



To the CO₂ Coalition:

The CO₂ Coalition offers the scientifically valid and honest stance that CO₂ is essential to life, ecology, and mankind and that the label of CO₂ as a pollutant is without merit. The IPCC, supported by many governments, media, and universities, presents climate change as due to human actions entirely.



This assumption appears to have originated with W. W. Kellogg in the 1970s.

The above graphs are due to Kellogg, from an invited WMO paper (1977) (left), and from *Climate Change* (1987), ten years later (right). Small differences aside, the remarkable aspect of these plots is that climate change occurs ONLY due to human intervention and CO₂ is the cause.

This is an explicit assumption in Kellogg's papers. Kellogg unilaterally DECIDED that humans MUST be altering climate through their activities and set out to prove it. That is NOT scientific.

In the past fifty years, Kellogg's concept has been translated into \$BILLIONS for climate change remediation and study, with plans for \$TRILLIONS more through the Paris Protocol, IF the world (read, USA) will just ACT on the premise that CO₂ is a pollutant. Every propaganda tool available is used and will continue indefinitely; a very recent example, Dr. Gavin Schmidt, Columbia U and Goddard Institute for Space Science, asserted, unequivocally, that humans are 100% responsible for climate change in a public forum, quoting his and other current models. I was in the audience. His graph was the "Kellogg graph", extended to 2100 rather than 2050 (i.e. 50 years have passed with little effect).

<http://www.studlife.com/news/2017/09/21/wash-u-hosts-climate-change-panel-continues-push-toward-increased-sustainability-on-campus/>

So, yes, CO₂ IS a political propaganda issue.

Honest scientists are constrained by our best knowledge. However, not all scientists agree that the scientific method is sufficient when faced with a MORAL duty. Schneider, an early hire of Kellogg's, wrote clearly that his moral convictions REQUIRED his manipulation of the science in order to reach the public (his **double bind**) (Schneider, S. H. (1988). The greenhouse effect and the U.S.: Cause and effect or a media event: An editorial. *Climatic Change*, 13, 113-115.

I totally oppose such anti-scientific attitude. That is the reason I joined this organization.

Regards, Bill

W. H. Smith, Professor of Earth and Planetary Science
Washington University St. Louis