With Climate Change Science Unsettled, a Carbon Tax is Even More Useless
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Reuters’s environment correspondent Alister Doyle provides even more fodder for why a carbon (energy) tax or the Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) regulation of greenhouse gas emissions is economically and environmentally foolish. Doyle writes:

Scientists are struggling to explain a slowdown in climate change that has exposed gaps in their understanding and defies a rise in global greenhouse gas emissions.

Often focused on century-long trends, most climate models failed to predict that the temperature rise would slow, starting around 2000. Scientists are now intent on figuring out the causes and determining whether the respite will be brief or a more lasting phenomenon.

Figuring out the reasons and severity behind climate change is a worthwhile cause, but Doyle’s article is another example that the science is far from settled as to what is causing climate change, how quickly it’s occurring, and the effect of increased greenhouse gas
emissions (natural or manmade) on the earth’s temperature. Doyle continues:

Theories for the pause include that deep oceans have taken up more heat with the result that the surface is cooler than expected, that industrial pollution in Asia or clouds are blocking the sun, or that greenhouse gases trap less heat than previously believed.

The change may be a result of an observed decline in heat-trapping water vapor in the high atmosphere, for unknown reasons. It could be a combination of factors or some as yet unknown natural variations, scientists say.

Richard Tol, a climate and economics professor at the University of Sussex, told Doyle, “My own confidence in the data has gone down in the past five years.”

One of The Heritage Foundation’s eight principles of The American Conservation Ethic is that science should be employed as one tool to guide public policy. Science is a critical and informative guiding tool, but it should not dictate public policy, especially when lawmakers distort the science to help them meet their policy agenda. As we explain in the principles, “Commitments to use the force of law should be made with great caution and demand a high degree of scientific certainty. To do otherwise is likely to result in environmental laws based on scientific opinions rather than scientific facts.”

Even with the science unsettled, proponents of carbon taxes, the EPA’s greenhouse gas regulations, and green energy subsidies argue that we should enact these policies as precautionary measures and protect future generations. But we’ll be leaving our children and grandchildren a world with higher energy costs and less economic prosperity with nothing to show for it.

Since the large majority of America’s energy needs are met with carbon-emitting conventional fuels, a carbon tax would cripple economic growth. Heritage’s Center for Data Analysis recently analyzed the carbon tax legislation proposed by Senators Barbara Boxer (D–CA) and Bernie Sanders (I–VT) and found family income losses of $1,000 per year and 400,000 jobs lost as soon as 2016.

It’s not just making our children and grandchildren worse off; it’s making us worse off through higher energy bills, higher product prices, and less economic opportunity. And as the carbon tax increases, so does the economic burden.

What’s worse, the climate impact of a carbon tax is almost too small to notice. A $25-per-ton tax would moderate global warming at most by 0.11 degrees Celsius by the end of the century.

Congress should be proactive in addressing climate change, but only by categorically rejecting the idea of a carbon tax and removing the ability of the EPA and any other federal agency to regulate greenhouse gas emissions.
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 decade after decade since 1900, the following decade was warmer than the previous one 3/4 of the time, and cooler by 1/4 of the time. When you incorporate what we know from physics about the greenhouse effect, which is simply inarguable, you get an estimate that the following decade has a 15% chance of being cooler than the one before it. The only flaw the retarded logic of taking one of these decades and claiming it opens holes in the reality of global warming.

This is setting up not only higher costs but sickness for those who can't afford it or lower themselves to get help through the manufactured government help services that's set up to combat the high costs government has already corruptly imposed. If these people can't face reality because their corruption is that important to them, no one should comply. It's a corrupt tax with corrupt representation abusing all people discriminatily who aren't behind their corruption. The cost of heat including this carbon tax is a precursor to illness and death where carbon properly handled, has no evidence. Global warming is not going to kill us before these disingenuous, misrepresenting taxes will...
Stop the corruption! Get rid of all government entities! Independent studies from reputable scientists who have names, have earned trust and are without conflict. These fools think they're fooling but their stupidity is beneath acceptable. America is above this!!!!!!

*Unsettled* seriously?! With disingenuous articles like this, the discussion starts out disconnected from reality, and serves no functional purpose.

How does removing the EPA's ability to regulate greenhouse gas emissions, have a positive affect on addressing climate change? I understand your point regarding the carbon tax, but I'm not sure what you're suggesting in crippling the EPA.

The flooding, drought, flooding whiplash that we have experienced here in the Midwest is pretty much in line with what climate researchers have been warning is in our future. Of course, Chicago weather is famously variable, so this certainly does not prove anything. But it will be interesting to re-visit this post in 5 years and see how well it holds up. In addition to monitoring the earth's surface temperature, we will discover if the ocean has become even more acidic, and if the Arctic sea ice continues to melt during summer. We'll also discover if China really follows through on a carbon tax.

Its amazing how many different ways the govt finds to tax us. How does a tax fix the problem anyhow? (Assuming there is a problem and that we could actually do something about it). All taxes take money out of the private sector and put it in the hands of the govt. Its a power and control issue. They then decide what kind of car we drive, the fuel in the car (ethanol is an economic joke. Steal from the food supply. Real good idea...) what kind fuel our power plants use, etc. I'm not saying we shouldn't research cleaner energy but don't force it on us when the technology is good enough yet. This puts the US at a huge disadvantage in the global market. Enough ranting, problems with government are the result of too much government.
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[...] change is a problem, although global warming has leveled off over the past 16 years (something the models failed to predict), increased economic growth here and abroad will help us deal with any costs associated with [...]