurricane frequency, uh, since 1980. And I do not need a nonlinearly squares fitting program to see that nothing is happening.

Um, you say, well, you know, maybe we should pan back a little bit. Okay, here's the continental U. S. landfalls, which I, maybe I trust our data because maybe the guys so far away, God forsaken place aren't counting their hurricanes, right? But in the U. S. we ought to be and, and, uh, and here from 1900 to 2021.

And, you know, if you wish you can. [00:23:00] Put a line through it, and I, I think someone did, and it sloped slightly downward. And so, so, so the people who say anyone can see that climate change is a problem, look at all these hurricanes we're having, um, is using that naked eye model to watch the trees grow and watch the air get hotter and watch the hurricanes get worse.

Um, but it, it turns out not to be true. Um, or maybe we're too narrowly focused on hurricanes. Maybe we should look at global climate disasters, which includes droughts and things like that. And they're dropping, too. So it would appear as though the climate is getting tamer, uh, since that case. It's since 2000, you know, I use sort of random timescales, not because I'm trying to shape the narrative.

That's just what I'm fed by Google, right? The coolest plots. You know, I haven't hidden anything. If I find a better plot, I'll show it. Um, And, and, and here's Schellenberger, who is an award [00:24:00] winning, um, environmentalist, who, who, who was called the heroes, one of the heroes of the environment, and very, very left leaning, and then he, he wrote a book saying, I apologize, I got this climate story completely wrong, and now, now he's painted as a right wing mog or white supremacist because he's gotten up to his ass and things like Twitter files and things like that.

But he was a lefty at one point in his life. And he said, um, he points out that the chance of dying from a bad weather events dropped 99%. Which means that if you're worried about climate change causing bad weather events, you probably ought to take a Valium or something because, uh, because we have, we have learned to see them coming and say, okay, now it's time to leave the coast because we've got a hurricane coming and we've got tsunami warning mechanisms and all sorts of things.

And so we've gotten very good at coping with, with the events that sometimes get exacted upon us by climate change and by, by, by, by Mother [00:25:00] Nature. Um, near Shaviv. Um, smart guy graduated from college at 18. He's a solar physicist, chairman of Hebrew University, which I'm fairly convinced that a physicist at Hebrew University is probably a very smart *guy*.

Um, and, uh, and he says it's all solar. CO2 has never been shown to be causal. He published that in a, Forbes op ed article that had the life expectancy of a fruit fly. It was pulled down within four hours because it was said to not be up to the standards of Forbes Journalism the high standards that give us a financial crisis every five years without them noticing.

Um, in any event, um So no, you won't you'll find other solar physicists who have trouble with the same story. Uh, here's one from Willie Soon basically saying that um, You That, that, that all the variations lie. Um, uh, [00:26:00] basically that, that, that, um, that none, nothing lies outside the normal natural variability.

Confronting the Climate Change Narrative with Data and Analysis

Dave: Willie is, I find to be an interesting character. He's, he's sufficiently sort of flamboyant in kind of a goofy way that I, he may not be the best spokesperson because you, you'd like to see a Richard Feynman type, you know, there are people who are not necessarily the, because he, but he, he's a smart guy and now he's, um, privately funded.

He moved out of Harvard. Now he's using foundation money to do his research. So he's not constrained by funding agencies and things like that. Um, so, and those are, those are, you know, Greenland ice, ice cores showing, um, showing, um, uh, showing CO2 and it correlates with solar activity. Um, I like this model.

This is a great one. Um, projected, uh, sea level and, and, and the, the top curve is the [00:27:00] IPCC alarmist scientists. Uh, the quote here is that all models are parametrized. If I translate parametrized into English fudge, do we force models to include the influence in, in some cases, I can't remember the details, but in one case, someone found that you could literally put any Any data in you could put in random data and you would still get, um, you'd still get the catastrophe showing up in the curve because if I give you a function ax to the B power and I force B to be two, it's going to be an exponential function.

Um, that top curve in that plot is really interesting. Um, One could imagine that that is not a very sophisticated model that produces an

upward curvature. That looks like a x to the second power to me might be x to the 1.8 power, but I, you know, I, I, I and all those other ones, they're just, I could draw those by hand, right?

They're really, so there's nothing sophisticated there, and, and the models aren't. Um, they're because they're not sophisticated compared to the [00:28:00] climate. Um, this is one of my favorites, actually, is you can see if there is any any pictorial depiction of climate change that catches people's attention. It's the it's the melting glaciers, right?

So 2021 you'll see a glacier. You'll see no glacier. 1921 you'll see there was a glacier. They say, look, the glaciers are melting. Um, it turns out what you find when those glaciers have receded are indigenous artifacts from 1200 years ago and trees that grew there 1200 years ago. And so, uh, so what it tells you is that when those glaciers did not exist 1200 years ago, there were trees which means therefore 1200 years ago, it was warmer.

Then it was in 1921, and maybe about the same temperature as today. And so, um, and so the glacier depictions are, are stupid. Um, and then here's the Arctic ice will be gone. That was, that was predicted in 1814. [00:29:00] Um, I forgive that guy for getting it wrong. He was really working with a very, very small, Data set.

And this is pre Darwin, right? So they really he was he was really he was painting his hands like a wall. So it was a good guess. You got it wrong. Um, and then there's global Arctic sea ice back to 1879, I think. And, you know, it doesn't really look like a big trend there to me somehow. Um, uh, there is no trend in global sea ice.

Um, and people think there is. There's not. Um, It says, Why is Antarctica sea ice? Here's the Guardian saying, Why is Antarctica sea ice at record levels despite global warming? And I go, Well, maybe you don't have global warming. Let's start with that possibility.

The Future of Climate Change Discourse and the Importance of Skepticism

Dave: Um, here's the Guardian saying, Oh, wow. What happened in the Arctic in 2023?

It's the same, same magazine. I will not call them a journalist for sure. And, and this was, [00:30:00] I think I mentioned this one to you and you had not yet spotted it. Um, and, and, and so here's Antarctic sea ice and it's, it's, it's over the course of a 12 month year. And those are all, all those colorful, all these colorful, um, lines are previous, it looks like about 40 or 50 years of, of data.

And what's really interesting is out of the blue, 2023 just drops to the floor. And so that, that caused so much excitement amongst those who are praying for a catastrophe so they don't have to explain themselves to their, to their, to their, to their relatives. And it turns out that if you convert that data to, to standard deviations, It turns out that that drop in 2023 was six standard.

That's a six standard deviation drop, which is round number one in a billion. So somehow in 2023, a one in a billion event occurred. There must've been some serious CO2 spewed out that year. Um, and, and, uh, And, and, and, and, [00:31:00] and then it turns out it gets even more interesting than that.

If you look over here to the right, you'll see, uh, the month of, of, of, of November. The global sea ice dropped by six standard deviations, but then right, went right back to normal within about a month. So, so one in a billion drop in sea ice all of a sudden turned into normal sea ice a month or two later.

And then what happens is when I was looking for different depictions of this data, and this, this is data, right? As best you can tell, what you call, it looks like data to me. It doesn't look like a model. Um, when you go boot up different, if you go to Google and just search this, what you find is a whole bunch of plots that look just like this one.

But you'll notice a couple of things. One is that the fine structure is different. So if you look at the little bumps and jiggles, which presumably there's, it's not like there's 20 people putting together the same data. This is, this is a, there's got to be a single source data set. The bumps and jiggles are changing in the different depictions. [00:32:00]

And so the fine structure of the, of the data is moving around. And then what you notice is this, this little variation over here of six, one in a billion, six standard deviation disappears in some. And so you go, okay, so someone's fiddling with the data to make it look better. And I haven't seen much about this since then.

So it's conceivable they're hiding some fraud. And, uh, and then I say Fat Tony knows the answer. Now, if you've read Nassim Taleb, you know who Fat Tony is. Fat Tony is the guy who gets asked, Here's the narrative. Hey, Tony, that's some guy named Vinny, says, Tony, I flip a coin 30 times, it comes up heads. It's a legitimate coin.

I flip it 30 times, comes up heads. We'll see how it's gonna come up tails on the 31st flip. And Tony says zero. And Vinny says, no, it's 50 50. And, uh, and Tony says, no, it's your own, and Vinny says, why is that? And he says, the coin's rigged. [00:33:00] And, and, and

Vinny says, no, I told you the coin was legit. And Tony says, you lied.

Now here's an almost impossible string of heads. The 10 percent has a 50, but you go, the easiest way to explain it is someone lied. And so, so I think, I think that's what we're seeing in the climate narrative. Um, so any, you can see the sea level is rising. Right? And this data goes back to 1995 or something.

Now, again, you look out your back door, and you're, you know, you're near the coast, and all of a sudden you've got flooding somewhere, and you go, Oh, see, you know, I've never seen flooding like that. Even if it's rising spectacularly by climate change standards, it's rising the thickness of a dime. And if you somehow think that you can look outside and look at some flooded street, And say, well, I, I can now see that because it's been rising the thickness of a dime [00:34:00] here after here, it seems unlikely that the naked eye is really letting you see that.

So, so I hate the anecdotal stuff that people say, Oh, yeah, it's hot today. It must be climate change. Um, and here is, uh, back to 1880. And, and the sea level has been rising, I think, I think that's probably statistically significant, but, um, but, uh, it's not something that would cause me to, you know, sell my beach house.

By the way, 100 years from now, there will be no beach houses that were built today. And so to the extent that there, there, there are consequences to the coast. We, we will be washing houses off the beach to, to the end of adult time because you build a house on the beach at some point, mother Nature's gonna take it back that we know.

Um, and so, um. And so it's the quote is from the IPCC saying there's robust evidence that that [00:35:00] of disasters displacing people worldwide, but limited evidence that climate change or sea level rise is the cause. Now, all the headlines that talk about sea level rise and climate change seem to ignore the fact that IPCC said no.

The IPCC, as you know, is the, supposedly the Bible, but it's actually, part of it's the Bible, which is supposedly the scientific part, and then part of it's the propaganda wing, which you might call Pravda or something like that. And Pravda is where the headlines come from. Um, this one I stole from, this whole idea I stole from Tony Heller, um, in which he shows this, and he points up here.

This is the post glacial rise in sea level, and you can see there have been times in history after the glaciers melted, while they were melting, the sea level really rose many, many meters. Um, and then he points the cursor right up here at the very top, and he says, see that part right there? He says, that's your fault.

I kind of thought Tony [00:36:00] was really funny. Um, this is where Hayhoe, and I got into it, so Hayhoe is a climate change, um, scientist and activist. I would argue you can't be both. And, uh, I would argue that she's, uh, the latter. And, uh, and one day she posted something on Twitter. And it was, uh, it was, uh, some document documenting a bunch of things happening in the world.

And I, I went through it, and I said, I think there's some fraud in there, Catherine. And she says, why would you say that? And she was not happy. And I said, well, look at figure 26, which turns out to be the one on the left. And I said, um, I don't really believe you can separate the fires and in the southwest of of the United States into what fires caused by climate change and fires caused by normal.

consequences. I just don't believe that. And she says, well, you have to read the original paper. So I went and read the original paper and it turns [00:37:00] out that that that document had done one little tiny adjustment. And that is over here where it says cumulative fire forest burn, blah, blah, blah. They had taken the word models off that caption off that Y axis labeling.

Now, of course it's a model. But the word model's toxic to the climate change guys, because it seems to say yes, but that's just a model. You put together some differential equations, and it gave you an answer, and you published the paper, and you go, Ah, yeah, that's cool. I don't know if it's true, but, you know, your computer says so, so it must be interesting.

The Complexities of Wildfires and Droughts

Dave: And, uh, And what you can't separate are things like land management problems where all of a sudden states will say we can't do controlled burns or whatever. Let's build more houses here or whatever. So, so, so that's a preposterous dissection of fires into two. Now, you may notice it starts in 1985 here, right?

That's really an important point because fires seem to be rising. Um, if, if you actually look at U. S. forest [00:38:00] area burned since 26, Um, since 26 huge acreage was burning, then it died back. Now, if you really squint down in there, um, around 1980, which I think is about here, If you would cut off the data right here, you could then draw a rising.

fires, but, but somehow Hayhoe and her buddies saw fit to, uh, to decide not to continue it back up here where the, where it would be way up, way up here. Um, if you went back to the turn of the century, they just clipped it off at the most convenient low and followed the trend in the recent years. Uh, that is dishonest.

Um, any idiot can see we have serious droughts.

The Drying of Lake Mead: Consequences and Discoveries

Dave: This is Lake Mead, and the drying of Lake Mead has serious consequences. There's no question that's true, because, um, well, first and foremost, as it dried, we started to discover that the mob was dropping off [00:39:00] bodies in Lake Mead, and they were finding barrels with carcasses in them that they thought were comfortably submerged underwater at one point in time.

Um, but also, Lake Mead. Provides power for several major cities in the southwest and, and, um, and, uh, if the water level gets below the drainage, the input, which, which also I think, you know, water pressure above it matters. So I imagine it's not draining as well since you don't have 200, 300 feet of water above the drain pipes going to the hydroelectric power plant.

Um, at some point, it would get below it. And then from that point on, you don't get power. And you could, I think Vegas might be one of the cities. So Vegas has trouble getting water, but they really have a problem. I can't imagine a city hurt more than Vegas if it lost electricity. Right? Vegas kind of sells itself on electricity.

And, uh, and so what I like to point out here is that the climate catastrophists in an effort to mitigate the problem would go out and buy [00:40:00] electric cars. And right at the point where they can't get electricity. Um, don't get me started on the electric cars.

Electric Cars: A Market in Decline?

Dave: It turns out as we speak, the electric car market appears to be imploding.

And I'll give you a quick synopsis. This is from memory because I didn't intend to put it in. Um, Uh, it turns out that that people no longer want to rent them. They don't know where they're going to charge them. My brother was at a desk and the woman asked how was it when he got one? And he said, I was fine.

And she, she said, she said, most people don't want them. And then some other lady was, was waiting to get a car. And she said, well, where do you charge around here? And the person behind the desk couldn't tell her, but she said, but don't use a Tesla charger. And then she says don't charge it over 90 percent And the woman said never

mind i'm out of here now It turns out the electric cars have problems because the battery replacement costs seven to thirty thousand dollars And I don't know why it's such a big range, but that is the range Um, [00:41:00] so in the best case scenario, it's like losing a transmission when your battery goes now I don't know about you, but I have a lot of electrical appliance, which my battery Doesn't function well after about a year and it gets worse and worse and pretty soon you can't unplug your phone because you'll power down and and the car's total at that point because it's not worth replacing that battery, especially if the average value is 15, 000.

The Insurance and Safety Dilemmas of Electric Vehicles

Dave: Now, What's also true is, is that the fires have now got the insurance companies paranoid and they're refusing to insure them. And, if you get an offender bender, supposedly there's no mechanism to determine if the battery has been damaged. It's encased. And you could say, well, there's a crack in the case, okay.

Electric cars being, that are in accident, supposedly are being written down by insurance companies as totaled. Now, the resale value, for obvious reasons, apparently is absolutely in the basement. No one is buying a [00:42:00] used electric car. Which means rental fleets can't use them because they need to be able to buy a car in 2024, sell it at the end of 2025, and get a new car for 2026.

And if the Karin 2025 sells at a third list price. You can't afford to run a rental company off that you really need to be able to get a good price for that resale and so, um And and also by the way, you know You you see these you've seen these fires If you happen to be charging your car in your garage and that car lights on fire your house will burn down There is no question your house will burn down because those fires are exceedingly hot.

They are way worse than any fire. They take 24 hours to put out. Your house is long gone after that car has started to burn. They catch on fire so quickly that if you're in the car when the fire starts, there is a very high probability you do not have time to open the door and get out. You will be [00:43:00] flash fried like hiroshima.

And so i'm not buying an electric car. You can if you want. There's don't get me started on evs California did a funny thing where they passed a law that said you got to have an evs by some date The same week that that law was passed, they put out a notice saying please don't charge your cars at night because the grid can't take the pressure.

Now, it's at night, people are charging their cars, which, by the way,

is not the time of day when solar panels and wind turbines are providing energy, which, by the way, they don't work well anyways, and so, um, so, the entire green movement is filled with people. gigantic potholes. Um, California, you know, they're bitching about their water and their burning problems.

It turns out it was the It was the the 20th century was the wettest Wettest century in the last 10. So California was built during a wet spell. The entire society of California was built during a wet spell, and it's now [00:44:00] regressing to the mean. So now it's turning back into a desert where it, from whence it came.

Climate Change Narratives and Misconceptions

Dave: Uh, you mentioned the polar bears, or maybe we talked about, I don't know, but any of you can see the biosphere is suffering. Look at that polar bear on the left. I'm in the middle of a podcast with a guy named Chris Irons, QTR, and it all of a sudden clicked. I said, you know, Maybe that polar bear on the left has stomach cancer.

Maybe he's 45 years old. Maybe he's who knows what? Um, what I do know is I looked up what polar bears can eat, and the answer is anything they want. And so, so it turns out, turns out to go, yeah, but he's obviously sick. And how do you know he has stomach cancer? Well, the polar bear population, according to Susan Crockford, has tripled.

Since the 1970s, so maybe starving to death because the population, I think they banned shooting them or something. I don't know. The bear on the right's a grizzly and he doesn't look very healthy. You know, he looks a little on the thin side. Um, I've scammed you a little bit. [00:45:00] That turns out to be Beez Nose Bear number 409.

Beez Nose Bear number 409 is the reigning champion of the fattest bear in Alaska. That's Beez Nose at the end of the season. And he seems to have solved that starvation problem. He is said to, where he sits on the shore of the creek, they call it his office. But he, after 22 years of being the baddest bear in Alaska, he finally succumbed to a younger competitor.

But, uh, so, you know, you can, so I kind of duped your, your readers into thinking B Nose was sick. No, B Nose was just hungry. Um.

The Amazon Fires: Debunking Climate Change Myths

Dave: Here's, here's, here's from one of the world's experts on the Amazon, an author of the IPCC says these fires were not in the Amazon

were not caused by climate change. The Amazon is not the lungs of the world, which is what it was called.

It's bullshit. So, you know, people are starting to call it out.

Biodiversity and the Misinterpretation of Climate Impact

Dave: Um, the number of extinct [00:46:00] species, uh, by decade shows you the biosphere took a beating. Humans really did a number, but it also appears as though we've kind of figured it out. We've said, okay, we really got to pay more attention to the spotted owls and the hooping cranes and things like that.

The hooping cranes are up to about 500 now. So I think we've been able to save them from what was the population at 22. So I think we're figuring out how not to send species into extinction. Oh, there's probably some we have without even knowing it, but we've been doing that for. For 100, 000 years.

Questioning the Climate Change Consensus

Dave: So, um, uh, Petri Palas, Secretary General, World Meteorological Association, um, criticizes the fact that the IPCC His documents are read like the Bible.

Um, you basically that this resembles religious extremism. He's the secretary general of the World Meteorological Organization. That strikes me as a, you know, of the 97 percent of People who know climate science, [00:47:00] um, 97 percent say it's a crisis. Well, we keep finding the 3%. They're pretty easy to identify.

Um, that's just a archival list of, of, of, uh, of, of deniers. Michael Moore made a moviethinking he was going to talk about climate change and discovered it was, he ended up talking about the disasters being caused by alternative energy. So he made the movie that got blackballed, et cetera. Um, yeah. There is robust evidence of disasters displacing people worldwide.

I think that's been true since the dawn of time, right? You know, the tsunamis do a job for one thing. Uh, limited evidence that climate change or sea level rise is the direct cause. That's from the IPCC. So, so it's really kind of funny. The IPC is the Bible of the scientific community. At some level, that might be true.

It seems to be kind of an archival document for everything they find. But, but, but people who care about the narrative. Just go cherry pick

their way through it [00:48:00] and find the parts that they like and just ignore the bulk of it. Um, these are U. S. hazard losses as a percent of U. S. GDP. So we're obviously not being bludgeoned.

This is sort of a Bjorn Lomborg kind of an argument that we know how to cope with climate problems. Um, Europe, if you look at people who die from cold versus people who die from heat. It's a, it's a 10 to one heat to cold ratio, uh, 10 to one cold to heat ratio. And so, so if you want to save lives in Europe, warm the place up, um, because people are dying from, from being frozen to death more by a factor of 10, um, deaths from natural disasters by decade, not a shock.

They've dropped to almost zero because. We know how to see him coming and we know how to defend against them. And so, so, you know, if you die from a natural disaster, you know, tornado, you know, that you can imagine, but we even have tornado alerts and stuff. So even a [00:49:00] small town, you know, the alarm goes and you go into the basement.

You hide from the tornado. So we really have mastered the art of hiding from Mother Nature. Um, now what are the other risks here? There are risks. Uh, here's a great one. Says that, um, says that there's a chance that young people are going to get more kidney stones because of dehydration. And, and I, and I, I've looked at this.

I'm going, you really have to be kidding. So I live on the lake. And it's probably four degrees colder, 500 yards up the hill. And so am I going to get kidney stones, but the guys 500 yards up the hill are not going to get kidney stones? Is that, is that, is that the model? Or if I move from New York to Pennsylvania, will I, will I start getting kidney stones because of that?

I don't think so. But, but down at the bottom there it says hospitals have opened stone clinics to keep up with increased cases amongst kids. I'm going, Oh, yeah, I believe that. I [00:50:00] wonder if they're federally funded stone clinics that also, you know, have a set a repurposing capability that using him is, you know, for example, pediatric wards.

Um, underground climate change. I don't know what that is. Maybe that's melting dirt. I just, but it's deforming the ground and beneath the buildings. A study finds, uh, some of these are really comical.

The Absurdity of Climate Change Solutions

Dave: Here, here's like a quadruple whammy where I could say three scams collide. Scam number one starts with the CDC.

Remember, the best way to fight climate change, scam number one, and support Ukraine, scam number two, is to keep up to date on your COVID booster, scam number three, and have a safe Labor Day. Probably not. You'll probably get drunk and crash your car. Why the CDC is talking about climate change, Ukraine and COVID all in the same, same announcement [00:51:00] is a little on the mysterious side.

This one I really love. Um, according to Vladimir Putin, um, he's talking to Greta, um, saying go, go and explain to developing countries why they should continue living in poverty and not be like Sweden. That's a picture of Greta with some big swingers in the geopolitical world. What, what's really interesting is there's Greta on a panel.

talking about coronavirus. So Greta now has become a coronavirus expert. And when I first presented this talk, I was at a, at a finance meeting. I, in a, in a spontaneous utterance, I said, um, I, I am going to start giving talks on vaginal itch since I am now a world's expert on vaginal itch. And Sanjay Gupta, who you saw got the crap kicked out of him by Joe Rogan where Joe kept saying, but you lied, you lied.

And then Sanjay finally admitted he lied. And then the next day went on TV and said he didn't lie. So, [00:52:00] um, Greta's gotten into a little trouble. She fakes some protests, arrests and things like that. And she's sort of getting old and, you know, she's, she's losing her, her reason to be. So Greta's trying to, uh, find a way to fund her own carbon print.

Print footprint from this point going forward. Uh, there were rumors.

The Political and Economic Dimensions of Climate Change

Dave: She is being replaced with a woman named Sophia Kiani at Stanford Um, I must admit for me as a male, that's an upgrade Um, if they want to put Sophia on the front page, I I I would be okay with that for a while at least um Okay, here's AOC one of the great.

Um, one of the great intellects of the modern era saying that the world's going to end in 12 years if we don't address it. Here's Patrick Moore, founder of Greenpeace, calling her a pompous little twit, says you would bring about mass death. The former founder of Greenpeace, yet another one of the 3%. [00:53:00] And here's, here's AOC's handler.

This is actually a really interesting one. He's that Indian guy, real smart guy. He was, AOC got elected from a cattle call. I don't know if people know that. So they were looking to primary someone in an

election. And they actually put out a cattle call and said, we are looking for someone to run for Congress.

And, and AOC's brother sent in her resume and described why she would be good. They interviewed her. And and said, Okay, we're gonna run you for Congress. That's how AOC got the job. So her handler, who is, I'm sure, a smart guy, but has moved on to handle someone new who now needs to be ushered into the halls of power, said it wasn't about climate change at all.

It was about, uh, how do you change the entire economy thing, he says. So again, he admitted in a moment of clarity that the climate change is not about climate. It's about power. Um, the World Economic Forum, classic line now, welcome to [00:54:00] 2030, I own nothing, have no privacy, and life has never been better, World Economic Forum.

They have a plan for us. Here's, um, here, here, here, here's sort of a synopsis, CO2 will destroy life as we know it, apparently, not fast enough. Uh, be very careful about people who smuggle in ideas like environmentalism into the climate model because because environmentalism, I'm totally behind and pollution.

I'm totally against and, um, 150 trillion dollar climate opportunity. Just if you wrap your brain around how much money is said to be targeted to solve this problem, you understand why people trying to get a piece of that pie are going to play along. Uh, limited resources. I'm totally with the great reset.

Whatever it is seems to be somehow behind the whole thing. Um, let's talk about the risks of of climate change here. There's some funny stuff in here. Risk means what could happen, [00:55:00] not what did happen. And as I like to point out, Russian roulette is statistically a five to one winner. But, but, but you wouldn't say that there was no risk if you pull the trigger and didn't blow your brains out.

Um, so what are your, what are your response? Well, you could glue yourself to the road, sit in front of traffic. And I love this meme when you thought you had a dog and, but it was just a climate protester. Um, you could cut back on healthcare. Here's an article suggesting that surgeons use less anesthetic during surgery.

That's good. If they do that to me when I finally wake up, I'm putting a scalpel right into the guy's throat right into his throat. Um, they say that we should cut down trees now. Now you got your audience has to stay with me on this because this bit of logic really is nuanced. They say that they've discovered that the CO2 taken in by the trees.

Is not processed as efficiently as we thought, and so they [00:56:00] were releasing more CO2 than we thought. So the CO2 taken in, more of it was being released, and as a consequence, the more trees you have,

the more CO2 you're releasing. And I was sitting there going, oh my god, how, how, how could you come up with something that stupid?

And yeah, but no one believes that. Well, here's a bunch of headlines signing up, and there was actually a movement. To hire gobs of people to cut down trees and bury them! I'm going, oh my god! Oh, I just wet myself again, and that's easy now that I just have my prostate out. Um, We can get rid of gas stoves, banning gas stoves is a great tweet, but what unhealthy lungs of a five year old whose parents cook on a gas stove.

That's ginger root.

I posted that, you wouldn't believe the number of people who thought those were lungs. That's [00:57:00] fantastic. Um, you could cut back on your holidays. That would be good. That'll, that'll ban travel and that means we'll restrict it down to only those with private jets. Um, we could have climate lockdowns. This is Klaus Schwab's daughter, ~which should have been smothered in the crib on a genetic argument.~

Um, and she's talking about permanent lockdowns now. And I don't know what a permanent climate lockdown is. I think it means we all die. Right? I think that means we all just don't get to eat. I don't know, but Klaus Schwab never should have bred. That's all I can say. You can abstain from sex if you cut the birth rate back. I've seen also claims that you should breed with shorter people because they consume less, less carbon dioxide producing nutrients, at which point out comes the joke about short, short women with flat heads.

Then, uh, here's how climate change is ruining your beer. This is a serious problem now. This is, [00:58:00] don't you laugh, Tom. This is getting serious now, you know, even though I don't drink. Um, you can elect a new president. There are the various, there's the Democrat, Republican variants of the CO2 content. Uh, apparently there's a lag that hasn't yet shown up.

Um, and, uh, And then and then how do you cope with these risks? Well, if there's a tornado, you could mow your lawn. If there's a fire, you could, you know, play the back nine. Um, there's a hurricane. Go surfing, right? These are really good, good alternatives to curling up in fetal position. And if there's flooding, you have sex.

And then, uh, I actually saw a friend of mine on, on, on CNBC and they asked him about what would happen if there was thermonuclear war. And he just shut up and his friends talked about that that would have an effect on the markets. I go, really? [00:59:00] Really? That's So, so analysts are warning that an all out thermonuclear war could be economically desirable.

Has thought about climate change, but it shows you how stupid the

average hominid is on TV. Um, and there's the 150 climate opportunities and 97 percent of climate scientists agree that they don't want to be defunded. And that really says it all. Um, and then, um, and then I used to get, I get, I get hate mail.

I read the comment section of podcasts. It's really funny. There's actually something odd going on here because I'm a pretty popular podcaster and there'll be these waves of complimentary things saying Oh, I really like the part about and then all of a sudden, there'll be like three or four or five Just hateful pod comments in a row.

And then it goes back to the normal stuff. And I'm going, there's some algo that decided to just throw shitballs at me for no reason. So Jerry was my mad emailer. And he not only used to [01:00:00] email me, but he used to email my podcast hosts and say, you should get this whiny doctrinaire old man off, off the stage.

And here's the Atlantic monthly, a journalist who said that my take on climate change, I wrote again. whatever year it was. The first one was the greatest take on it since Michael Crichton, which was, she's a, she's a well known, uh, journalist. So, um, I took that quite complimentary. Now, last post, I'd like to, I'd like to provide a, uh, a plug if, if, if, if, if someone has possibly missed this, what you do is you go look up Constantine, Kyson, who gave a talk at the Oxford Union on climate change.

So if you search Konstantin Kyson, and there's the link right there, but if you search him on YouTube, Konstantin Kyson, climate change, you will get that link. And if you haven't listened to it, you have to listen to it because I transcribed it. And what I realized in the process of transcribing it, is [01:01:00] all I had to do was add punctuation marks.

The guy speaks in perfect sentences. There's no ums. There's nothing wrong with the sentence. The sentences are flawless. I just had to add commas and periods and capital letters. And, uh, But it's a brilliant explanation. It's sarcastic is how I've listened to it probably three times. I got to sit down with Constantine last October and I said, Constantine, when you first dug into the climate change story, how long did it take you to figure out that it was baloney?

He said, ah, a couple hours. That's about it. A couple hours. And that's what most people, most people who finally dig in, say a couple hours, and then you realize that you've been lied to nonstop, and I think I'm not, oh yeah, and there's, uh, I think that's Margaret Thatcher saying that it's an international effort, it provides a marvelous excuse for worldwide supranational socialism, and I, I actually believe that's the story.

Understanding Authoritarianism Through the Lens of Climate Change

Dave: I, I, I've been reading [01:02:00] numerous books on authoritarianism, and I believe that the climate change narrative, besides being a fantastic gift, is about are constraining the world's population into behaving themselves in ways that people of great power, uh, want to constrain the world's population. So if you want to understand so so your readers, listeners can't possibly have not have failed to notice that the world's pretty screwed up, right?

You look at raise your hand if you think the 2024 election is going to be uneventful, right? And we're bombing countries that don't make sense. And it we're If you, I think if you want to understand the world, what you do is you go find books on authoritarianism and all of a sudden you go, Oh my God, that's what I'm seeing.

It's rising authoritarianism. So you start the white pill by, by, Michael Malice, I like. It's a history of the Soviet Union that's exceedingly readable. And we know that Stalin killed 40 million. What we don't know [01:03:00] is how, right? 40 million is an unimaginable number. And you go, but do you just like line them up and shoot?

No, it's a description of how the Soviet Union as a society completely consumed itself by this rising authoritarianism. And you read, uh, Hannah Arendt about that. Well about the the holocaust very difficult readers Hannah Aaron Edward Bernays book on propaganda from I think it's 1926 Matthias Desmet's books are very very good.

And so if you start reading about Authoritarianism and propaganda things like that. You'll often say that is what we are seeing right now And that's how you will defend yourself against, uh, against the bad guys.

Agricultural Practices and Climate Change: A Controversial Take

Dave: Um, there's a young man saying farming needs to stop because it's the biggest driver of climate change.

So we should stop farming. And, and so we could destroy agriculture and there's some cows in which it was [01:04:00] claimed that they, and this is going on in Northern Europe, and I have no idea how this is happening, but they are destroying agriculture in Northern Europe on this argument. And they've calculated they got to kill 65, 000 cows this year to, uh, to meet the climate goal.

It's like, holy cow, you guys are loons. Um, And there's a picture of Ithaca, New York. That's right outside Ithaca. We have something like

200 waterfalls in that's higher than Niagara falls, it turns out, um, not as much volume, but, uh, but they used to film Tarzan movies there.

Back in the pre talkie days, my grandfather was an extra. I'm thinking, man, it must've taken a lot of shoe polish to make him an extra. Um, And, uh, and, and that's Ithaca. Ithaca is a utopian place. That's it, dude.

Pre-presentation discussion

Tom: That was the end of Dave's presentation. What follows is about 35 minutes of discussion that we had both before and after that [01:05:00] presentation.

Dave: , I want to point

Tom: out one fun fact just after your first episode on YouTube, that episode for me out of 200 episodes, that one is about number 35 in views, but that's pretty good on Apple podcasts.

That one is by far number one. It's well over twice as popular as my second most, what

Dave: kind of numbers are we talking about? I, I, I, I don't know.

Tom: Well, you can see him. I think you've got, I have to look it up, around 10, 000 on YouTube, maybe.

Dave: Yeah. Okay. Yeah. Well, I've had people tell me, you know, sort of why, why, why I'm a podcaster.

Um, And one of the things I've discovered, there's no topic, I don't have an opinion. I literally can only remember one moment in podcast history where someone asked me and I said, I just have no idea what you're talking about. And, uh, and so I, I can kind of fake, fake a conversation on almost any subject at this point and have an opinion, which I'm not sure it's a flattering personality trait to have an opinion on every subject.

Um, but [01:06:00] also I'm, I'm a little bit unfiltered, a little bit outspoken. And so, um, so there are people out there who I think are thrilled to hear someone say something they've been thinking and they go, God damn it. This has been bugging me. Right. And so to have someone else say it, I think it means a lot to them.

I just

Tom: looked you up on ChatGPT, I don't know if you've done that to look up your own name, but it says you are not shy about expressing contrarian views. I think they got that right.

Dave: Yeah, that one, I can see where they scraped that from too, so. Oh, okay. I once had, had ChatGPT write something about me and I thought it was actually pretty accurate.

Tom: Oh, okay. And people are surprised that you're still at Cornell after expressing all these views. You're still

Dave: there. You know, it's not easy to fire a tenured faculty and it's not clear that the university cares about firing me. Once in a while I've gotten myself into a bit of a scuffle. It doesn't hurt the fact that I have friends [01:07:00] in both the level of the trustees and, and I would say that the, uh, the provost is a friend.

And I have some things that make me harder to fire than your average tenure faculty member too. So, um, there, there's some embedded stuff that would make me a particularly problematic removal. And so, um, so I think, I think they, they just like it when I don't get fired. Into deep trouble funny. Here's a funny story.

Actually. I posted a An article about a tweet about cornell one night. I was just, you know thinking and I said something like, you know, cornell's doing fine um We're we're okay. I said the president pollack is okay. Um, it was kind of a faint praise comment Um, and I said the provost is a rock is rock rock star And uh, I said it's a utopian place You Uh, we just have to get out of the news cycle because we had been in the news cycle, uh, in some very unfortunate ways.

And I got a call from my brother in [01:08:00] law, who happens to be a trustee, there's part of the hint. Um, and he, he read for me that tweet. I said, Ezra, where the hell did you get it? Now, his name is Ezra Cornell. That's the second hint. My wife is Candace Cornell. She's Ezra, Ezra Cornell, the original third great granddaughter.

I'm Ezra. Oh, and if for some reason that's not enough, my grandfather was president of National Alumni Association. And what got me into trouble with the angry Philistines is I fought two union movements and won them almost single handedly. I mean, I really was standing alone and we won. And that was at the request of the provost.

So it'd be very hard to fire me and sit in court and have to fess up to the fact that all the guff I took was because I, the provost, had asked him to go fight these guys. These bastards, right? So that would be kind of an embarrassing thing to have to testify to. Um, and I've, I've got a great funding record and, and I've [01:09:00] coached two collegiate sports and, you know, there's just, there's, I was a Cornell undergrad.

There's just, I believe Cornell Red. Um, so I would be a tough fire. I would be particularly problematic. So in any event, so he reads part of this tweet. I go, Ezra, how did you see that? He said, my boss sent it to me. And I said, Daphne, where did she see that? He said, no, the other boss. I said, what other boss?

You, you're independent. He said, he says, the president of the board of trustees. I go, what? He goes, yeah, he said, he sent it to me and he said, there's hope. And then he said to Ezra, he said, my brother in law, he says, is there any chance you actually know this guy? Because Ezra lives in town, so he knows a lot of people.

He says, yeah, he's my brother in law, which really, which really shocked the chairman of the board. I guess he's chairman of the board. And, uh, and so, so, so, so he said, well, you know, that's, that's really good to hear. Because they're so used to having faculty just, you know, Just scream about how bad their lives are, [01:10:00] not noticing that they have a utopian existence by any metric.

That's a very interesting,

Tom: very interesting background. I've heard you on many podcasts and I hadn't heard this part of your background. So,

Dave: yeah. So again, I, again, it would be an ugly court case. I was actually told by Cornell legal after I got canceled very, very big. It was a serious, it got made into the Federalist and places like that.

So it was a serious cancellation. I'd heard second hand, I think the message was actually intended to get to me that that the Cornell legal said they, we'd get destroyed in court if we tried to, if we tried to fire Dave. I was on a, I was on a first name basis with all the guys in Cornell legal too, because when I fought the unions, I was on speed dial with the Cornell legal department.

And so, you know, it just, it just wouldn't have been funny. So they're just hoping they're just crossing their fingers that I don't get in trouble. And I stay out of topics like, um, you know, [01:11:00] Palestine, Israel, I don't touch that one.

Exploring Controversial Topics: Climate Change and Vaccines

Dave: I go deeply into Ukraine. I'm happy to express my views and their contrarian.

And I, you know, since I'm ultra loyal to Cornell, I would never do anything to hurt them intentionally, and I think they know that. So

let's talk about what

Tom: you're going to do here today about speaking out on climate change. Do you think that one is as controversial as some of the other ones at Cornell, for

Dave: example?

No, no.

The Science and Debate of Climate Change

Dave: And I'll tell you why, because it's about science, right? So, uh, you could argue the vaccine was about science, but we're up against a very geopolitical force. And so, so you could run into a lot of trouble because we're hugely powerful forces that we're trying to shut down any comment about the vaccine, which I had strong comments about, but you know, on Twitter, you could even use the word vaccine.

I mean, you'd get kicked off Twitter just with the word vaccine got picked up by the algo. So climate change doesn't trigger that. And, uh, And, uh, you know, if someone wants to debate me on climate change, I'd accept [01:12:00] their offer in a heartbeat. So I would love to see that, that debate and, and I would actually say, can I bring my friend Tom with me?

I would love that too. That'd be fun, wouldn't it?

Tom: That would be great.

Reflecting on Past Work and Climate Change Opinions

Tom: I love the work that you've done in your year in review. You've done it at least a couple of different times in your year in review and including the most recent one, right? You talked at length about climate change, right?

Dave: I just kind of top it off.

I think it was in, um, 19 or 17. I did. I sort of laid it out. I really went to town on it. And then every year I just say, Oh, by the way, here's, you know, 15 pages of update and, and who's the, who's the Nobel prize winner? What's his name? Who came out and denounced it? John Clouser. Yeah, John Clouser and stuff like that.

That's why I take notes because I can't remember stuff anymore. Um,

yes, and I'll just top it off like, oh, by the way, this year, here are the other funny things that occurred in the climate change argument. Now I see John Kerry stepping down. Oh, there there's real [01:13:00] intellectual loss for the climate change community, huh?

What did I see? He just said that that Russia would be having a better client. I just saw some sporting. That Russia would have a better time in Ukraine if they would simply address their um, their CO2 emission problem I'm going yeah, I'm sure Putin's sitting around shitting a brick over CO2 emissions.

That's

Tom: mind blowing that he would say that I don't get it.

Dave: Well, I think he's actually an idiot. I mean, I I think he's just stupid I hesitate to do that because you know when you say something stupid you then dismiss what they say and there might be content But I do think he's dumb. I think you're right.

Yeah.

Addressing Climate Change in Education

Tom: So let's talk about this presentation. This is one that you're going to give to your students at Cornell. Pretty close to what you're going to do here.

Dave: Yeah, so what I'm actually going to do, I'm teaching an undergraduate lab course, and I need about 26 lectures. I'm allocated about 42. And so what I'm going to do is, uh, I was [01:14:00] going to do it last year and then somehow I didn't get to it.

Um, but I'm going to give them a talk on climate change.

Navigating Controversial Topics in the Classroom

Dave: Now, I throw hints at them about stuff and I said, look, you know, I'll say something like, look, the vaccine doesn't work very well. Um, and I said, the reason I'm telling you this is because you've all been told it does and you're, I'm, I'm training young scientists and you don't have to believe me, but what you have to do is start developing a discerning eye and start to recognize that there will be differences of opinions and that credible scientists will take the other side of some of these debates where you're not, where it's not working its way through to you through, through the normal

channels.

And I'm, and I said, the reason I do that is so that when you see some article on the subject, You might slow down and say, okay, that might not be a nutcase. That might actually be a legitimate story, so I'll read it, right? And so, so I have all sorts of extra lectures. I don't need them. And so I'm going to do an optional lecture.

Um, I [01:15:00] feel bad in the sense, what I don't want to do is corner students. So I say, if I don't go, they don't give me a lousy grade. Well, I don't hand out the grades the TAs do. So that's stupid. But, um, so, so I don't want to force them to listen to it. But it is science, and it's about scientific process, and it's about, it's a, it's, it's one of the burning issues of the modern day scientific era, and if COVID somehow finds a way to go away, which, which is appallingly hard, um, then they are going to go right back to climate change, um.

Do you

Tom: think when students sign up for a class, they know who you are, and they know what they're going to get, or are kids still surprised when they get into class and find out what, uh, what you

Dave: say to them?

The Impact of Speaking Out: Personal and Professional Reflections

Dave: I actually think they're surprised on the positive sense that I think that if you Google me, I'm toxic because of the union fight and the cancellation left just a killing field of bad press, including a lot of real just pathological lying and stuff [01:16:00] like that.

So, um, so what were made as jokes were turned into, although this is what he believes that just two days ago, someone said I was a known pedophile. Yeah. You've been talking to my wife again, haven't you? Um, and so it's, that stuff's out there. And so the grapevine works overtime on a campus. And so the first day of every, every semester, I actually spend about 10 minutes explaining, instead of letting it lurk in the background, I just say, here's what happened.

And here's why if you Google evil, you'll see Stalin, Mao, and me, you know, and, uh, and, and here's what the back story is. And, and then I'll, I'll tell them a little bit about, you know, look, I'll probably say something that'll offend you. You know, you could go to the chair, you go to the dean, you go to the president, but they don't care.

I said, you could, on the other hand, come and talk to me and we can

have a lovely chat about what we disagree about. And, uh, and some get it by the end of semester. I'm fine. You know, they start to [01:17:00] recognize that I really, I don't have a mean bone in my body, except when it comes to guys like Biden, I'm starting to get some mean bones in my body and, uh, and, um, and, and so it seems to go.

Okay. And then at the end of the year, I semester, I throw, I have a picnic and cook for him on my deck and stuff. And then it seems to go. Okay. Do you think there's the pleasantly shocked? I think I think they're pleasantly shocked and then some are shocked, you know, it's like, you know, I've lost my filter in class.

So I'll, I'll, I'll swear. I don't give a shit. Right. And if they want to fire me, cause I said, I don't give a shit in class or I call someone a douche bag or a dick weed or something, but the students don't care. But all it takes is one. All it takes is one student to care. Next thing you know, there's all sorts of, you know, people have to just get to the bottom of the fact that they've called someone a dickweed.

Have you seen

Tom: any sort of dynamic where you speak out on controversial topics and other professors kind of feel safe and they edge into that water too and start speaking their mind or nothing like that?

The Dynamics of Free Speech and Academic Freedom

Tom: [01:18:00] No,

Dave: no. I did go to a free speech. Here's a funny one. I went to a free speech in the classroom symposium that was Sort of organized mostly by the president.

She didn't show up. I thought that was cool. Um, but the provost was there and, and, uh, And they had a panel discussion and stuff and there were very few scientists. I was like, why would I go to that? Well, I decided I would go to that. What I discovered is that the humanists are more afraid of their students than the scientists.

You know, why would, why would that be? I mean, here's a one legged black lesbian chick Who? How is she not checked enough boxes to be pretty bulletproof against attack? The answer is because while I am lecturing to chemists in training, And could offend them. They're lecturing to activists in training. And so they're walking on a charge of glass.

I'm walking on eggshells. Which don't seem to bother me, so I don't really walk on eggshells. But, um, [01:19:00] So I, I think, I think all the professors are acutely aware that they could, they could step on, on a, on a bouncing betty at any moment for no apparent reason. And, and, and trigger a bad event. And I've tried to help a few who did.

I've reached out and said, Look, here's what's going to happen now. Batten down the hatches, shut your mouth. It'll go away. You know, that sort of thing.

Challenging the Climate Change Narrative

Tom: So, Will Happer in the climate world has said that since he's older, he feels free to speak his mind, but if he was 30, he would not speak his mind.

Dave: Yeah.

Yeah, I'm not sure I would have had the filter back then, but, but there's no question that, you know, the climate activists, Look at the deniers. It's either just a bunch of old white guys. I go, that's because those are the ones who feel safe speaking. And, and, and you can say, well, there's isn't even old white women.

And I go, well, because women weren't in physics to be old white women physicists, right? So they're, they're still young. Um, so, so, um, when [01:20:00] Clouser, Clouser came out and said it, one of the activists said, just another old white guy. And I go, yeah, okay. That pretty much negates the argument by a Nobel prize winner then, doesn't it?

So this isn't even the toughest topic, right? I, I'm in, I'm, I'm embedded in the transgender debates and sex trafficking and everything else under the sun. So I

Tom: think on this topic, there is a lot of shooting fish in a barrel. There's completely crazy claims that, uh, yeah, it's so easy to debunk a lot of them.

Yeah, that's

Dave: why I enjoy it. It's fun. And some of the claims are so preposterous, you can't help but laugh. You'll see some of those. So, so as, as I can't remember if you mentioned this, but I'm, I'm going to show you a talk I'm going to give. And at some level, I'm going to give the talk, but at some level I'm going to talk about the talk because I, your crowd is so sophisticated.

What I will do is generously offer that if anyone wants the PowerPoint slides, I'll happily give them. So all they have to do is email me. Or I can send them to you and you can post them. I don't care. [01:21:00] That's

Tom: what I do. I put them up on sub stack if you're okay with that. Yeah,

Dave: that's fine. That's that's fine.

Okay. And, um, and, and then people can use them if they want, right? If they say, okay, I'm now going to beat my, my brain dead nephew over Thanksgiving with these babies, you know, that sort of thing. Great. I'd love to see that. Yeah. I'll happily pass them along. I don't, I'm happy to, happy to be the bearer of good news.

Okay. We're not going to, we're not going to fry, but, but most of it's meant to be sort of shockingly shocking idiocy. Right? It's really the whole talk is designed to be like, okay, you're told this. This is how stupid that is. Right? So the whole thing is sort of juxtaposition of claims juxtaposed on sanity.

Start of Q and A

Dave: do you have any thoughts, uh, in the big picture about where this is going? About how much longer is the general public going to, uh, stick with this before they revolt and they, they're gonna have none of it.

This one's gonna be tough to stop because it's, it's easy to sell an idea in which you say, look, it's [01:22:00] gonna be. 50 years from now, but it's going to be a disaster. So it's always going to be 50 years from now, whereas, whereas certain things, um, I think there's things that are, that are driving us all bananas right now that will burn out quickly.

Transgender Debates and Societal Issues

Dave: So I get into hot topics. So I think the transgender story is going to burn out. Um, I think, I think, uh, and I'll tell you what's going to end up very quickly is that, um, the transgender clinics, um, have been protected by, um, by statute of limitations on the things they're doing of about a year. And so they have to keep people who got medical interventions to be, to stay convinced of their move for about a year and then they're good to go.

Their state's going to pass a law saying it's the statute of limitations. It's 20 years, which means if you do a transgender surgery on a 13 year old. Uh, they have to stay happy with that move till they're 33 before you're safe from a lawsuit. And I think the clinics are going to shut right down completely.[01:23:00]

And, um, and so, so I think stories like that, you know, transgender, uh, women in, in female sports. I did a poll on Twitter. And, uh, and I said, you know, no ifs, ands, or buts, no waffling should transgender women, should biological men be allowed in women's sports. I got 97.6 no. So the world's already made the decision.

For some reason, we just haven't acted. So I'm militantly against transgender interventions on kids. And I'm militantly against transgender, um, biological male athletes in women's sports. The rest have a ball. They'll be whatever you want.

Economic Predictions and the Future of the US

Dave: Um, on the other hand, I don't see, I don't see the United States pulling out of its death spiral, its debt spiral.

I think we have tough times ahead. I've made the case for a 40 year bear market. I think we can wake up 40 years from now and say, holy shit, my portfolio hasn't really [01:24:00] moved, inflation adjusted. Um, because we're that overvalued. So there are things that I don't have a solution to. I don't have a solution to student debt.

I don't have, there's a lot of things that I think are going to haunt us for a long time. So, and, and this, this could be, this is arguably. Um, sort of evidence of end of empire stuff, right? So, you know, they say the Roman Empire ended in 476, but it, it was a rotting process. There were guys walking around in Roman togas after 476.

There were people in the empire that didn't know the empire had collapsed. And, you know, so it, it takes a long time. It's a, it's a, it's, it's not like. all of Rome just burnt. And, and so we, if, if you want to pay attention to what's going on, you pay attention to the BRICS countries where, um, BRICS used to be, um, um, Brazil, Russia, India, China.

It was this alliance of kind of our foes at some level. And, uh, it's now the BRICS 20. [01:25:00] Including a bunch of Arab countries with oil and people, some people think it's a currency thing, it's not, it's about alliances. These are 20 countries saying, you know what, we're gonna, we're gonna hang out with these other cool kids over

here, we're gonna, we're gonna sign up with Russia and China.

We're going to go with them instead. This is a sea change in geopolitics, my opinion. So I think things are going, I don't think they're going to be fast. I don't think things fast change sometimes self corrects quickly too. I think, I think it's, we're going to rot our way into some sort of, you know, British empire sort of thing.

The Brits, British empire just kind of slowly, but surely a couple of wars along the way, but just kind of, they just became underwhelming. So we are at risk of it. When I listen to Edward Dowd, it sounds like he is thinking bad times are coming, maybe short term, but we're going to see the flowering of something new.

Maybe it won't take that long, but you're, uh, thinking it's going to take longer, right? It's going to take decades, probably have a slow decline. I think so. You know, [01:26:00] if Eddie's talking about, I've known Ed for a long time, well before the COVID story, um,

If you look at markets that when, if they correct spectacularly, the, the dip buyers show up and they come back the way, the way you really correct the market. So if we're, I, I was about 150% overvalued and that, that's a 60 70% correct. That means it's gotta go down 60 or 70% and not come back. And the way you do that is you knock the person down and they get up, they say, I'm a dip buyer, and then you knock them down again, and they get up, they say, I'm a long term holder, and they knock them down again, and pretty soon they're just, they're just down.

This week was a historic moment. The Japanese Nikkei hit all time highs this week. After 35 years, so the Nikkei got way overvalued and 35 years later, we finally, without correcting for inflation, are back [01:27:00] to where they were 35 years ago. That, and it's not like Japan or some third world country. Back when the Nikkei was at its apex, they had 14 of the 20 biggest countries and companies in the world.

And the idea is, well, why would you invest in the Nikkei? They go, well, that's where everything is. That's, that's where everything. And, and as Buffett said, you know, something like 12 of the 20 biggest companies in the world are in the United States now. And he said, 40 years from now, they won't be. And so, um.

Cryptocurrency Skepticism and Final Thoughts

Dave: So, uh, have the Bitcoin people gotten to you at all yet, or still no? Well, they haven't gotten me to buy it. Um, they certainly, you know, They've certainly worn my podcasting down to a bloody stump.

I've done many, many podcasts with some of the most elite Bitcoiners on the planet. And, um, there's just a host of reasons why I'm not interested in Bitcoin.

It's not a total disbelief in Bitcoin. It's, it's, uh, it's just a game. You know, if someone [01:28:00] says, look, you could buy, you know, call options on this company, I wouldn't do that either. Right. I just, there's things I just don't do. And Bitcoin happens to have some of the criteria required for me to not do it.

Okay. Fair enough. Uh, any other points you'd like to make before we go ahead and finish this one off? Well, fight the authoritarianism, my biggest fear. I did a podcast this morning, a radio interview actually, and she said, what bothers you the most? I said the weaponization of the DOJ. DOJ, yeah. When you start taking out your political opponents with the justice system, I don't care how much you hate the guy.

You, and it's conceivable someone did something so bad that you simply have to prosecute, right? No one's above the law, but You know, everyone in Washington, D. C. is above the law. So it has to be a very high evaluation, high, the bar in D. C. to actually prosecute someone is very high. And, and, and I have no, no problem understanding why people hate Trump.

I do have trouble understanding why they can't see [01:29:00] past their hatred of Trump and recognizing that taking him out using the legal system is a horrid Rubicon to be crossed. And they seem to be happy to do it. And I said, well, okay, but don't be surprised if let's call me a right winger when my team gets in power, we start doing it to you guys, because that's, that's the game you're playing now.

And, and, and that's civil war, right? That's a problem. And so I don't see how 2024 goes smoothly. I can't find a path through the elections. The only path I can see is the, um, is if the Democrats could come up with a legitimately strong candidate. And the only one I could name, they will not take. And so, um, so the Democrats are blowing it.

They could save us by coming up with a good, strong candidate. People say, okay, fine. I will vote for that person, but they can't. Do you want to name that one? Or you don't want to name it? Oh, I'd vote for Kennedy. I [01:30:00] vote for Kennedy. He's got warts. He's got, he's got zits. He is got things, but he, he, he, he's anti-war anti deficit spending.

Um, you know, he, he got a little stuck in the Palestine Israel debate, which is an unwinnable debate. So, um, um, but, but no, I vote for Kennedy. I'd have no trouble with that. But they won't take him

because they don't want him near the White House. Yeah, I agree with you. I mean, I cannot believe that I'm thinking positively about a lot of the things he's said, but he's speaking a lot of, uh, common sense, I think, or I put about 15 pages, I put together about 15 pages, which I dug in and find out his views.

Now you can't read about his views. You really have to hear him talk about his views. And I went through and did that, said, here are the key topics and here are his views. And ironically, the person reading that is reading about his views, which I told you not to do, but I at least know that I [01:31:00] didn't just read about his views.

And there's things I don't totally agree with, but I would say that, um, I would say that he makes more sense else to me. And he he does have the idiosyncrasies of trump, which I don't have a problem with what trump did, but I do understand that he's polarizing and I would like a break from polarization for a while.

So if you listen. If you listen to what R. F. K. Jr. says about climate change, if you listen to what he says about it, he sounds way more sane now than he did five, ten years ago, you know. Well, yeah, and one of the things that he said is, look, I don't support big government solutions to the problem. And that's, that says it all.

It's over at that point. Say, look, if you think, if you think you can make a ton of money with solar panels, Then make solar panels or windmills or whatever. I watched a podcast yesterday by a woman from Australia, and Australia has real problems. But she talked to, [01:32:00] for seven years she worked in some organization that involved windmills.

And she said, she said, the Australian government pays something like a million dollars per windmill to be installed. What happens is foreign, foreign investors, foreign companies come in and install windmills on farmer's land, which they pay the farmer 12, 000. But the contract was written such that once that windmill is up, it is the farmer's responsibility.

And as a consequence, if it burns, if it breaks, if it's got to be disposed of, it's the farmer's problem. And so it is just a huge scam. It goes back to the, you know, 50 trillion opportunity. And by the way, windmills and solar panels are destabilizing the grids. People don't know that. The grid has an inherent frequency.

And it's not, you know, night and day, you know, clouds, non clouds, it's a frequency. [01:33:00] And so when you have some big turbine at Niagara Falls whipping around, that thing whips around at a very steady frequency. And, and coal fired power plants, very steady frequency. The, the, the solar panels in the, in the windmills don't, Don't do that.

So, so according to, uh, some analysts that, that, that, that, that hooking windmills and solar panels to the grid requires some serious jerry rigging. To not destabilize the grid because of the frequency problem and that you can only take up to maybe 15 percent of the grid being fed by these alternative energies before the grid just becomes unstable.

And no one's paying attention to that. No one knows where, did you see the Biden plan to put up 3 million solar panels, 3 million solar panels. These are 3 million toxic waste dumps that are promised last 25 years, but maybe 10 or 12. Right. Right. And you have to wash them. You need [01:34:00] water. You know, what happens if a hailstorm shows up?

You know, there's just so many reasons why you should not put in 3 million solar panels. I think I was going to look it up here. Steve Malloy has some just general rule of thumb that if it's green, it's a scam. I can't find the quote right now. I think that's pretty accurate. I think that's pretty accurate.

Um, I would love if they started trying to get at the question of not putting plastic items in plastic packaging. You know, stupid stuff like that. It's like, why, why don't you, you know, when you need a hacksaw to open the package, um, maybe there's a better way to package it. So, so, you know, the great trash heap in the Pacific ocean strikes me as a, as a human failure.

Um, I do think we're running out of resources. I know that there's a renewed debate on peak oil and guys. I really think are smart or supporting the it's oil's not a problem. I'm still [01:35:00] thinking where if we're going two miles below the Gulf of Mexico, it sure smells like we're treating it as a problem.

And, uh, you know, it's not like Jed Clampett firing his gun into the side of the mountains in some hillbilly town and getting oil. Um, those days are over. So, um, I do think that Patrick Moore says that that great Pacific garbage patch, whatever, plastic patch, he doesn't believe in it. It doesn't exist. I've heard that.

I've heard that. And if, if, Let me just say that in general, if someone tells me we've been lied to, I'm not that shocked. So any story that turns out to be false, I say, well, of course, because they, they can't stop lying. So I, I was, uh, I've been chasing the darkest of dark stories as, uh, as, um, the geopolitical effects of, of global pedophilia rings.

And, uh, Try to get a fact from that one, but I was on a I was on a this is so amazing Actually, I was [01:36:00] on a twitter spaces last night and I was just listening and it had some of the pedo hunters. I

call pedo hunters Um, like liz crock and who's out there battling like crazy People follow the story know her by name and and a couple others who've made documentaries And then and then I noticed There's Jacob Chansley.

Now, he is QAnon Shaman from January 6. Now, this start, this plot is thickening like crazy because Jacob Chansley was talking about, uh, pedophilia and Satanism like a pro. I'm going, I didn't know Jacob Chansley knew about that stuff. And, and what I can also tell you is I've seen photos of Jacob Chansley with known Ukrainian operatives.

And Jacob, and here he is queuing on Sham and I, you know, there's something so wrong with the Jacob Jansley story. He gets let out of prison. I'm mad as hell at the Republicans for not [01:37:00] releasing all the January 6th tapes. They're gonna release them piecemeal for some political reason. I go, are you aware there are people rotting in prison right now?

And those tapes might get them out of prison, but you're sitting on them because you want to defeat someone in some political, political elections. I, that, that's, that's me, the morality of that. So that's where, you know, I really blame the Republicans on that one. Do you follow Julie Kelly's work on that a lot or no?

Yeah. A little bit. Okay. A little bit. It's a big dark, it's a big, January 6th bothers me. Bothers me a lot. It was, it was a bad day, but it wasn't a day that justified 870 years of prison time. We should have walked from it. How many people are still in prison right now from January 6th? I don't know the numbers, but the prison sentences [01:38:00] totaled 870 and they're arresting more people now.

They just arrested a journalist. That doesn't smell right to me. Right. That sounds very Stalin, Lenin. Right. Yeah. Or banana Republic or whatever. But, uh, and when, when they talked about, they said, we're now going to go after people in the outer rings where they actually crossed some boundary, but didn't go in the building and I go, how do you do that?

So I think people, I think people who think that that's okay have just lost their way. Now, maybe they're smart people. Maybe they're just morons. Yeah. But somehow they've lost their way and they've not recognized it when you support that kind of behavior. It doesn't matter which party it's against, it will turn on you very hard.

And it's like the famous Niemöller quote, where, you know, it said they came for this so and so, and I didn't speak up because I wasn't one of them. And then when they came for me, there was no one left, right? It's, um, [01:39:00] you really, you really should support the basic principles of what we used to think we were.

I'm not sure we ever were, but we used to think we were that. We used to, we used to try to be that, I think, and we seem to have lost our way. Okay, my last question here is, can you point us to any other people's work that you think that we should take a look at? Maybe Whitney Webb, you're a fan of her.

Anybody else we should be listening to? Well, there's an economist on Twitter named Peter St. Onge, who's very, very good, and you should interview him. Um, and um, um, who to watch? You know, always Thomas Sowell. Um, I, I don't know. You know, get on Twitter, start reading stuff, find, find the news. Uh, subscribe to Zero Hedge.

I, I know there's people who think Zero Hedge is garbage. I happen to think it's the best site on the internet. And so, you have to bring a filter. You can't just take it hook, line, and sinker. [01:40:00] I searched my name once on zero hedge. I searched it. I I'm in there something like 70 times. It's ridiculous.

You've written a bunch of stuff, haven't you for them or no? Well, not for them, but it ends up there and it ends up there and stories about me and stuff like that. Yeah. All right, I will let you go, I think, but thank you so much for doing this. I think a lot of people are really going to enjoy hearing this