



# Global Warming is good

Terence J. Hughes<sup>✉</sup>

Professor Emeritus of Earth Sciences and Climate Change, School of Earth and Climate Sciences, Climate Change Institute, University of Maine, 404 North Sixth Street, Fort Pierre, South Dakota 57532

<sup>✉</sup>**Correspondence to:**

Professor Emeritus of Earth Sciences and Climate Change,  
School of Earth and Climate Sciences,  
Climate Change Institute,  
University of Maine,  
404 North Sixth Street, Fort Pierre,  
South Dakota 57532

**Article History**

Received: 13 April 2016

Accepted: 11 May 2016

Published: July - September 2016

**Citation**

Terence J Hughes. Global Warming is good. *Climate Change*, 2016, 2(7), 130-133

**Publication License**



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

**General Note**



Article is recommended to print as color version in recycled paper. *Save Trees, Save Climate.*

For some years now, some of my glaciological colleagues (Bob Thomas whom I brought to the University of Maine for a few years before he went to NASA), Jay Zwally (who funded my first glaciological proposal when he was at NSF, and then founded the glaciology program at NASA) and Craig Lingle (my first graduate student at the University of Maine) have urged me to march in lockstep with Albert Gore, the Drum Major in

the parade denouncing global warming as an unmitigated disaster. I have demurred for the following reasons.

1. Assuming global warming is caused by CO<sub>2</sub> (which has greatly increased in the last 18 years with no corresponding global warming), more atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> would greatly increase agricultural production because CO<sub>2</sub> is "oxygen" for plants, which produce oxygen we need to survive.
2. Global warming would thaw permafrost (perennially frozen ground), opening arctic and sub-arctic lands in Alaska, Canada, and Russia to a boom in economic development that would benefit all mankind. For example, 18 to 24 hours of summer sunshine would deliver two agricultural harvests per year.
3. Thawing permafrost would increase by one-seventh Earth's landmass open to extensive human habitation (two-sevenths for agriculture with two annual harvests). It would be a new global frontier, just as was the New World after Christopher Columbus, and on a comparable scale.
4. Melting arctic sea ice would open the Northwest Passage and the Northeast Passage to year-round shipping, cutting travel times and costs to the Orient in half, with new cities and seaports along these sea routes mushrooming to handle the export-import trade with vast lands freed from permafrost.
5. Melting sea ice and rising sea level (if the Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets shrink from melting) would open vast new fishing grounds worldwide that could join with the boom in agricultural production to feed mankind. All offshore activities now prohibited by perennial sea ice would become available, from commerce to recreation.
6. If sea-level did rise, there would be a global economic boom with billions of new jobs worldwide to relocate coastal cities and re-design port facilities. Examples: "floating" port facilities like those along the Amazon, notably Manaus, Leticia, and Iquitos, and boats replacing cars for travel on city streets, as in parts of Venice.
7. Science, technology, and engineering would undergo a massive revolution we can scarcely imagine as mankind rose to meet these new challenges. None of these benefits would take place if no change in climate and sea level occurred. "Sustainability" (the environmentalist watchword) means stagnation.

8. These changes in climate and sea level would encourage more cooperation between countries to handle the redistribution of population, manufacturing, and commerce, cooperation that is sorely lacking today. Endless warfare would be the only alternative. If we have learned anything, we now know that is not an acceptable option.

The other change would be global cooling. We know that endgame: A sheet of ice thousands of feet thick from south of the Great Lakes across the North Pole almost to the Mediterranean Sea, the situation only 18,000 years ago. Why is this scenario never stated? Would reductions of atmospheric carbon dioxide trigger that calamity?

There must be some other unstated reason for the constant drumbeat to Save The Planet by reducing atmospheric carbon dioxide. Critics tell us the drumbeat is merely to keep Federal funding of climate research going. Academic promotions and prestige depend on getting funded research. The resolution of climate records, especially in cores taken from mountain glaciers and large ice sheets, can now resolve changes only a few years apart, even seasonal changes in exceptional circumstances. This puts "climate" changes within election cycles, an irresistible temptation for some politicians to gain attention by politicizing science, to predict global "catastrophes" unless the spigots of government funding are opened to the full.

Politicians always want more taxes. In this case it would be an open-ended carbon tax that would penalize use of fossil fuel essential for transportation, heating dwellings, and in many manufactured products. It would target the middle class, where most wealth exists, but which has little political clout. This would be a multi-trillion-dollar tax because the world economy, especially in the wealthy First World, depends on fossil fuels. A share of the tax would go to the United Nations, with the goal being a World Government with taxing powers. The UN is ideal, since all delegates are appointed, none elected. The people worldwide have no voice. The "elite" rule. Advocates tell us the nation state is obsolete, and the cause of most wars. We need a World Government.

There may be a more sinister reason. One the climate scientists probably don't even know exists. But the politicians know. They need funding to get re-elected and it comes from super-rich crony capitalists who control the global economy and too many governments worldwide. Their payback is no-bid government contracts on useless activities, including endless wars that destroy equipment, to be promptly replaced at huge profits. Hand-in-hand is control of Third World resources, while reducing its population. The blueprint appears in National Security Study Memorandum 200, written by Henry Kissinger for Richard Nixon. It has become the cornerstone for U.S. foreign policy in the Third World, especially in mineral-rich sub-Saharan

Africa where Black people are mostly powerless and often ruled by despots who can be easily bought.

NSSM 200 states that American economic supremacy can be maintained only if U.S. foreign policy is aimed at reducing the non-White population worldwide. *We need their* natural resources to maintain *our* standard of living. This is seen in support by our government for the one-child forced-abortion policy in Communist China and for targeting aborting baby girls using ultrasound technology that is rampant in both China and India, the two countries producing the most atmospheric carbon dioxide by far. Black Africa is targeted because these countries are still more than replacing their population, and have most resisted legalizing abortion.

In stark contrast, the White nations, notably in Europe and North America, and also Japan, have for decades been unable to replace their populations. Roots sunk by contraception and abortion are too deep, and have spawned lifestyles that see children as a burden. Too much time, money, and effort are needed to bear and raise them. Behind this is acceptance of the Darwinian doctrine for human origins and destiny. We came from worms and our only destiny is to be eaten by worms. That is, to become worm excrement. Why waste our allotted time on Earth to produce *that*?

The full title of Darwin's magnum opus is *On The Origin of Species By Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*. It was written as British Imperialism was reaching its zenith, and it was viewed as justifying suppression of non-White people. Its racist overtones cannot be exposed today, when American Imperialism is also being denounced as racist, as NSSM 200 proves. The irony of embracing Charles Darwin and spurning Jesus Christ is the "favoured" race, its Poster Boy being the Victorian English Gentleman, has stopped reproducing itself. Why produce worm food, ultimately worm excrement? Darwinism made the Victorian English Gentleman an extinct species. The White Man is now also on the same road to oblivion. Having jettisoned the Biblical vision of man, he is now jettisoning himself.