



Technocrat Billionaires Plot Leaving 'Dying' Earth

The very same Technocrats who are running society and the physical world into the ground are the first ones who want to get off the planet as it dies from climate change, overpopulation, disease, etc. We would have less problems if they would oblige.

The desire to reach the heavens is as old as the Tower of Babel, and has been depicted in art and literature for hundreds of years. Now that the technology exists to actually do it, Technocrats are doing it. Mars is more inhospitable than the Sahara Desert in the middle of summer, yet they deceive themselves that Mars is preferable to living on earth. □ TN Editor

Coronavirus, climate change, overpopulation, rising sea levels, and the ever-present threat of nuclear war. Lots of people would leave this planet if they possibly could.

And maybe a few people can.

A number of multi-billionaires – notably Elon Musk, Jeff Bezos, Richard Branson and Yuri Milner – have poured huge chunks of their fortunes into space travel.

Maybe they're just squandering their unimaginable wealth on rockets in the same way that mere millionaires might buy yachts.

But some people are speculating that the mega-rich might be planning to flee off-planet.

In a New York Times article entitled *The Rich Are Planning to Leave This Wretched Planet*, Michael Suffredini, who is spearheading the creation of a new “luxury” space station called Axiom, revealed the details of his designer orbital habitat.

He predicted that a holiday on Axiom would cost \$55million, and not only had he recruited world-famous French designer Philippe Starck to create the station's interior but he was close to doing a deal with a major European fashion house to provide custom-made space suits.

He said that three people had already signed up even though the space station had not yet launched. The station is slated to receive its first guests in 2022.

Elon Musk has made no secret of his plan to establish a permanent settlement on Mars. He has stressed the importance of ensuring that humanity is a multi-planet species so that there will be seem of us left behind if the worst should happen.

Musk says: “Last century, we had two massive world wars, three if you count the Cold War.”

While the PayPal billionaire isn't predicting a global conflict any time soon, he says: “I think it's unlikely that we'll never have another world war again.”

But noted American media theorist Douglas Rushkoff has written that the overall direction of technological development was about creating an escape route for the super-rich.

He pointed out that combat robots would serve very well to guard the bolt-holes of billionaires remaining on Earth once climate change reached its end-game and described Elon Musk's planned Mars colony as "less a continuation of the human diaspora than a lifeboat for the elite."

[Read full story here...](#)



Unsustainable: Wind Turbine Blades Are Piling Up In Landfills

Afterthought: these giant windmill blades cannot be recycled so they end up in landfills. Some are as long as a football field and can only be transported one at a time. How many? Over 8,000 get buried every year in the U.S. □ TN Editor

A wind turbine's blades can be longer than a Boeing 747 wing, so at the end of their lifespan they can't just be hauled away. First, you need to saw through the lissome fiberglass using a diamond-encrusted industrial

saw to create three pieces small enough to be strapped to a tractor-trailer.

The municipal landfill in Casper, Wyoming, is the final resting place of 870 blades whose days making renewable energy have come to end. The severed fragments look like bleached whale bones nestled against one another.

“That’s the end of it for this winter,” said waste technician Michael Bratvold, watching a bulldozer bury them forever in sand. “We’ll get the rest when the weather breaks this spring.”

Tens of thousands of aging blades are coming down from steel towers around the world and most have nowhere to go but landfills. In the U.S. alone, about 8,000 will be removed in each of the next four years. Europe, which has been dealing with the problem longer, has about 3,800 coming down annually through at least 2022, according to BloombergNEF. It’s going to get worse: Most were built more than a decade ago, when installations were less than a fifth of what they are now.

Built to withstand hurricane-force winds, the blades can’t easily be crushed, recycled or repurposed. That’s created an urgent search for alternatives in places that lack wide-open prairies. In the U.S., they go to the handful of landfills that accept them, in Lake Mills, Iowa; Sioux Falls, South Dakota; and Casper, where they will be interred in stacks that reach 30 feet under.

“The wind turbine blade will be there, ultimately, forever,” said Bob Cappadona, chief operating officer for the North American unit of Paris-based Veolia Environnement SA, which is searching for better ways to deal with the massive waste. “Most landfills are considered a dry tomb.”

“The last thing we want to do is create even more environmental challenges.”

To prevent catastrophic climate change caused by burning fossil fuels, many governments and corporations have pledged to use only clean energy by 2050. Wind energy is one of the cheapest ways to reach that

goal.

The electricity comes from turbines that spin generators. Modern models emerged after the 1973 Arab oil embargo, when shortages compelled western governments to find alternatives to fossil fuels. The first wind farm in the U.S. was installed in New Hampshire in 1980, and California deployed thousands of turbines east of San Francisco across the Altamont Pass.

The first models were expensive and inefficient, spinning fast and low. After 1992, when Congress passed a tax credit, manufacturers invested in taller and more powerful designs. Their steel tubes rose 260 feet and sported swooping fiberglass blades. A decade later, General Electric Co. made its 1.5 megawatt model—enough to supply 1,200 homes in a stiff breeze—an industry standard.

Wind power is carbon-free and about 85% of turbine components, including steel, copper wire, electronics and gearing can be recycled or reused. But the fiberglass blades remain difficult to dispose of. With some as long as a football field, big rigs can only carry one at a time, making transportation costs prohibitive for long-distance hauls. Scientists are trying to find better ways to separate resins from fibers or to give small chunks new life as pellets or boards.

[Read full story here...](#)



The Great Academic Purge Of Skeptical Climate Scientists

A left-wing Australian advocacy teamed up with the elitist Center for American Progress in the U.S. to destroy the reputation of climate skeptics who dared to debunk faulty global warming science.

Dissent is simply not tolerated. These attacks have been vicious but persistent and well-funded.

The Center for American Progress (CAP) was founded by Trilateral Commission member John Podesta, a left-wing ideologue who almost single-handedly crafted global warming and environmental policies for the Clinton and Obama administrations. Podesta was a central figure in forming the Obama campaign and administration, and was Hilary Clinton's campaign manager in the during the 2016 elections.

CAP's largest financial donors include the Ford Foundation, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Silicon Valley Community Foundation, the Peter G. Peterson Foundation and the Schwab Charitable Fund. □ TN Editor

A climate advocacy group called *Skeptical Science* [hosts a list of](#)

[academics that it has labeled “climate misinformers.”](#) The list includes 17 academics and is intended as a blacklist. We know of this intent because one of the principals of *Skeptical Science*, a blogger named Dana Nuccitelli, said so last Friday, [writing of one academic on their list](#), “if you look at the statements we cataloged and debunked on her [*Skeptical Science*] page, it should make her unhirable in academia.”

That so-called “unhirable” academic is [Professor Judy Curry](#), formerly the chair of the School of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences at Georgia Tech, and a Fellow of both the American Geophysical Union and American Meteorological Society. By any conventional academic metric, [Curry has compiled an impressive record](#) over many decades. The idea that she would be unhirable would seem laughable.

But there is nothing funny about *Skeptical Science*. Today, Curry should be a senior statesperson in the atmospheric sciences community. Instead, she is out of academia. She attributes that, at least in part, to being placed on the *Skeptical Science* blacklist and its use, as expressed by Nuccitelli, to make her “unhirable.”

I asked Professor Curry about this situation. She explained, “In 2012 I was informed by my Dean that the administration wanted me to step down as Chair. While there were several reasons for this, one obvious reason was extreme displeasure by several activist climate scientists who had a very direct pipeline to the Dean.”

So Curry stepped down and started looking for administrative positions at other universities, “At the time, I was getting numerous inquiries from academic headhunters encouraging me to apply for major administration positions, ranging from Dean to Vice Chancellor for Research. I applied for several of these, and actually interviewed for two of them. I did not make it to the final short list.”

The headhunter gave Curry the following feedback from the universities: “They thought I was an outstanding candidate, looked excellent on paper, articulated a strong vision, and interviewed very well in person. The show stopper was my public profile in the climate debate, as evidenced by a simple Google search.”

Indeed, in [my own Google search of "Judy Curry,"](#) and confirmed by others on my Twitter timeline, the *Skeptical Science* blacklist page for her appears on the first page of Google results, and for me it was the top listing.

How can it be that a website, [founded by an Australian cartoonist](#) named John Cook and run mainly by volunteer non-academics and amateur scientists, can rise to the position of not just claiming to arbitrate who is and who is not an appropriate hire for universities, but actually fulfilling that role?

Skeptical Science emerged in 2007, the peak of the climate blogging era. It was also a time when the pursuit of "climate skeptics" (or "deniers") really took off. The website soon found a large audience and was promoted as an ally in the battle against climate skeptics and deniers. For instance, [according to Wikipedia](#), "*The Washington Post* has praised it as the "most prominent and detailed" website to counter arguments by global warming deniers."

But the main legitimizing factor in the rise of *Skeptical Science* as a powerful climate advocacy group was its [endorsement by prominent scientists](#), such as by widely-known climate scientists Michael Mann of Penn State University and Katherine Hayhoe, of Texas Tech. Like *Skeptical Science*, Mann and Hayhoe focus much of their advocacy efforts on identifying and denigrating so-called climate skeptics or deniers.

The American Geophysical Union (AGU), a leading scientific association that includes many climate scientists, has routinely endorsed *Skeptical Science*. The AGU has even invoked the *Skeptical Science* blacklist, as recently as last December, when one of its writers dismissed an Australian academic by observing simply that he "[has his own page on John Cook's Skeptical Science site.](#)" The mere fact of being listed on the *Skeptical Science* blacklist appears to be sufficient to be dismissed on the official website of the AGU, where Curry was elected a Fellow.

But what has happened to Curry is just the tip of the iceberg.

Upon discussing on Twitter the *Skeptical Science* claim that their

“debunking” of Curry should make her “unhirable in academia,” a follower of mine pointed to a trove of hacked internal discussions among the *Skeptical Science* team. In those discussions from around 2010-2012, my father, Roger Pielke, Sr. — also a prominent atmospheric scientist — was mentioned some 3,700 times. Correspondingly, my father is also listed on the *Skeptical Science* blacklist.

I have read those internal discussions and what I saw is incredibly disturbing, for academic freedom and for simple human decency.

Let me take a step back and explain why I believe that it is appropriate to discuss the content of these hacked discussions. (Note: These hacked discussions are different than the Photoshopped imagery found in 2013 on an unprotected *Skeptical Science* website showing several *Skeptical Science* team members with their faces super imposed upon Nazi soldiers, with John Cook as Heinrich Himmler. According to Rob Honeycutt of *Skeptical Science*, those images were prepared as an in-group joke to make fun of a climate skeptic who appears on another of their lists, and were not intended for the public.)

The discussions in the hacked conversations - like those in the Wikileaks releases, those of President Emanuel Macron’s hacked conversations, or even the Climategate emails - are [legitimately in the public interest](#).

There are at least three reasons for this. One, the hacked forum reveals that *Skeptical Science* - a foreign advocacy group — in collaboration with the Center for American Progress (a DC-based progressive advocacy group), improperly obtained Congressional testimony in advance from several U.S. scientists and were engaged to help Democrats in the House to impeach the testimony of these scientists. Second, the leaked discussions reveal a coordinated effort to lobby U.S. elected officials by a foreign-based entity.

[Read full story here...](#)