

Global warming assignment



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

So there is no one thing that he has done other than (in a very general sense) continue the process. Continue the wars; continue the attack on our liberties – so it has to be a broad answer. Sometimes people would like me to say just one thing like “ Obama care” but it is not just one thing. It is the continuation of Big Government and the attacks on our personal liberties. 2. What is your response to the charges that you are speaking at an “ anti Semitic” conference? 3. If you could reverse one decision Obama made in office, which would it be and why? (Being a BOGGY) 4.

What is your stand on abortion? I am against abortion because I believe life begins at conception and abortions end innocent lives. 5. What is your position on legalizing marijuana? My position on marijuana has not changed for a long time, but the position has always been that it should be legal and there should be no criminal penalties at all for the use of it. When people do things that may harm themselves, the government should not be involved, therefore I do not believe in any drug laws. If there is going to be any regulation at all, it should be at the state level.

The federal government should not be engaging in a war against drugs. Fortunately, the people are waking up and the states are rebelling, and I think that at some point in the near future there will not be much enforcement of the federal laws against marijuana. 6. What you do different from George W. Bush? 7. What is your stand on education in poor communities? 8. What is your stand on equal pay for women? 9. Why should we doubt global warming? Perhaps Paul just does not care about biology. Perhaps he has not looked into it much.

Therefore, he has not boned up on Wisteria's article on Evolution; we're all human. Nevertheless, in climate science the situation is quite different. Here, Paul is very much an active player. As it stands, Paul is among the most influential promulgators of oil-company-funded conspiracy theories alleging that the entire scientific community is (for some reason or other) lying to us. The greatest hoax I think that has been around for many, many years if not hundreds of years has been this hoax on the environment and global warming.

It might turn out to be one of the biggest hoaxes of all history, this completely global warming terrorism that they have been using, but we will have to just wait and see, but it cannot be helpful. It is going to hurt everybody. Again, Paul's ignorance of what is at stake is far more troubling than his disagreement with scientific consensus. According to him, global warming, whether real or not, just isn't important; it's not a "major problem threatening civilization" (unlike, one supposes, the overpopulation of raw milk). In contrast, 84% of U. S. Meteorologists and geophysicists consider global warming a "moderate to very great danger. Intensified hurricanes, tsunamis, heat waves, droughts, the destruction of freshwater resources, the spread of pathogens, the extinction of most of the complex biodiversity on Earth -?? for Paul, all these sadly plausible eventualities are matters of indifference, 'cause Big Brother anti doing' it. These changes, which will expatriation's affect developing nations, are of fundamental relevance to international relations, since droughts and other causes of mass human migration are immense engines of war and conflict. As an example, the World Health Organization estimated that 0. % of all human deaths in 2004

already were a result of man-made climate change, mainly affecting children and in large part resulting from the spread of disease. And these conservative risk estimates do not even take into account the possibility of irreversible feedback loops and discontinuous catastrophes, many of which are difficult to predict until we've passed the point of no turn. If Paul is wrong, he is, through his influence on the youth of America, directly sabotaging efforts to resist one of the gravest existential threats to humankind and to all aquatic and terrestrial life. He'd better hope he's right.

If Representative Paul thinks he understands climate science better than the experts, the onus is on him to supply peer-reviewed studies refuting them. If he thinks the issue is simply not important, the onus is even greater, and the potentially tragic consequences of his continued advocacy against climate science even more stark. So Eng as he continues to campaign for the end of environmental regulations, the repeal of federal research and investment in clean energy, and the abolition of the Environmental Protection Agency, he owes it to his constituents to do a little research and back his views up.

I would love to hear some answers. And I think it would be a fairly stunning betrayal of Pall's own strongly-held principles and long career of challenging and questioning authority if he did not take such questions seriously.

[Besieger's original thank you:] Many thanks to Rick Stark for writing 55-6 and hooting down my many bogus ideas, and to Haley Kvass for helping research Pall's legislative history! Happy Kandahar, and God save the 10.
Why should we doubt evolutionary theory?

Ron Paul rejects the modern evolutionary synthesis, characterizing it as a mere “theory,” as lacking “absolute proof,” and as a trivial topic fit for “theological discussion.” Setting aside what “absolute proof” is supposed to amount to in science, that Paul dismisses the consensus of some 99.85% of U. S. Earth and life scientists is less worrisome than that he considers the issue unimportant. For its one thing to agree with the majority and buck scientific orthodoxy; it is quite another thing to not comprehend what is even at stake when you make your claims.

After all, without understanding what practical difference theories make, one might rush to cut federal research programs by over \$10 billion. One might even oppose giving pay raises to schoolteachers, abolish the Department of Education, and legalize the efforts of school boards to incorporate creationism into their biology curricula, or look askance at public education itself. Pall’s views on science are not without consequence. He owes us a defense of them.