

EPA's Carlin on Global Warming: 'This Whole Hoax, from A to Z, Makes No Sense'

by Michelle Lerner

As the curtain opened on Dec. 7, 2009 for the first day of the international act of failure for the Obama Administration that was called the Copenhagen Summit on Climate Change, the stage was set for an attempted coup against the Legislative branch by the Executive branch. Admittedly, the Legislative branch has largely been playing the role of henchman for the crimes being committed by this new Presidency against the U.S. population; but this latest step would not only be a crime against the people, but against the Constitution itself. The separation of the powers of these institutions was a clear means by which the Union could defend itself against the tyranny of King George III; but the intent of the Obama Administration to commit the world, including the United States, to a legally binding agreement forcing the reduction of CO₂ would, in fact, abolish that defense and establish a regime just as committed to the suppression of industry as was George III, against which the American Revolution had been waged. And so it should be no wonder, that this crime should be committed today with the blessing of the descendants and heirs of that same British monarchy.

On Dec. 7, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Lisa Jackson announced that the EPA had found greenhouse gases (GHGs), including CO₂, to be dangerous to public health. This "finding," according to a 2007 decision on the Clean Air Act, allows the EPA to enforce emission reductions, bypassing the legislative process.

Prior to this statement, President Obama had been warned by members of the Senate that he had no legal authority to commit the United States to any legally binding international agreement. Was this just a coincidence? What need is there for such drastic measures?

A week after the EPA finding was announced, *EIR* interviewed Alan Carlin, who has been working for the agency for 38 years. Speaking for himself, he had plenty

to say about the process that brought about such a finding. From inside the process, Carlin objected on scientific grounds. In March, he wrote a 100-page response, but his objections fell on deaf ears. More about him and the response can be found at <http://carlineconomics.googlepages.com/>.

Interview: Alan Carlin

Dr. Carlin has been Senior Operations Research Analyst at the Environmental Protection Agency since 1974. From 1971-74, he was the director of the EPA's Implementation Research Division. Prior to that he worked at the RAND Corp. His undergraduate degree was in physics, his PhD in economics. He told EIR, "I've done about everything in the field of environmental economics, plus something in environmental sciences as well. This combination is very unusual, and very useful. Economics and physical science. That's the key to this whole thing."



EIR: What do you think of the Copenhagen summit, and the fact that this report was issued by the EPA on the first day of the summit?

Carlin: Oh, that was just an accident! No, I differ from you people a little bit on holding the Copenhagen conference: I think that there's a good chance it's going to fail, and that would be just great. . . . If they want to go and make fools of themselves, I'm all for it.

I think [the timing of the EPA report] is very clear. They hoped to go into this meeting in Copenhagen

June 26, 2009 11:09 PM

EPA May Have Suppressed Report Skeptical Of Global Warming

Posted by Declan McCullagh



Font size



Print



E-mail



Share



371 comments



(CBS/AP/Stockphoto)

The Environmental Protection Agency may have suppressed an internal report that was skeptical of claims about global warming, including whether carbon dioxide must be strictly regulated by the federal government, according to a series of newly disclosed e-mail messages.

Less than two weeks before the agency formally **submitted** its pro-regulation recommendation to the White House, an EPA center director quashed a **98-page report** that warned against making hasty "decisions based on a scientific hypothesis that does not appear to explain most of the available data."

The EPA official, Al McGartland, said in an e-

CBS News was one of the few "mainstream" media outlets to cover the suppression of Dr. Carlin's critique of the EPA's global warming report. This program was on June 26, 2009.

being able to promise the rest of the world everything they thought the rest of the world wanted. It was abundantly clear to me, and maybe to them, that Congress was not going to approve what they wanted, in terms of cap and trade, before the meeting—and in my opinion, they won't approve it afterwards either. So, they said, okay, we've done the spade work for this "endangerment" finding—we'll put that out. As I've written in my blog, I think that was a very dangerous thing for them to do, and I think they're going to live to regret it. But obviously, in my opinion, word came down from the White House that that's what they wanted done, so that's what EPA did.

EPA Didn't 'Do Its Homework'

EIR: They already had this study done, they had the policy of declaring carbon dioxide a pollutant, adding it to the Clean Air Act....

Carlin: This is one of the first things that the new Administration decided to do. I had gone on a private round-the-world trip in late January to late February, and within a few days of when I arrived back, they said, Oh, there's this technical support document that will be coming up for review, on the endangerment from CO₂

and GHGs. And I said, Oh, okay. I didn't know anything about it. It seemed like a weird thing to do, to me. And that was my first introduction to what they were up to.

[The Obama Administration] came into office on Jan. 20. It required a couple weeks' preparation on EPA's part, and the draft went out approximately on the 8th or 9th of March, for internal review. So, I wrote a review which was extremely negative—but in a positive sort of way! That is, no one could argue that I wasn't trying to be helpful....

I said, there are a few problems here. Science doesn't support what you're saying. There have been some new developments that aren't covered in this report—it's about four years out of date.

And I felt that EPA should do its own homework, and not copy out of the IPCC [Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change] report, and the CCSP [U.S. Climate Change Science Program] report.

EIR: How evident was that? The White House came in, and put the IPCC's report in front of the EPA, and the EPA basically just spat it right back out?

Carlin: Right. I was told at the time that the people over in their office preparing this TSD [Technical Support Document] were very concerned, because they had only one footnote that didn't reference either CCSP or IPCC, and they couldn't decide whether they should leave it in, or take it out. I mean, just *one independent thought* in the whole thing! Which I found absolutely amazing.

I've been at EPA for 38 years, and I cannot think of another instance where we did not do our homework, where we didn't check whether claims made by whichever side were reasonable, and in conformance with good science, etc. But here—I don't know how many weeks' preparation, but probably two to three weeks max—and all the other offices were given seven days, but they had an elaborate review process, so we ended up with four to five days to review a 200-page report.

As it happened, it wasn't too hard, because I was

very familiar with both the science and the economics; but it was a pretty tall order. I came up with 100 pages. There are errors in it—I'm sorry about that; I ran out of time. And I made those main points that I just made to you, and it became clear towards the end of the week, that it wasn't going to be forwarded. So on Monday, I made a last-ditch effort and sent an e-mail to my boss, saying, this is really important, etc., etc. And that's when he wrote his now somewhat famous, or infamous, e-mail which said: You haven't gotten the message. This is what they're going to do, and our job is to support them.

EIR: Stamp it.

Carlin: And without that e-mail, the whole thing wouldn't have flown very far. But that's what he wrote, and I think he was trying to be honest, saying, Alan, I realize you spent a week on it, but—

EIR: “I should have told you in the first place it didn't matter”?

Carlin: Well, my view was that it mattered a great deal, because it was my reading that the cap and trade was going to go nowhere, at least in the Senate (I thought it would get through the House, and it did). I was fairly certain it wouldn't get through the Senate. So, what EPA did is of extreme importance, because if EPA didn't do anything, the whole thing was dead. Hallelujah!

The EPA comment period for the TSD ended in late June, and somehow this outside group called CEI, Competitive Enterprise Institute, got a hold of both my boss's e-mail and my report, and on June 22 or 23, nearing the end of the comment period, they made the e-mail public, and then, late in the week, on the last day of the comment period, they released their version. It wasn't the final version; it was some earlier version, which, somehow, they got—I hadn't given it to them.

And so, that picked up quite a bit of interest in the conservative news media—not in the mainstream media; the mainstream media just ignored it, like it didn't exist, with the exception of the *New York Times* and CBS.

So, I gave various interviews, almost always to the non-mainstream media, and it caused a few problems



White House Photo/Pete Souza

President Obama at the Copenhagen Climate Change Conference, Dec. 18, 2009. With him are (foreground, left to right): Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh, Danish Foreign Minister Per Stig Møller, and Israeli President Shimon Peres. The harder Obama pushes the global warming fraud, Carlin said, “the more people are just going to get fed up with him.”

inside EPA. And in March, in an e-mail a couple of minutes after the one I just described, my boss said: Don't spend another minute on climate change, ever. Don't talk to anybody about it, except in a group, etc. So, when the thing broke in June, there was an about-face, and suddenly I was allowed to talk to news media, and it's now pretty obvious that that came from a decision made by the EPA Administrator.

Now, recently there have been all the Climategate e-mails, and my reaction is, “Well, what did you expect?” And, my strong recommendation, that EPA do its own homework, looks even better now, because EPA never looked at it! They simply copied out what these other people had said, used footnotes to the CCSP reports, and AR4s [4th Assessment Reports] of the IPCC, and so they never really looked at the issue. Gee, is this good science?...

It is my view that most of the changes [with respect to climate] that we are witnessing, or have witnessed, or will witness, are a result of the Sun, and possibly other nearby planetary bodies, but the most important thing is the Sun. And the major mechanism *appears*—although we're getting very doubtful here—to be a result of changes in the Sun's magnetic field, which in turn changes the ability of cosmic rays to get down into the atmosphere. There's more and more evidence now that

that changes the quantity of clouds....

Now, I think the last word has not been heard on all that, but this hypothesis at least makes some sense, whereas the “warmist,” CO₂ hypothesis makes zero sense on a whole bunch of scores.

Politics of ‘Climate Change’

EIR: Why is there such a political thrust for this specific argument?

Carlin: My view on that—and I will immediately give credit to a man named Richard Lindsen, who’s the person who pointed it out to me—he says that this whole thing has great intellectual appeal to people who have lots of education. It’s sort of a ready-made hoax for them, and fits all their needs.

Whereas people who are not so well educated, and have to face the realities of the world—they have a job, and so on and so forth—tend not to be easily persuaded that they should have to pay a lot more money to get what they have now. They’re having a hard enough time now; if prices go up, they’ll have an even harder time. And I think that has a good bit of truth to it.

You’re asking a very important question, and I don’t have all the answers. It is sort of uniformly supported around the world by the left-wing parties, rather than the right wing. Although the curious thing is that the idea originated, I think, with Margaret Thatcher—not that it originated with her, but she’s the one who put in the money, that got the whole thing going. And it’s the left-wing parties that tend to represent the interests of the working people. And so, how these people think they’re going to get re-elected, when they advocate things like this, is beyond my comprehension. If it were a bunch of right-wing intellectuals, then the right wing could happily support them. But it’s the left wing. And why that is the case, is beyond me. I assume the whole thing will continue until these people are voted out of office, which I think they’re making some progress on.

EIR: What Mr. LaRouche always identifies is that



Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark

Britain’s Prince Charles at the welcoming ceremony opening the conference of heads of state to Copenhagen, Dec. 14, 2009. The British monarchy wants to reduce the world’s population to 2 billion or less, as the best “solution” to global warming.

particularly the ’68er phenomenon (Baby Boomers) representing a shift away from blue-collar society, adopting an anti-technology, anti-science identity—that these are the people who now hold office. Particularly, you see this type of thing reflected in the space program being dismantled: By the time we got to the Moon, we were already losing the technology to get back to the Moon.

Carlin: Yes, we certainly have. My explanation, not being faintly familiar with all this—I see a very distinct correlation between interest in this idea, and red states and blue states. If you map where the support’s coming from for this idea, it’s the blue states—it’s the two coasts, particularly Massachusetts and California, the two most liberal states in the country. And it sort of falls off in the middle; when you get in the heart of the Midwest, it’s gone.

And I assume you’ve been following what’s been going on with regard to all this in Australia. It’s just absolutely fascinating. There again, it’s the left-wing [Labor] party which, by its name, seems to represent the working people, which is so much in support of this thing, and they won’t hear of anything else. And once again, in Britain, it’s the left-wing [Labour] party that is supporting this, and it’s beginning to bite. People have noticed quite a big increase in their costs of electricity,

airplane flights. And how long this weird situation can exist, I don't know. When is it going to come to some reality? Well, I think we're beginning to see it now. I think the "Climategate" was where it started to shift, but there's still a huge fight. It's going to go on for a number of years. These people are not going to give up easily.

The British Role

EIR: You mentioned the British. It's not just the left, but also top down, the British monarchy.

Carlin: Absolutely. And the weirdest thing of all: The current leadership of the Conservative Party says, "Me too, me too"—this is a group that has had a very long history, a very reasonable history, and they've felt they had to support this too. And it passed the Lower House with only three votes against. Unbelievable!

This whole hoax, from A to Z, makes no sense.

We've only touched on a few of the things, but the first several years that I worked on this, I wasn't looking at this aspect of the science at all. I was saying, let's assume that this is all true. What would you do? And within ten minutes, I found a much better answer, and wrote about it for two years—which, of course, was completely ignored; that's okay.

How, particularly, people with PhDs can espouse this type of thing, is beyond me. I went to a college reunion—most of my fellow classmates have PhDs in physics, and I only found two members of the class that were sympathetic to my view. And they had reached those conclusions before they came. Unbelievable!

EIR: Why would the alternatives be pushed aside?

Carlin: Well, there are a number of hypotheses. I can't burrow into the minds of all these people, and I probably wouldn't understand it if I were able to. But one possibility, is that they want world government, and they see this as a route to world government. Another possibility is that they've just been so brainwashed that they can't think any more.

EIR: Specifically with Copenhagen, I think the world government issue is definitely coming up. The British role in that is very clear: They say we need a supranational organization to oversee all of this. I was just looking at one group, the Optimum Population Trust, which says basically: Reduce the human race to

a couple billion people. They're the ones who said that by 2050, we should actually have a net loss of 500 million, because more than 5 billion is unsustainable.

Carlin: That is just utter hogwash. They apparently haven't understood that Europe has been losing population now for quite a few decades, and that presents problems. Like, who's going to pay the taxes?

EIR: Who's going to build the country?

Inside the Beltway

I'm interested specifically in what you said, that this was one of the first things the Obama Administration did, coming into office, because we knew that there were certain assets in this government that we had to keep an eye on. Obviously, the Wall Street assets have been most prominent, in terms of the bailouts. But I'm curious about what insight you have into this Administration. . . .

Carlin: I am not the person to ask. I'll give you my speculation, but I don't understand this. For the reasons just outlined, Mr. Obama is going to be a one-term President, because, partly, of this. The harder he pushes it, the more Copenhagens he goes to, the more people are just going to get fed up with him.

So, it happens they've installed as my boss's boss, a lady by the name of Lisa Heinzerling, and she is the brains behind the lawsuit that went to the Supreme Court, and which said, contrary to the Bush Administration's view, that EPA could regulate GHGs, if it felt that it should—it met all of the requirements. So they embraced her pretty early on.

EIR: Who brought her in?

Carlin: She was appointed by the other Lisa [Jackson], but I'm willing to bet you that it came from two possible sources in the White House. And if they were going to have her, they couldn't abandon what she had spent several years of her life trying to get through.

EIR: Perhaps that's why they picked her.

Carlin: That is entirely possible. But they apparently wanted to use it as a lever, to get Congress to do what they wanted Congress to do. That was the hypothesis. As I've written in my personal blog, and as others have written, I think they've made a huge blunder. Because what I think what Congress is going to do, is say, okay, you've taken this on—go right ahead.