

1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON
PORTLAND DIVISION

4 **David White, Pro Se.**
5 research@cctruth.org,

Case 1:24-CV-1300-MC

AMENDED COMPLAINT

6
7 **FOR**

8 **DECLARATORY**
9 **JUDGEMENT,**
10 **AND DAMAGES, BY**
11 **FEDERAL RULE 15**

12 **Plaintiff**

13 v.

14 Scott Ashford, in his personal
15 capacity and his official capacity of
16 Dean of Engineering, Jeff Nason
17 in his personal capacity and his
18 official capacity of Environmental
19 Engineering Leader, Philip Mote in
20 his personal capacity and his
21 official capacity of
22 vice provost and dean of the
23 Graduate School; Edward Feser in
24 his personal capacity and his
25 official capacity of Provost of
26 Oregon State University
27 Defendants.

28
29
30
31
32 **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**
33
34

1) Law 117 - 58 - Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, Executive Order 13990 86 Fed. Reg. 7037 Section 40434a; relating to protecting public health and the environment and restoring science to tackle the climate crisis. However, no climate crisis exists.

Federal Case Law

2) Pagtalunan v. Galaza, 291 F.3d 639, 642 (9th Cir. 2002): Pagtalunan

was Pro Se and made numerous mistakes in filing his complaint resulting in the case being dismissed. However, upon appeal, the higher Court ruled that the lower Court was in error because they did not give allowance for Pagtalunan's lack of legal training.

3) 22–451 June 28th, 2024 Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo and Relentless, Inc. v. Department of Commerce.

https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/23pdf/22-451_7m58.pdf

4) STUDENTS FOR FAIR ADMISSIONS, INC. v. PRESIDENT AND FELLOWS OF HARVARD COLLEGE

CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT

https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/22pdf/20-1199_hgdj.pdf

At Harvard, each application for admission is initially screened by a “first reader,” who assigns a numerical score in each of six categories: academic, extracurricular, athletic, school support, personal, and overall. For the “overall” category—a composite of the five other ratings—a first reader can and does consider the applicant’s race. Harvard’s admissions subcommittees then review all applications from a particular geographic area. These regional subcommittees make recommendations to the full admissions committee, and they take an applicant’s race into account. When the 40-member full admissions committee begins its deliberations, it discusses the relative breakdown of applicants by race. The goal of the process, according to Harvard’s director of admissions, is ensuring there is no “dramatic drop-off” in

1 minority admissions from the prior class. An applicant receiving a
 2 majority of the full committee’s votes is tentatively accepted for
 3 admission. At the end of this process, the racial composition of the
 4 tentative applicant pool is disclosed to the committee. The last stage of
 5 Harvard’s admissions process, called the “lop,” winnows the list of
 6 tentatively admitted students to arrive at the final class. Applicants that
 7 Harvard considers cutting at this stage are placed on the “lop list,”
 8 which contains only four pieces of information: legacy status, recruited
 9 athlete status, financial aid eligibility, and race. In the Harvard
 10 admissions process, “race is a determinative tip for” a significant
 11 percentage “of all admitted African American and Hispanic applicants.”
 12 UNC has a similar admissions process.
 13

14 5) WEST VIRGINIA ET AL. v. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
 15 AGENCY ET AL. [https://www.hsph.harvard.edu/news/features/the-](https://www.hsph.harvard.edu/news/features/the-supreme-court-curbed-epas-power-to-regulate-carbon-emissions-from-power-plants-what-comes-next/)
 16 [supreme-court-curbed-epas-power-to-regulate-carbon-emissions-from-](https://www.hsph.harvard.edu/news/features/the-supreme-court-curbed-epas-power-to-regulate-carbon-emissions-from-power-plants-what-comes-next/)
 17 [power-plants-what-comes-next/](https://www.hsph.harvard.edu/news/features/the-supreme-court-curbed-epas-power-to-regulate-carbon-emissions-from-power-plants-what-comes-next/)

18 The Clean Air Act of 1967 directed the EPA to tackle issues like Acid Rain
 19 and other environmental dangers. The Act instructs the EPA to make a
 20 “toxic chemicals” list. Anything the EPA wants to regulate must be on that
 21 list, Section 111, subsection D. In 2015, the EPA illegally began to regulate
 22 “greenhouse gases” without including them on the toxic chemicals list as
 23 prescribed by The Clean Air Act. Carbon dioxide and Methane, to name a
 24 few, are not toxic chemicals. In fact, every living animal and human being
 25 on earth breathes out carbon dioxide. It’s not a toxic chemical.

26

27 6) 18 U.S.C. § 1001 False Statements, Concealment...3, 4
 28 7) 18 U.S.C. 1621 Perjury.....3, 4
 29 8) FRCP 15. Amended and Supplemental Pleadings
 30 9) Federal Rule 902. Evidence That Is Self-Authenticating.....4
 31 10) US Copyright law 17.17.....33
 32 11) Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 65 restraining order,
 33 12) Federal Rule 60. Relief from a Judgment or Order
 34 13) Rule 56. Summary Judgment
 35 14) 18 U.S.C. § 1001 False Statements, Concealment.
 36
 37 15) 28 U.S.C. §191 Proceedings in forma pauperis.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

16) 8 U.S. Code § 1324c - Penalties for document fraud.

17) Rule 5. Serving and Filing Pleadings and Other Papers.

18) Rule 11. Signing Pleadings,

19) Rule 21 Writ of mandamus.

20) 28 U.S. Code § 455 (b), (1) which says Where he (The Judge) has a personal bias or prejudice concerning a party, or personal knowledge of disputed evidentiary facts concerning the proceeding;

21) 18 U.S.C. 4 says, “Whoever, having knowledge of the actual commission of a felony cognizable by a court of the United States, conceals and does not as soon as possible make known the same to some judge or other person in civil or military authority under the United States, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.”

22) 28 U.S. Code § 455 (b), (1)- Disqualification of justice, judge, or magistrate judge. In this case obstruction of justice by unnecessary delay of Proceedings in Forma Pauperis.

23) Judges Code of Conduct, Canons 2 and 3, which require officers of the Court to refrain from even the appearance of judicial bias or impropriety. <https://www.uscourts.gov/judges-judgeships/code-conduct-united-states-judges>,

24) 28 U.S. Code § 455 (b), (1) which says Where he (The Judge) has a personal bias or prejudice concerning a party, or personal knowledge of disputed evidentiary facts concerning the proceeding.

25) 18 U.S.C. 4 requires, “Whoever, having knowledge of the actual commission of a felony cognizable by a court of the United States,

5

1 conceals and does not as soon as possible make known the same to some
2 judge or other person in civil or military authority under the United States,
3 shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or
4 both.”

5
6 26) 22–451 June 28th, 2024 Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo and
7 Relentless, Inc. v. Department of Commerce.

8 https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/23pdf/22-451_7m58.pdf
9
10
11
12

13 **INTRODUCTION**
14

15 Plaintiff presents this Complaint requesting that the

16 Federal Court convene as an article III, US Constitution Court, in

17 which priority and emphasis is given to Constitutional law,

18 unhindered by administrative procedure. U.S. Supreme court

19 ruling 26) on June 28, 2024 in Loper Bright Enterprises v.

20 Raimondo and Relentless, Inc. v. Department of Commerce that all

21 courts shall no longer function as administrative law courts. They
22

23 must convene as Article III of the U.S. Constitution Courts. This
24

6

1 ruling is retroactive because it is merely reaffirming the original intent
2 of the Constitution of the United States. Anything else is a violation
3
4 of 2), 16,) 17), 18), 19), 20), 21), 22) and 23) above.

5
6 Plaintiff is advised by a team of 3 professionals, also volunteering, pro se.
7
8 One is a 40-year retired, Federal Attorney, expert in the application of
9
10 Federal and Case law, environmental law in particular. Another is an
11
12 investigative journalist, providing legal research and serving as Legal
13
14 Editor for all Court Documents. This team currently has three docket cases
15 before the Ninth Circuit Court to correct illegal administrative law rulings
16
17 and remove four Federal judges who made the Unconstitutional rulings.

18

19

20 **Cause of Action / Claim For Relief**

21

22 This Complaint has several legally recognizable claims. These show with

23

24 clear and convincing evidence that the Federal Court has jurisdiction, and

25 Plaintiff is harmed by Defendants' illegal actions. The items below justify

26 the rulings for relief requested in the Prayer for Relief section, per Federal

27 Rule 8 a 1-3. These five points provide the background context in which

1 our 3 Causes of Action and 5 Prayers for Relief are based:

2

3 1. The textbook Defendants are using is in violation of Federal
4 copyright law and plagiarism, although Plaintiff was/is not the direct victim
5 of these two offenses. The book is a standard Welty, Wicks & Wilson,
6 Chemical Engineering textbook, but not appropriate for Environmental
7 Science, which is an interdisciplinary subject, broader in scope, and
8 especially related to human interaction with the environment.

9 2. Plaintiff is "White" by ethnicity. The prospective students in a Zoom
10 meeting and in a separate graduate school bullpen were all "Black." This
11 is evidence of race-based selection, which is illegal by element 4), Breach
12 of Contract. Plaintiff is not prejudiced, just stating a well-documented fact,
13 plus the common knowledge that the University receives more
14 compensation for selecting foreign students. However, this needs to be
15 verified by examination of Graduate School records in Discovery.

16 3. Defendants had/have 20 openings for graduate students each year.
17 Plaintiff has more than all the requirements needed to be selected. All
18 other applicants during the two years in question had nowhere near as
19 many of the requirements. Defendants charged an application fee which
20 establishes a contract, and therefore must reject illegal Affirmative Action
21 as a selection criteria. However, Dr. Nason casually revealed in a chat
22 that Plaintiff was denied because of Plaintiff's incorrect Affirmative Action
23 responses, thus confessing that they were screening applicants using
24 illegal Affirmative action criteria: a breach of contract. DEI is a subset of
25 illegal Affirmative Action. Dr. Nason must be replaced or transferred for
26 condoning these illegal actions based on the U.S. Supreme Court Harvard
27 ruling that Plaintiff apprised him of during their interaction.

28 4. Nucor was developed at Oregon State as a small nuclear power
29 plant that puts out 30 megawatt at all times to power up to several
30 hundred homes for cheap power. It has only 18% of the waste as the
31 older, first-generation nuclear power plants and is much safer. It is
32 imperative that Oregon State University install a Nucor unit to mitigate
33 pending rolling blackouts this Fall, due to EV's. This is directly related to

1 the Environmental Science Department, which focuses on human
2 interaction with the environment, especially in matters of energy policy
3 due to the alleged Climate Crisis.

4 5. This is the rationale for paying \$1 million to Plaintiff at Climate Change
5 Truth Inc. / Cctruth.org to supervise reorganization of the Department and
6 oversee the Nucor energy implementation and transition on the OSU
7 campus. This will include press releases and other public relations to
8 promote this innovative energy alternative within the University network
9 and beyond. Energy Savings realized are estimated to recoup this fee
10 within 20 years and OSU's reputation for energy innovation will be
11 cemented in the scientific community.

12
13 **Claims For Relief**

14
15 **Breach of Contract:**

16
17 Defendants are in breach of Contract by violation of all 4 elements of a
18 Cause of Action required to bring this lawsuit:

- 19
20 1. The existence of a contract between the parties.
21 2. Performance (or non-performance with legally tenable justification) by
22 one party, i.e. plaintiff.
23 3. Non-performance by the other party or parties (Respondent) without
24 legally tenable justification.
25 4. Damage caused to the plaintiff due to such non-performance.

26
27 Defendants charged a fee to submit an application for evaluation to the
28 Environmental Science doctoral program, which establishes **1)** a legal
29 contract. Plaintiff assumed that 2) performance of evaluation would not
30 include any illegal DEI and Affirmative Action criteria, which the U.S.
31 Supreme Court has ruled to be illegal discrimination.

32
33 However, Dr. Nason told Plaintiff the reason the Selection Committe
34 rejected his initial application was because of his response to
35 DEI/Affirmative Action questions on the Application. The Selection

1 Committe told Plaintiff to "take it up with the legal department," but the
 2 Legal Department subsequently said they didn't want to get involved with
 3 the question. Dr. Nason also indicated Plaintiff's book perspective was not
 4 welcome.

5 This demonstrates 3) Non-performance of a legal contract due to use of
 6 illegal Affirmative Action criteria. Because Plaintiff was/is the most highly
 7 qualified candidate by all other criteria, this act of non-performance has 4)
 8 set Plaintiff back at least a year in his quest for his nearly completed
 9 doctoral degree, with all the ensuing financial and career advancement
 10 losses which that entails.

11
 12 Plaintiff's request to analyze recent school records in discovery is not just
 13 permission for a frivolous fishing expedition to justify the Allegation of
 14 Breach of Contract. It springs from a clerk's review of an application I made
 15 for student aid as a master's Student at OSU in the late 70's. She told me -
 16 - a white man -- that I forgot to check "Black" under ethnicity. But I'm
 17 "White" I told her. If you don't check Black you won't get any money, she
 18 said. Well, I'm not going to lie, I said. And I didn't get any money. So
 19 there is reasonable grounds for suspicion that this kind of thing happens
 20 often at OSU and has been going on for decades.

21 22 23 Fraudulent Misrepresentation:

24 According to Cornell Law, "Fraudulent misrepresentation is a [tort claim](#),
 25 typically arising in the field of [contract](#) law, that occurs when a [defendant](#)
 26 makes an intentional or reckless misrepresentation of fact or opinion with
 27 the intention to coerce a party into action or inaction on the basis of that
 28 misrepresentation." Defendants are guilty of all 6 elements:

- 29 1. A representation was made
- 30 2. The representation was false
- 31 3. That when made, the defendant knew that the representation was
 32 false or that the defendant made the statement [recklessly](#) without
 33 knowledge of its truth
- 34 4. That the fraudulent misrepresentation was made with the intention
 35 that the plaintiff rely on it

- 1 5. That the plaintiff did rely on the fraudulent misrepresentation
- 2 6. That the plaintiff suffered harm as a result of the fraudulent
- 3 misrepresentation

4 In evaluating enrollment to the program, Plaintiff observed that the main
5 textbook for Environmental Science -- "Mechanics in the Earth and
6 Environmental Sciences" -- was **1)** represented as being an Environmental
7 Sciences text. However, a careful review of the book by Plaintiff revealed
8 that the only place the phrase "Environmental Sciences" was mentioned in
9 the entire book is on the front cover, thus **2)** making it a false
10 representation. In fact, content of this book is identical to a Chemical
11 Engineering text Plaintiff studied in College by Welty, Wicks & Wilson, then
12 titled "Momentum, Heat, and Mass Transfer."

13 It was an excellent book for that topic, but is only obliquely related to
14 Environmental Science, if at all. Thus, it was **3)** impossible for defendants
15 not to know that this was a false representation, as in our Breach of
16 Contract Allegation. From all appearances, Defendants have **4)** been using
17 a plagiarized version of the Welty, Wicks & Wilson book to teach a course
18 in Chemical Engineering while conveying the false impression to
19 prospective students, including Plaintiff, that they are teaching
20 Environmental Science.

21 Students, such as Plaintiff, enroll in an Environmental Science Program
22 and course expecting content that conforms to the standard definition of
23 Environmental Science. According to Britannica.com, Environmental
24 science is an interdisciplinary field that studies environmental problems and
25 human impacts on the environment. It uses quantitative methods and
26 models to analyze and solve environmental issues, such as pollution,
27 climate change, and natural resource management.

28 When the cover of the main textbook says "Environmental Sciences," **5)**
29 Plaintiff and other potential students relied on it. And as a potential
30 student/author of a genuine Environmental Science textbook **6)** Plaintiff
31 suffered the loss of sales to the clever imposter. This is a classic case of
32 "Bait & Switch, or in legal terms, Fraudulent Misrepresentation.
33

1
2

3

Unjust Enrichment:

4 The charge of Unjust Enrichment flows from the other two allegations
5 above. Under the law, a claim for unjust enrichment has three elements:

- 6 1. The defendant received a benefit;
- 7 2. At the plaintiff's expense; and,
- 8 3. Under circumstances that would make it unjust for the defendant to
9 retain the benefit without commensurate compensation.

10

11 *See Pulte Home Corp., Inc. v. Countryside Cmty. Ass'n, Inc.*, 2016 CO 64,
12 ¶ 63. Whether a plaintiff is entitled to compensation for unjust enrichment is
13 "a discretionary call for the district court" and requires "extensive factual
14 findings." *Falcon Broadband, Inc. v. Banning Lewis Ranch Metro. Dist. No.*
15 *1*, 2018 COA 92, ¶ 50. Because a claim for unjust enrichment is a mixture
16 of both contract and tort law, courts occasionally treat such claims as tort
17 claims and sometimes as contract claims.

18 As we have demonstrated, by Fraudulent Misrepresentation, Defendants
19 1) received the benefit of selling a Chemical Engineering book under the
20 misleading title of "Environmental Sciences" instead of an actual
21 Environmental Science text. This came at Plaintiff's expense 2) because
22 he was proposing to teach from his textbook as part of his Doctoral
23 Program requirements. It would be an injustice to Plaintiff and the other
24 students for Defendants to retain these benefits this school year, 3) without
25 making free copies of Plaintiff's textbook available to each student also, as
26 a supplementary text before making it the main Textbook next year.

27 Plaintiff's textbook, costs \$89 on ctruth.org and then on Amazon, which
28 means that Plaintiff lost a minimum of $\$89 \times 21 = \1869 due to Defendants'
29 Unjust Enrichment. This is not even counting the loss of their approximate
30 \$100 application fees that 80 of 100 applicants (times 2 years) suffered
31 from Defendants' Fraudulent Misrepresentation (\$200 cost to Plaintiff over
32 2 years \times 100 misled applicants = \$20,000 of Unjust Enrichment.

33

Argument

12

1

2 Science is never settled. Measured data from two independent

3

4 experiments show water vapor is 89% effect Greenhouse gas. Carbon

5

6 dioxide is 8.9% effect and Methane is 0.3% effect. These are the same

7

8 results reported in Annex II in IPCC AR6 WG1 by my watchdog team of
9 35

10

11 PhD's, mostly college professors performing expert and government

12

13 review of IPCC WG1 FOD. This makes the IPCC global warming model a
14 fraud. It assumes equal greenhouse gas concentration for all elements,

15


16 which is impossible. In addition, it was not benchmarked with the data in

17

18 annex II. We submitted our review, and they simply deleted the table from

19 annex II to cover their tracks.

20



1

2 Even if we double carbon dioxide to 800 ppm the warming will be no
 3
 4 different. The red curve inside the black curve is barely distinguishable
 5
 6 from each other.

Water vapor is 89.4% ghg effect.
Carbon dioxide is 9.09%
Ozone is 0.88%
Nitrous Oxide is 0.32%
Methane is 0.29%

7

8 Defendants are pseudo-scientists and operate on a scientific belief
 9
 10 system instead of an open mind scientific system. The scientific consensus
 11 about Climate Change is only 33% not 97%. See the consensus page on
 12
 13 the untruthful climate.nasa.gov. Read what they did. They interviewed
 14

14

1 only scientists on 330 published manuscripts between 2009 and 2012
2
3 which were pro the UN false agenda. Web search manuscripts against
4
5 UN agenda from 2009 to 2013. Around 700 were published. Therefore,
6
7 33%. Cherry picking is not science and is illegal by 26) U.S. Supreme
8
9 Court on June 28th, 2024 in Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo and
10
11 Relentless, Inc. v. Department of Commerce.

12
13
14 Plaintiff asks the Federal District Court to convene this case as an
15
16 Article III, of the U.S. Constitution Court case. Article III Section 2 of the
17
18 U. S. Constitution says “The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in
19
20 Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution Context: Plaintiff files
21
22 this complaint after the 26) 22–451 U.S. Supreme Court on June 28th,
23
24 2024 in Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo and Relentless, Inc. v.
25
26 Department of Commerce that all Courts can no longer adjudicate as

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

administrative law courts. They must function as Article III, U.S. Constitution Courts. This ruling is retroactive because it is merely reaffirming the original Constitution of the United States, whose jurisdiction was gradually and illegally usurped by lower courts using administrative law.

Therefore, this case must be considered under the U.S. Constitution.

Plaintiff reviewed the textbook the defendants are using for Sophomore Environmental science, and it is not such a book. It is a plagiarism of Welty Wicks and Wilson, Momentum heat and Mass transfer. The book is called “Mechanics in the Earth and Environmental Sciences”. The title is the only place in the book which says “Environmental Sciences” Our book for Environmental Science second edition is almost 200 pages. The Intergovernmental Panel On Climate Change Reports are Deliberate

16

1 Science fiction (IPCC).

2

3 Second Edition

4

5 College Textbook for Environmental Science

6


7 Also a new book by one of the professors on our IPCC review team called

8

9 Unsettled shows all the scientific models are junk science because they

10

11 are not benchmarked with available data.



12

13 Plaintiff is not biased in any way. Plaintiff worked in Semiconductor

14

15 lithography for 25 years and not one complaint against plaintiff. Plaintiff

1
2 has driven lyft for 6 years with all kinds of people in his car. No complaints
3
4 and a 4.93 out of 5 rating.

5
6 Plaintiff was in a zoom meeting with around thirty prospective graduate
7
8 students applying for the same program as Plaintiff. Roughly 100 students
9
10 applied in all. Based on Plaintiff training in Graduate 461 Statistics,

11
12 Plaintiff concluded this group is representative of the whole.

13
14 Some facts from the meeting.

15 1. Most perspective graduate students were foreigners to the United
16
17 States. Plaintiff is not prejudiced, just making an observation.

18
19 2. Plaintiff was the only perspective graduate student who had
20
21 completed all prerequisites.

22
23 3. Other candidates in the zoom meeting still needed to complete many
24
25 more of their prerequisites.

26
27 4. Plaintiff is not prejudice against anyone.


28
29 Thus, we find an obvious bias in favor of lower-qualified, foreign

30
31 candidates over and above far more qualified white, male American

18

1
2 candidates, who in Plaintiff case happens to hold an anti-establishment
3
4 viewpoint regarding the environment. This decision was clearly not merit-
5
6 based.

7
8 Email from Dr Nason 4/29/2024.



9

10 Dear Dave,

11

12 I have received word from our front desk and also from the Dean's office
13 that you plan on visiting campus tomorrow. We have shared the
14 information that we can regarding our graduate admissions process. We
15 also do not have a need for your textbook or teaching services in our
16 curriculum. As a result, there is not anything additional to discuss at this
17 time.

18

19 I most certainly respect your right to have an opposing viewpoint.
20 However, I respectfully decline to meet with you on April 30 or at any other
21 time. Respectfully, you should not show up to my office unannounced
22 tomorrow or in the future, as such visits would necessarily disrupt my
23 efforts to do my work.

24

19

1 Sincerely,

2 Jeff

3 Jeffrey A. Nason, Ph.D. (he/him) | Head and Professor

4 Oregon State University | School of Chemical, Biological, and
5 Environmental Engineering

6 116G Johnson Hall | 105 SW 26th Street | Corvallis, OR 97331 |
7 541.737.9911

8 webpage: <http://research.engr.oregonstate.edu/nason/>

9 Plaintiff response;

10

11 If you don't desire to use our textbook as so many universities have, then

12

13 please leave the copy I gave you at the front desk so I can pick it up. As

14

15 far as my viewpoint, it is backed up by over 3000 PhD's at over 25 climate

16

17 change conferences. Also at least 10,000 other PhDs worldwide have an

18

19 opposite viewpoint as yourself. Answer this? What is the numerical value

20

21 of NetzeroCo2e?

22

23 Dr. Nason, Defendant 4, did not answer the question.

24

25

26 Plaintiff's research has produced the only worldwide manuscript for

20

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11

netzeroco2e presented at Plenary Addresses at Climate Change conferences around the world. <https://cctruth.org/the-essential-role-of-photosynthesis-in-defining-net-zero-carbon-dioxide-emissions-for-equilibrium-calculations.pdf> cctruth.org
Plaintiff has **presented** plenary addresses at climate change conferences like the one in Dubai ahead of the sham COP28.



12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

This is a well-documented fact! The worldwide media is owned by 9 of the richest people in the world. There are all globalists who are bent on removing people from the earth and enslaving the remainder. AI is another globalist ploy. Covid is also a globalist ploy. The Covid death

1 jabs don't work. See science facts on makingsenseofcovid.com. The news
2
3 media is the virus! Covid worldwide has a 0.3% death rate. The death jabs
4
5 have a 1.6% death rate and an 8% strong reaction rate. The only media
6
7 telling this is the Epoch Times. Plaintiff never wore a mask and didn't take
8
9 the jab. Plaintiff has a boosted immune system.

10
11
12 Plaintiff dropped by OSU to pick up the hard copy of the textbook we
13
14 published and left without incident. While there, Plaintiff visited the
15
16 graduate location in Johnson Hall third floor. Same result as the zoom
17
18 meeting. No White graduate students present. Plaintiff is stating this as a
19
20 fact, not prejudice.

21
22 The thesis and contention of this lawsuit is that a merit-based selection
23
24 process is more fair, less discriminatory, and more beneficial to the
25
26 University and the candidates. Moreover, based on recent court precedent
27
28 in the Harvard case, the merit-based criteria is in fact the only legal option

1
2 allowable for the selection committee.

3
4 The following evidence is presented in support of this thesis, based on
5
6 Plaintiff's demonstrated competence and contributions to the current
7
8 debate:

9
10 1. Plaintiff has performed extensive research on climate change, published
11
12 manuscripts, and presented the plenary address at many Climate Change
13
14 Conferences.

15
16 2. Plaintiff also heads up the official watchdog team comprised of 35 PhD
17
18 level climate scientists, (mostly college professors) who perform Expert and
19 Government review of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
20
21 (IPCC) reports for the Global Change Group of the National Academy of
22
23 Science.

24
25 These independent scientists have concluded that the IPCC reports are
26
27 compromised by junk science, with virtually all data cherry-picked to push
28
29 an admitted and oft-stated Globalist agenda of "removing people from the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

earth.”

3. Plaintiff will invite members of his team to testify for the case and thereby establish the standard for “expert witness” to serve on a comparable, United Nation’s review panel. These experts are located all over the world and most will need to testify by remote access.

4. Science is never settled. Measured data from two independent experiments show that water vapor is 89% effect Greenhouse gas. Carbon dioxide is 8.9% effect and Methane is 0.3% effect. These findings are the same as reported by IPCC Working Group 1 (WG1), Annex II in IPCC WG1 FOD for AR6, according to the above-mentioned review team, who performed the expert and government review of IPCC WG1 FOD. As noted, they concluded that the IPCC global warming model is fraudulent.

It assumes equal greenhouse gas concentration for all elements, which is completely unrealistic. In addition, the data was not benchmarked with the data in annex II. When we submitted our watchdog review the IPCC simply deleted the table from annex II, rather than do the honest and scientific thing by making the necessary changes in their fake model. This is


24

1 sloppy science at best, fraud at worst.

2
3 5. The fact-checking team has also discovered 34 ppm of fraud in the
4
5 carbon dioxide rise reported by NOAA. More than 36 doctoral level
6
7 scientists at NOAA have been dismissed as a result. This is verified by the
8
9 Complaint filed with the Department of Commerce Office of Inspector
10
11 General. https://cctruth.org/NOAA_Mauna.pdf

12

13



Thank you.

Your information has been submitted to the DOC OIG.

The OIG will evaluate your complaint and determine an appropriate course of action. Options include opening an OIG review (audit, evaluation, or investigation); referring the matter to a DOC Operating Unit for review and corrective action, if warranted; referring the matter to another Federal agency; or taking no action (allegations that do not involve a potential violation of law, rule, regulation, or policy as well as allegations with limited specificity or merit may be closed with no further action). Due to privacy interests, we do not provide complainants with updates on, or the results of, complaints and/or investigative matters.

If you did not provide contact information and you wish to provide additional information about this complaint matter, please call (800) 424-5197 and provide your tracking number.

Your submission tracking number is: **TMG202402892**

14

15

16 6. Additional qualifications include recent publication of a college textbook
17
18 for Environmental Science. Weekly emails to more than 600 Professors of
19
20 environmental science show that some have already adopted it as their text

1
2 book for the upcoming Fall term. The Second edition is displayed on our
3
4 cctruth.org and will be published in the October timeframe.

5
6 The book is published, taught at a number of universities, and now
7
8 sold on Amazon.

9 [Climate Crisis Changed: The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change](#)
10 [\(IPCC\) reports are Deliberate Science Fiction: White, Dave:](#)
11 [9798888121276: Amazon.com: Books](#)

12 It is also available on Barnes and Noble stores and online. [Climate Crisis](#)
13 [Changed: The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change \(IPCC\) reports](#)
14 [are Deliberate Science Fiction by Dave White, Hardcover | Barnes &](#)
15 [Noble® \(barnesandnoble.com\)](#)

16
17 To summarize, the current “consensus” on Climate Change is based on a
18 relatively small group of government employed scientists, spouting globalist
19 fear mongering and in their own words, “removing people from the earth.”
20 They are opposed by a much larger group of private sector scientists
21 whose voices go unheard.

22
23 For example, here’s what the UN predicted in 1989 related to rising sea
24
25 levels. The year 2000 has come and gone a quarter century ago and we
26
27 all know what never happened. They repeat this same unscientific
28
29 nonsense year after year to generate fear among the uninformed.



1

2

3 As you may know, the key figures perpetuating these deceptive falsehoods
4 include all the familiar suspects. Bill Gates, Klaus Schwab, George Soros,
5 and now Jane Goodall, are advocating for a drastic reduction in the world's
6 population by 2030. This may sound extreme, but their radical intent is
7 documented in this video, which may soon be taken down due to its
8 incriminating content.

9 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MFV0QVO2T3U> or

10
11
12
13

27

1 https://cctruth.org/jane_goodall_remove_people.mp4

2 Climate: The Movie (The Cold Truth) The college professors featured are on
3 Plaintiff's IPCC review team.

4
5 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zmfRG8-RHEI>

6 https://cctruth.org/Climate_the_movie_the_Cold_Truth.mp4

7
8 TV interview for the college textbook for environmental science on

9
10 [cctruth.org](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zmfRG8-RHEI) taught at many Colleges

11
12 now. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5XISZTuOtk>

13
14 Podcast interview with Tom Nelson for the college textbook we published
15
16 on [cctruth.org](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zmfRG8-RHEI)

17 <https://twitter.com/TomANelson/status/1740356736643400074>

18
19 The table below, along with other critical information, was presented by a
20
21 grid expert at an October 18, 2023 Cascade Policy Institute Conference.

22
23 Note that for this Winter, 2024-2025 the Northwest electric grid is projected
24
25 to fall 927 megawatts short of demand. It is projected to be almost nine
26
27 times as bad in 10 years.

28
29 The grid expert reported that they are talking about activating virtual
30
31 generators at homes to help make up the difference when needed. For
32
33 example, a virtual generator is equipped to switch the smart meter on a
34 home which is charging an electrical vehicle at night and drain the EV

28

1
2 battery charge back into the grid.

3

Northwest Region Requirements and Resources

Table 1. Northwest Region Requirements and Resources – Annual Energy shows the sum of the individual utilities’ requirements and firm resources for each of the next 10 years. Expected firm load and exports make up the total firm regional requirements.

Average Megawatts	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	2030-31	2031-32	2032-33
Firm Requirements										
Load ^{1/}	21,814	22,791	23,694	24,558	25,545	26,225	26,485	26,681	26,841	27,006
Exports	520	502	502	501	501	501	501	501	501	501
Total	22,334	23,293	24,195	25,060	26,046	26,726	26,986	27,182	27,342	27,507
Firm Resources										
Hydro ^{2/}	11,459	11,439	11,424	11,462	11,424	11,402	11,200	11,200	11,161	11,005
Small Thermal/Misc.	28	28	28	28	28	18	11	11	11	11
Natural Gas ^{3/}	4,107	4,497	4,801	4,551	4,546	4,544	4,474	4,426	4,225	4,222
Renewables-Other	276	275	273	274	269	268	268	266	264	260
Solar	503	503	503	502	502	501	501	500	498	483
Wind	1,757	1,747	1,747	1,721	1,661	1,623	1,611	1,596	1,596	1,622
Cogeneration	41	41	34	32	31	31	31	31	31	31
Imports	488	488	467	467	453	380	324	310	310	222
Nuclear	1,116	994	1,116	994	1,116	994	1,116	994	1,116	994
Coal	2,583	2,356	1,593	1,065	1,068	891	593	479	497	508
Total	22,357	22,366	21,985	21,096	21,097	20,652	20,127	19,810	19,708	19,357
Surplus (Deficit)	22	(927)	(2,210)	(3,963)	(4,949)	(6,074)	(6,859)	(7,372)	(7,634)	(8,150)

^{1/} Load net of energy efficiency

^{2/} Firm hydro for energy is the generation expected assuming critical (8%) water condition (the methodology is changed for the 2023 report)


^{3/} More energy may be available from natural gas power plants

4

5

6 Diminishing returns on emissions control.

7



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Climate Crisis Changed

The Intergovernmental Panel On Climate Change

Cctruth.org


Reports are Deliberate Science fiction (IPCC).

1

College Textbook

2

2nd Edition



3

Second Edition

4

5

6

White, Wismuller, Beers, McMenemie, Nelson

7

8

1 **The Table of Contents below is evidence of the broad range of interdisciplinary topics that comprise**
2 **the subject of Environmental science, in contrast to the current textbook in use, which misleads**
3 **students by its limited scope.**

4 **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

5 Chapter 1. Statistical Analysis, The scientific method.

6 Chapter 2. Carbon Dioxide Equilibrium—NetZeroCO2E = 8.6 billion tons of
7 photosynthesis left in the world. This is the only worldwide manuscript
8 published with plenary addresses at Climate Change Conferences. 27
9 external references!

10 Chapter 3. Green House Gases—Methane is much less greenhouse gas.
11 Water vapor is largest effect.

12 Chapter 4. Astrophysical Warming—Cooling in the south and warming in
13 the north where 90% of people live.

14 Chapter 5. Residence Time of Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide—It takes 150
15 years for anything we do with emissions of carbon dioxide to have an
16 effect.

17 Chapter 6. NOAA Mauna Loa Data and Fraud. Thirty 1 ppm of manual
18 adjustments.

19 Chapter 7. NiCE Fix for Southeast USA Storms—Storms stopped in 2022.

20 Chapter 8. Global Sea Rise—1.4 mm/yr. linear and not accelerating. No
21 reliability in NOAA Satellites.

22 Chapter 9. Photosynthesis Issues.

23 Chapter 10. Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide Doesn't Freeze in the
24 Mesosphere.

25 Chapter 11. NIST and Photosynthesis Experiment—scientific method.

26 Chapter 12. Ocean is not a Sink for Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide

1 Chapter 13. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)
2 Reports are Deliberate Science Fiction.

3 Chapter 14. Videos to Watch.

4 Chapter 15. Predatory Journals are a Fabrication.

5 Chapter 16 Modeling and fictional models.

6

7

8 Plaintiff mentioned residence time of atmospheric carbon

9

10 dioxide. Residence time for atmospheric Carbon Dioxide is like standing

11

12 water in a kitchen sink with the drain plugged. The water resides for a

13

14 long period of time.

15

16 “Retention time” is the same idea as “residence time.” The average

17

18 residence time for carbon dioxide is the average time a molecule of

19

20 carbon dioxide, for example, stays in the troposphere, according to

21

22 more than 160 PhD’s in 19 published manuscripts, summarized in one

23

24 published manuscript. Anything we have done or will do with

25

26 emissions of carbon dioxide will take 150 years to have any effect.

27

28 Proof is any major events which would have lowered atmospheric

29

30 carbon dioxide worldwide for which there is still no effect in the


31

32 carbon dioxide rise data.

33

34 ➤ Oil embargo in the 1970’s, for almost two years the worldwide carbon
35 dioxide emissions would have dropped by 90%.

- 1 ➤ Multiple recessions each one the worldwide carbon dioxide emissions
- 2 would have decreased by 40% for at least one year.
- 3 ➤ Worldwide recession in 2009. A 70% reduction in emissions of
- 4 carbon dioxide for almost two years.
- 5 ➤ COVID-19 pandemic. A 6% reduction in emissions for 1.5 years.
- 6 You can clearly see no signature from these events in the NOAA data.



7
 8 Unrealized Global Temperature Increase: Implications of Current
 9 Uncertainties, Schwartz, S. E. J. Geophys. Res. , 2018, doi:
 10 10.1002/2017JD028121.


11
 12
 13 The following table provides evidence of the lengthy residence time of
 14 Carbon Dioxide in the atmosphere, proving that all emissions-based
 15 solutions are futile, misguided, and nefarious in intent, given the globalist
 16 agenda stated above.

17
 18

D. Residence Time (Years)	E. Author	F. Year
G. >700	H. Allen	I. 2009
J. 610	K. Zickfeld	L. 2013
M. 500	N. Matthews	O. 2008
P. 300	Q. Plattner	R. 2008
S. 270	T. Cao	U. 2010

V. 230	W. Zickfeld	X. 2012
Y. 220	Z. Solomon	AA. 2012
BB. 220	CC. Knutti	DD. 2012
EE. 210	FF. Gillett	GG. 2011
HH. 180	II. Frolicher	JJ. 2010
KK. 150	LL. Hare	MM. 2006

- 1 a. Unrealized Global Temperature Increase: Implications of Current Uncertainties,
- 2 Schwartz, S. E. J. Geophys. Res. , 2018, doi: 10.1002/2017JD028121.. ,
- 3 Another way to look at residence time is a signature from past events, which
- 4 lowered carbon
- 5 dioxide emissions.



Oil embargo in the 1970's
 Multiple recessions
 Worldwide recession in 2009.
 COVID-19 pandemic.

You can clearly see no signature from these events. Take the oil embargo of the 1970's. There was a national shortage of fuel and costs were prohibitive. Yet, on the graph you can see that there is no dip in atmospheric CO2. It's not

17 caused by fossil fuel burning.

18
 19

20 Given this scientific evidence do the draconian measures
 21 recommended by the UN make any sense?
 22

23

24 1. Do the Cap and Trade policies, mentioned above, provide answers
 25 to correct any needed climate change based on CO2 levels. The
 26 answer is, no.

27

28 2. Are Solar Panels and Windmills a viable solution? The answer is:
 29 no. There is nothing green in the green new deal unless you like
 30 rolling blackouts! Solar panels don't work at night or with snow
 31 cover. Nor are windmills the solution

32

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JYHX-lb3Q5Q>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

3. Are The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Reports based on correct science? Again, the answer is: no.

More than 3000 PhD's from 23 climate change conferences are fully aware and agree with this conclusion.

4. Are the IPCC references in their reports based on loosely referenced manuscripts with little or no scientific value? The answer is yes.

As noted earlier, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) reports are deliberate science fiction. They are based on loosely referenced manuscripts published in a journal whose editor had no qualifications other than a PhD in political science. His modus operandi were to circular reference these spurious manuscripts and pass them off in the IPCC reports as science. That is the farthest thing from science. When my team of scientific fact-checkers pointed this out he was summarily dismissed, although his replacement is not much better.

See chapter 13 in the college textbook on ccruth.org. See exhibits I and II in this complaint. To add a note of comic relief, if this pseudo-scientific trend continues, here's what Greta Thunberg will be saying in 2065.



1

2

3 5. The American Meteorological Society (AMS), Nature and Plusone
4 Journals have added to the confusion by starting a predatory journals list.
5 These groups are projecting their own malfeasance onto their opponents.
6 The journals on their lists are anything but predatory. For example, the
7 well-respected and renowned Journal of International Chemical
8 Engineering is on their predatory journal list!

9 Moreover, The AMS, Nature and Plusone Journals charge \$3000-4000 to
10 publish a manuscript open source. Most of the journals on the predatory
11 journals list charge only \$300-\$400 to publish a manuscript open source!
12 So we might well ask, who's the predator? The AMS, Nature and Plusone
13 Journals Chief Editors are pseudo scientists who won't let anything get
14 peer reviewed which doesn't conform to the United nations false agenda.

15

16 Conclusion

17

18 Plaintiff David White has archived 23 plenary presentations on cctruth.org

19

20 which show atmospheric carbon dioxide is not an emissions issue. It is a

1
2 97% loss of photosynthesis issue due to a depleted Amazon Rain Forest.
3 Moreover, Global sea rise is 1.4 mm/year linear and not accelerating.

4 As noted above, Plaintiff's watchdog team of up to 30-35 doctoral level
5 climate scientists participate in annual government and expert review of
6 the IPCC reports and have **found** many errors in data, analysis, and
7 departure from age-old scientific principles.

8 A case in point is the review team's requiring the mitigation group of IPCC
9 to make page 6, paragraph b.1.3, of their report for AR6 March 20 2024,
10 contain the statement of Jim Skea to lower emissions of carbon dioxide.
11 The statement had no external citations (references). This was buried on
12 page 95 of their report. On page 101 we found a probability table and the
13 statement:

14 ""No pathways were available that achieve a greater than **50-66%**
15 **probability of limiting warming below 1.5° C** [bold added] during the
16 entire 21st century based on the MAGICC model projections." For limiting
17 global warming to below 2°C with at least 66% probability CO₂ emissions
18 are projected to decline by about 25% by 2030 in most pathways (10–30%
19 interquartile range) and reach net zero around 2070". This shows that
20 their probability for a solution of lowering carbon dioxide emissions works
21 only 50-65% of the time.

38

1 Lowering emissions of carbon dioxide by 25% by 2030 will only lower our
2 carbon dioxide to a level of 26 billion tons. We need to reach 8.6 billion
3 tons to start the process of lowering atmospheric carbon dioxide. That
4 means this IPCC model is unattainable factually and statistically.

5

6 Relief Sought

7

8 FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

9 Provide all current Environmental Science students with a free copy of
10 Plaintiff's textbook for the current year. Adopt it as the primary textbook
11 for the 2024-25 school year as a more accurate representation of the
12 scope and interdisciplinary nature of the subject of Environmental
13 Science. Environmental Science, by definition, has more to do with
14 human interaction with the environment than the current emphasis on just
15 one narrow dimension of the subject that is being taught elsewhere in the
16 University.

17 Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations
18 as if fully set forth herein.

19

20 SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

21

22 Discovery: Prior to any hearing in this case;

1 Plaintiff receives in discovery procedure and details used in each year for
2 the past five years to evaluate graduate students selected.

3 a. Plaintiff receives a table containing each of the candidates for
4 Environmental Engineering and their acceptance status in a
5 spreadsheet Plaintiff will provide after item a. is evaluated. No
6 names need be provided.

7 b. Any other items needed to determine malfeasance in the
8 selection process.

9 Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference the foregoing
10
11 allegations as if fully set forth herein.
12

13 THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

14

15 Replace Dr. Nason with Plaintiff as Head of Environmental Engineering

16
17 because Dr. Nason's expertise is better suited to other departments within

18
19 the college of science at another university.

20
21 Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations

22
23 as if fully set forth herein.
24

25 FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

26 Install a low-cost Nucor, nuclear reactor at Oregon State – technology
27 developed on campus by a former Oregon State Nuclear Physicist to avert
28 power disruptions this Fall. This will demonstrate the availability of a

1 cheap, clean, safe, and incredibly efficient (only 18% typical waste)
2 alternative to alleged or real deficiencies of other energy sources, in
3 accordance with sound principles of Environmental Science.
4 <https://nucor.com/madeforgood/nuscale-case-study>

5
6 Plaintiffs re-alleges and incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations
7 as if fully set forth herein.

8

9

10 FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

11

12 Pay \$1 million to Plaintiff at Climate Change Truth Inc. (Cctruth.org)
13 to supervise reorganization of the Environmental Science
14 Department and oversee the Nucor energy implementation and
15 transition on the OSU campus. This will include press releases and
16 other public relations to promote this innovative energy alternative
17 within the University network and beyond. Energy Savings realized
18 are estimated to recoup this fee within 20 years and OSU's
19 reputation for energy innovation will be cemented in the scientific
20 community.

21

22 INJUNCTION

23

24 Oregon State University must begin immediately to incorporate Plaintiff's
25 Textbook as an alternative to the current UN, agenda-driven perspective on
26 climate change. In addition to required study in Plaintiff's text, students will
27 be given a syllabus, with a variety of optional exercises enabling teachers
28 and students to compare the two perspectives side-by-side: Student
29 debates, panels, forums, community projects, guest speakers and more will
30 be included as options in the syllabus for 200 series environmental science
31 and environmental engineering. Students will learn far more by a program
32 that compares the two perspectives than by suppressing either of them.

33

1 Teacher's Guide engaged in the fear mongering nonsense of the United
2 Nations and teach our college textbook

3

4 PARTIES

5

6 Plaintiff is a research scientist, with about 30 years' experience with
7 Semiconductors and who follows the data with no other agenda. He
8 leads a team of 35 PhD's, mostly College Professors, who participate
9 in the Expert and Government Review of the IPCC and NOAA reports
10 program for the Global Change Group of the National Academy of
11 Sciences. We just finished NCA6 NOAH review June, 2024 and as
12 usual, it ignored the Scientific Method to serve as a propaganda
13 piece for the UN's political agenda. Students deserve to hear "the
14 other side of the story," that is endorsed by thousands of private-
15 sector scientists worldwide, but who have no voice.

16

17

18



1 Respectfully Dated: 09/30/2024 David White President
2 of Climate Change Truth Inc.

3

4 **Exhibit I.**

5

6 David White (Dave) contacted the National Academy of Sciences, Global Change
7 group and spoke to Dr. Mike Kuperberg who is the Executive Director of the U.S.
8 Global Change Research Program (USGCRP), He saw the correct science in our
9 presentations page. He sent it to the other scientists in their office. Their
10 consensus was to have me get a team and participate in the annual “Expert and
11 Government Review (EAGR)” program of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate
12 Change (IPCC) reports.

13 I led a team of PhD’s whose ranks soon swelled from myself to thirty five other
14 scientists who are also participating in the writing of this college textbook.
15 Together we participated in the “EAGR” program, and we unanimously found all
16 kinds of garbage science in their reports. Also, we had Adam Yeeley, the chief
17 editor of Nature Climate Change fired. His PhD was in political science. He let the
18 IPCC scientists publish loosely referenced manuscripts and circular reference
19 them in their reports. This is not science.

20 The IPCC reports are deliberate science fiction. The IPCC writers identify
21 themselves as climate experts and inform governments globally in their reports
22 on what to believe about climate change. These false reports lead to false
23 government policies being made that negatively impact every person and
24 business around the globe through unnecessary economic restrictions and
25 taxation.

26 In our PhD review of IPCC working Group 1, in the first order draft for Ar6 we
27 found their inaccurate global warming potential model. This model assumes equal
28 greenhouse gas (GHG) concentrations. This equal concentration will never happen
29 in reality. Carbon dioxide is more than 200 times the concentration of methane.

1 Furthermore, we found in Annex 2, a table with the correct order of GHG effects.
2 Any model which ignores data to benchmark it with is an inaccurate model. We
3 sent our review at least 23 times to them to correct their inaccuracies and they
4 ignored our scientific finding. That makes the AR6, report worthless as a whole.
5 However, for the final draft for AR6 they deleted the table from Annex 2! Instead
6 of making changes to make their model they deleted the benchmarking data in
7 Annex 2. This is how corrupt they are. You can't have an accurate model without
8 benchmark data to validate it.

9
10 Disclaimer: Sometimes the IPCC changes things without notification. For example,
11 the Executive Summary of the Mitigation Chapter had our review paragraph
12 added. However now to confuse people they start out every paragraph the same.
13 Previously this was not done. Also they changed the numbering scheme for the
14 chapters. The difference is they are now beginning four paragraphs with this
15 statement, "**Limiting warming to 1.5°C depends on greenhouse gas (GHG)**
16 **emissions**". The three paragraphs that start with this statement have nothing to
17 do with our review and are just there to mislead people. In fact, they still state
18 inaccuracies they've been told about on several occasions such as methane gas is
19 the worst greenhouse gas. However, by scientific measurement, it is clear that
20 methane gas is 0.29% effect and water vapor is 89.4% greenhouse gas effect. See
21 Chapter 2.

22
23 In our 23-30 scientific PhD review of IPCC working Group 1 first order draft for Ar6
24 we found their faulty global warming potential model. This model assumes equal
25 greenhouse gas (GHG) concentrations. This equal concentration will never happen
26 in reality. For example, carbon dioxide is more than 200 times the concentration
27 of methane. Furthermore, in Group 1, we found in Annex 2, a table with the
28 correct order of GHG effects. Any model which ignores data to benchmark it with
29 this correct order is a fake model. We sent our review at least 23 times to inform
30 them they had to benchmark their Annex 2 table to the correct order of GHG
31 effects. However, for the final draft for Ar6 they chose not to benchmark their
32 final draft but instead chose to delete the table in Annex 2, which still left their
33 fake GWP model intact. This wasn't just overlooking the benchmarking of the

1 data. They purposely hid the fact that their science model was false. This is how
2 corrupt they are.

3 Twenty-three to thirty PhD's participate in "Expert and Government review"
4 program for the IPCC reports. We find all kinds of garbage in them. Each member
5 of our team downloads the reports by various "working groups" such as the IPCC.
6 We go through those reports line by line. Then we have an online meeting and
7 decide what we will submit for changes. Then we each submit the same changes
8 twenty-three to thirty times.

9

10 For example, for their mitigation chapter, Jim Skea said we need to lower
11 atmospheric carbon dioxide emissions by 45% by 2030. However, the statement
12 in the chapter he was basing that goal on was buried on page 95 and had no
13 references (citations). They completely made it up! Also buried on page 101 was a
14 statement stating that the probability of their solution to work is 66%. When we
15 submit our review, they put these things in the 5th paragraph of their executive
16 summary.

17 [https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg3/downloads/report/IPCC_AR6_WGIII_FullRe](https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg3/downloads/report/IPCC_AR6_WGIII_FullReport.pdf)
18 [port.pdf](https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg3/downloads/report/IPCC_AR6_WGIII_FullReport.pdf)

19

20 Our team of 30 scientific PhD's forced working group III to move the
21 statement with no references (citation) from page 95 to page 6 paragraph
22 B.1.3

23

24 **B.1.3** Historical cumulative net CO₂ emissions from 1850 to 2019 were
25 2400 } 240 GtCO₂ (high confidence). Of these, more than half
26 (58%) occurred between 1850 and 1989 [1400 } 195 GtCO₂], and about
27 42% between 1990 and 2019 [1000 } 90 GtCO₂]. About
28 17% of historical cumulative net CO₂ emissions since 1850 occurred
29 between 2010 and 2019 [410 } 30 GtCO₂].¹⁰ By comparison,
30 the current central estimate of the remaining carbon budget from 2020
31 onwards for limiting warming to 1.5°C with a probability of 50% has been
32 assessed as 500 GtCO₂, and as 1150 GtCO₂ for a probability of 67% for
33 limiting warming to 2°C. Remaining carbon budgets depend on the amount

1 of non-CO2 mitigation (}220 GtCO2) and are further subject to
 2 geophysical uncertainties. Based on central estimates only, cumulative net
 3 CO2 emissions between 2010 and 2019 compare to about four-fifths of the
 4 size of the remaining carbon budget from 2020 onwards for a 50%
 5 probability of limiting global warming to 1.5°C, and about
 6 one-third of the remaining carbon budget for a 67% probability to limit
 7 global warming to 2°C. Even when taking uncertainties into account,
 8 historical emissions between 1850 and 2019 constitute a large share of
 9 total carbon budgets for these global warming levels.^{11,12} Based on
 10 central estimates only, historical cumulative net CO2 emissions between
 11 1850 and 2019 amount to about four-fifths¹² of the total carbon budget for
 12 a 50% probability of limiting global warming to 1.5°C (central estimate
 13 about 2900 GtCO2), and to about two thirds¹² of the total carbon budget
 14 for a 67% probability to limit global warming to 2°C (central
 15 estimate about 3550 GtCO2). {Figure 2.7, 2.2, Figure TS.3, WGI Table
 16 SPM.2}

20 Exhibit II

21 IPCC

22 **The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Ignores Key Data,**
 23 **Simulation Results are invalid cctruth.org**

24 SUMMARY

25
 26 The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change reports are inaccurate
 27 and are falsely skewing Data. Publishing garbage manuscripts in a
 28 journal whose chief editor has a PhD in Political Science. There reports
 29 are deliberate scientific fiction. <https://cctruth.org/ipcc.pdf> This is well
 30 documented with links to their reports and descriptions where we found the items.

31 32 IPCC Reports

33 The IPCC cherry-picks the relatively few reports which follow and support their own agenda,
 34 rejecting the greater number of reports that do not support that agenda. They have ignored
 35 the oppositional findings of more than one thousand reports about the Amazon Rainforest.
 36 Any scientist who cherry-picks data would be shamed out of a job. More than 60% of the
 37 references in their reports were to the previously farce Journal Nature Climate Change who
 38 had as Chief Editor Adam Yeeley. His Ph.D is in Political Science. He let scientists publish
 39 garbage manuscripts so they could circular reference them in the IPCC reports. This is not
 40 science! He is just there to keep correct science out and publish crap science. However, after

1 sending email, to their board he is no longer there. Still that journals manuscripts reference
2 the IPCC reports. The IPCC reports then reference the manuscripts in that journal. Circular
3 referencing is not science! June 2020 I notified the board of this and they fired him the next
4 day. Bronwyn Wake is the board member who took Adam's place. Initially they said she was
5 chief editor for many years prior to June of 2020. I complained and they changed when she
6 started to June 2020. The kind of garbage getting published was like the manuscript in early
7 July which said the Antarctic was warming. This was all over the worldwide news for a few
8 days. This garbage manuscript like the reset under Adam had the title and abstract matched,
9 however they didn't match the manuscript. The manuscript said the warming was a 20-year
10 cycle that started in 2020 and is cooling now!

11
12 We performed an expert review of IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) SR 1.5
13 Chapter Two "Mitigation" https://cctruth.org/expert_review_SR1.5_mitigation.pdf. These
14 are the key findings: Their equilibrium statements had no references to any published
15 manuscripts. One of the chapter scientists replied and said they are not equilibrium
16 statements and they are from simulations. I showed their simulations to a friend who has 27
17 years' experience and he started uncontrollable laughter. Further down in their document was
18 the only probability they did is 50-66% for their solution by lowering emissions will work. I sent
19 this to around 1000 scientists, the worldwide media, the UN and IPCC scientists. The media
20 ignored it, however, IPCC working Group 1 and 3 saw my expert review ability and invited us to
21 review their reports for AR6 next year. https://cctruth.org/comments_ar6wg3_fod.xlsx is
22 already accepted for WG 3.

23 https://cctruth.org/comments_ar6wg1_sod.xlsx was uploaded 4/30/2020.

24 2019 IPCC SR 1.5 Chapter 2 "Limiting warming to 1.5°C depends on greenhouse gas (GHG)
25 emissions over the next decades, where lower GHG emissions in 2030 lead to a higher chance
26 of keeping peak warming to 1.5°C (*high confidence*). Available pathways that aim for no or
27 limited (less than 0.1°C) overshoot of 1.5°C keep GHG emissions in 2030 to 25–30 GtCO₂e yr⁻¹
28 in 2030 (interquartile range). This contrasts with median estimates for current unconditional
29 NDCs of 52–58 GtCO₂e yr⁻¹ in 2030

30 (<https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/chapter/chapter-2/>, Page ES, 5th paragraph). Now their Executive
31 Summary

32 (<https://cctruth.org/es.pdf>) shows this statement with no references and their probability of

33 66%. I sent four emails asking them where these numbers came from. A research scholar at

34 The International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) Schlossplatz 1, A-2361

35 Laxenburg, Austria replied: "Dear Dave, Thank you very much for your question on the

36 assessment of quantitative pathways in the SR15. The statement is taken from Table 2.4,

37 bottom section, third row, first column, rounded to multiples of 5. The assessment in this table

38 is based on the ensemble of quantitative pathways compiled by the IAMC and IIASA for the
39 IPCC SR15 process

40 (<https://doi.org/10.22022/SR15/08-2018.15429>). The Python script for preparing this table is

41 available under an open-source license at

42 [https://data.ene.iiasa.ac.at/sr15_scenario_analysis/asse](https://data.ene.iiasa.ac.at/sr15_scenario_analysis/assessment/sr15_2.3.3_global_emissions_statistics.html)

43 [ssment/sr15_2.3.3_global_emissions_statistics.html](https://data.ene.iiasa.ac.at/sr15_scenario_analysis/assessment/sr15_2.3.3_global_emissions_statistics.html) (see [https://doi.org/10.22022/SR15/08-](https://doi.org/10.22022/SR15/08-2018.15428)


44 [2018.15428](https://doi.org/10.22022/SR15/08-2018.15428) for the scientific reference of the assessment notebooks).

45 **Neither the statement nor the table does make any assertion about an equilibrium;**

46 **it is merely an assessment of the pathways at a specific point in time [bold added].** I

47

1 do hope that this clarifies your request. The International Institute for Applied Systems
 2 Analysis (IIASA) Schlossplatz 1, A-2361 Laxenburg, Austria.” Please note! This faulty
 3 simulation has us reach equilibrium at 2050!



4 I looked at their simulations and they are garbage because they don't have boundary
 5 conditions. Their simulation shows NetZero at zero to in 2050. However, the IPCC and UN
 6 have started this false 12 year doomsday garbage. This is why nothing they have predicted
 7 has or will come true. Dr. Kevin Dayaratna testified at the Oregon Carbon group with the
 8 correct use of their simulations. <https://ctruth.org/DAYARATNA.mp4>
 9 Earlier I sent this review to 5000 scientists and all the worldwide media by email with delivery
 10 and read receipts. They read it. One NOAA scientist replied and said I should go after the
 11 publishers of the IPCC crappy manuscripts. I thanked him and said I would if I had a large staff
 12 of scientists. I showed their simulations to an expert in simulations and he started
 13 uncontrollable laughter. Around December 15th 2019 I sent it to all other than Chapter three
 14 IPCC scientists. Our review was sent to the other 200 IPCC scientists who essentially agreed
 15 with the review we provided.

17 Rare Use of Probability

18 “For limiting global warming to below 2°C **with at least 66% probability** [bold added]
 19 CO₂ emissions are projected to decline by about 25% by 2030 in most pathways (10–
 20 30% interquartile range) and reach net zero around 2070 (2065–2080 interquartile
 21 range).1 {2.2, 2.3.3, 2.3.5, 2.5.3, Cross-Chapter Boxes 6 in Chapter 3 and 9 in Chapter
 22 4, 4.3.7} (p 21.3, Table 2.1).

23 “No pathways were available that achieve a greater than **50-66% probability**
 24 **of limiting warming below 1.5° C** [bold added] during the entire 21st century based
 25 on the MAGICC model projections” For limiting global warming to below 2°C with at least
 26 66% probability CO₂ emissions are projected to decline by about 25% by 2030 in most
 27 pathways (10–30% interquartile range) and reach net zero around 2070 (see p. ES,
 28 Paragraph 5). The probability is actually zero because the minimum residence time is
 29 hundreds of years. (Probability Table 2.1 page 21.3)
 30

TABLE 2.1

Classification of pathways that this chapter draws upon, along with the number of available pathways in each class

The definition of each class is based on probabilities derived from the MAGICC model in a setup identical to AR5 WGIII (Clarke et al., 2014) ¹⁰⁰, as detailed in Supplementary Material 2.SM1.4.

PATHWAY GROUP	PATHWAY CLASS	PATHWAY SELECTION CRITERIA AND DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF SCENARIOS	NUMBER OF SCENARIOS
1.5°C or 1.5°C consistent**	Below-1.5°C	Pathways limiting peak warming to below 1.5°C during the entire 21st century with 50–64% likelihood*	9	90
	1.5°C-low-OS	Pathways limiting median warming to below 1.5°C in 2100 and with a 50–67% probability of temporarily overshooting that level earlier, generally implying less than 0.1°C higher peak warming than Below-1.5°C pathways	44	
	1.5°C-high-OS	Pathways limiting median warming to below 1.5°C in 2100 and with a greater than 67% probability of temporarily overshooting that level earlier, generally implying 0.1–0.4°C higher peak	37	

(No business would spend such a significant amount of money (2.8 trillion dollars already spent worldwide) on a project with only a 50-66% chance of success.) Their probability is actually zero because the average residence time for atmospheric CO₂ is 150 years. [\(IPCC 2003\)](#)

Citation

“This chapter should be cited as: Rogelj, J., D. Shindell, K. Jiang, S. Fifita, P. Forster, V. Ginzburg, C. Handa, H. Kheshgi, S. Kobayashi, E. Kriegler, L. Mundaca, R. Séférian, and M.V.Vilariño, 2018: Mitigation Pathways Compatible with 1.5°C in the Context of Sustainable Development. In: Global Warming of 1.5°C. An IPCC Special Report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways, in the context of strengthening the global response to the threat of climate change, sustainable development, and efforts to eradicate poverty [Masson-Delmotte, V., P. Zhai, H.-O. Pörtner, D. Roberts, J. Skea, P.R. Shukla, A. Pirani, W. Moufouma-Okia, C. Péan, R. Pidcock, S. Connors, J.B.R. Matthews, Y. Chen, X. Zhou, M.I. Gomis, E. Lonnoy, T. Maycock, M. Tignor, and T. Waterfield (eds.)]. In Press” (p. 93)

Use of Unscientific Terms

The document uses the unscientific terms *highly* (or otherwise) *likely* six times, *unlikely* three times, and *highly* (or otherwise) *confident* sixty-two times. In every case, percent probability must be used.

Planting Native trees is the only way to lower Atmospheric carbon dioxide to 330 ppm by 2031.

The IPCC follows a false agenda and a false GWP (Global Warming Potential) Calculation, neither of which is based on reality. Their GWP calculation assumes equal greenhouse gas concentrations of methane, nitrous oxide and carbon dioxide and other gases, which will never happen in reality. If we did have equal concentrations of N₂O (laughing gas) for instance, the people in the world would have silly smiles on their faces and high-pitched voices. IPCC Working group I, second order draft (SOD) Annex II the IPCC review team found 14 published manuscripts summarized in a table which show the same data as Dr. Blasings. These were published prior to the GWP and the IPCC ignored them. We put this finding in our review for

1 Working Group 1. They ignored it and deleted the 14 manuscripts! Any model which is not
 2 verified by data is a false model. The correct order of greenhouse gases CO₂ then CH₄ then
 3 N₂O then NO (highest effect to lowest effect) Dr. TJ Blasing exposed the greenhouse gases
 4 with longwave radiation and was thus able to calculate the actual effect.
 5 <http://cctruth.org/index.php/ghg/> Methane is 0.5 watts/m². CO₂ is 1.94 watts/m². The media
 6 should not believe the IPCC or the UN when it comes to climate change. Dr. Hal Dorian passed
 7 away 4/28/20. [His memorial](#). He is one of the NASA scientists who helped write our proposal.
 8 We dedicate our [proposal](#) to him.

Gas	Pre-1750 tropospheric concentration ¹	Recent tropospheric concentration ^{2,3}	GWP ⁴ (100-yr time horizon)	Atmospheric lifetime ⁵ (years)	Increased radiative forcing ⁶ (W/m ²)
Concentrations in parts per million (ppm)					
Carbon dioxide (CO ₂)	~280 ⁷	399.5 ^{2,8}	1	~100-300 ⁵	1.94
Concentrations in parts per billion (ppb)					
Methane (CH ₄)	722 ⁹	1834 ²	28	12.4 ⁵	0.50
Nitrous oxide (N ₂ O)	270 ¹⁰	328 ⁵	265	121 ⁵	0.20
Tropospheric ozone (O ₃)	237 ¹	337 ²	n.a. ³	hours-days	0.40

9
10
11 **Planting trees is 100% probability to lower atmospheric carbon**
 12 **dioxide.**

13
14 *Residence Time of Atmospheric CO₂*

15 Residence time is how long a molecule will stay in a location before being released. Like
 16 standing water in your kitchen, sink. The water is residing longer. A 2003 IPCC report shows
 17 residence time increased from 5 to 200 years. Dr. TJ Blasing shows 100-300 years. In 2016, I
 18 emailed Dr. Jim Hansen and two other prominent climate-change scientists that emissions had
 19 been flat since 2014, but that atmospheric CO₂ was still increasing and the rate of rise was still
 20 increasing. I asked them how this could be happening--if emissions were the cause of
 21 atmospheric CO₂ increase. **They said we must wait another 470 years for anything we do**
 22 **with emissions to show an effect.** Anything we do with CO₂ emissions has not and will not
 23 have any effect on atmospheric CO₂ for hundreds of years. However, the residence time for
 24 atmospheric carbon dioxide is 150 years. This is why everything we have done to lower
 25 emissions of CO₂ has had zero effect on the atmospheric CO₂ rise.

26 https://cctruth.org/residence_time.pdf Below are the constraints I used. Even at average
 27 residence time of 100
 28 years Mauna Loa never stays low.

29 **Facts**

30 Residence time was 5 years, Now more than 150 years. Recently I sent out a survey email to
 31 400 climate change scientists about atmospheric CO₂ residence time. Most scientists said 200-
 32 400 years. One scientist sent me his research of published papers, which show residence time
 33 from 150 years to 700 years.

Residence Time (Years)	Author	Year
700	Allen	2009
610	Zickfeld	2013

500	Matthews	2008
300	Plattner	2008
270	Cao	2010
230	Zickfeld	2012
220	Solomon	2012
220	Knutti	2012
210	Gillett	2011
180	Frolicher	2010
150	Hare	2006

1 <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2017JD028121>


2 Assumptions

3 Keep current carbon emissions rise at 0.3 gt/yr (current)

4 Reduction in 45% of fossil fuel emissions by 2030 Decreases of carbon emissions will be offset
 5 by increases in population Atmospheric CO₂ stays the same slope. (Not increasing). However,
 6 rate of rise is increasing. Current rate is almost 3 ppm increase per year. At 100 years no more
 7 oil so CO₂ emissions drop by 55% Atmospheric CO₂ lowers to a minimum at year 2650 and then
 8 increases. We never reach equilibrium.

9 **Even at a residence time of 100 years, atmospheric CO₂ never lowers.**


10 **Constraints for this graph. 45% reduction in fossil fuel CO₂ emissions by**
 11 **2030 55% reduction in fossil fuel CO₂ emissions by 2130 due to depletion**
 12 **of those fuels. 2030 45% reduction in the rate of rise of Atmospheric CO₂.**
 13 **2130 45% reduction in CO₂ concentration 2230 55% reduction in CO₂**
 14 **concentration and rate.**



15
 16 This is because we have massive loss of photosynthesis consumption.

17 Globalforestwatch.org/map

18 Another way to look at residence time is a signature from past events, which lowered CO₂
 19 emissions. For example, the oil embargo in the 1970's, multiple recessions and the big
 20 worldwide recession in 2009. The current COVID-19 pandemic. These are examples of lowered
 21 worldwide emissions. Below is the current graph of Mauna Loa CO₂. You can clearly see no
 22 signature from these events.



1

2

On Netflix, please watch “kiss the ground” movie. It clearly explains why we cannot lower atmospheric CO₂ by working on emissions of CO₂.

3

4

[Sea Level Rise \(or lack thereof\)](#)

5

<https://www.ipcc.ch/report/sixth-assessment-report-working-group-i/> Twenty Ph. D’s and I uploaded comments on Working Group 1 second order draft for AR6.

6

7

https://cctruth.org/comments_ar6wg1_sod.xlsx was uploaded 4/30/2020.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

Sea Level Change data is unreliable. The satellite NOAA uses, (the Jason-3) has a minimum resolution of 25 mm. They say they are measuring a 3mm rise per year by measuring a location every 10 days. When we measure anything below minimum resolution, the data reliability drops exponentially below 50% of the minimum resolution. I put them in the document review for WG I AR6 for next year. I know the tide gauges tell the truth and show almost no sea level change. DOI : doi.org/10.33140/JMSRO.02.01.06 Review Article The Views of Three Sea Level Specialists, Mörner NA, Wysmuller T and Parker

17

A <https://www.opastonline.com/jmsro-volume-2-issue1-year-2019/www.opastonline.com> J

18

19


Mari Scie Res Ocean, 2019 Volume 2 | Issue 1 See this [document](#):

A movie called **Climate Hustle II** will come out October 2020 and show this.
<https://www.climatehustle2.com/gallery/>

20


21

In addition, the European satellite has a 1 mm minimum resolution and it shows the same sea level rise as the tide gauges at 1.06 mm/yr



1
 2 The Jakobshavn Glacier in Greenland has grown for the third year in a row. This is the
 3 large one Al Gore and others have falsely said would melt and cause the oceans to rise
 4 15 feet. [https://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/images/145185/major-greenland-glacier-is-](https://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/images/145185/major-greenland-glacier-is-growing)
 5 [growing](https://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/images/145185/major-greenland-glacier-is-growing) Tide gauge data:

6 [https://sealevel.info/MSL_weighted.php?g_date=1910/1-](https://sealevel.info/MSL_weighted.php?g_date=1910/1-2019/12&c_date=1910/12019/12&s_date=1910/12019/12&id=154,%20202,%20155,%20163,%20158,%20188,%2012)
 7 [2019/12&c_date=1910/12019/12&s_date=1910/12019/12&id=154,%2](https://sealevel.info/MSL_weighted.php?g_date=1910/1-2019/12&c_date=1910/12019/12&s_date=1910/12019/12&id=154,%20202,%20155,%20163,%20158,%20188,%2012)
 8 [0202,%20155,%20163,%20158,%20188,%2012](https://sealevel.info/MSL_weighted.php?g_date=1910/1-2019/12&c_date=1910/12019/12&s_date=1910/12019/12&id=154,%20202,%20155,%20163,%20158,%20188,%2012)



9
 10 **Ocean Acidity**
 11 Ocean acidity (or lack thereof). Tony Heller shows how the ocean acidity is the same as it's
 12 always been in this video. [Ocean stupidifcation](#)

13 **Net Zero**
 14 The document uses a term *Net Zero* with no definition.

1 We wrote the world's first and only atmospheric CO₂ equilibrium manuscript is peer reviewed
 2 and published in worlds top climate change journal by impact factor. [Equilibrium Paper](#)
 3 NetzeroCO₂e=8.6gt/yr.
 4
 5

6 **Truth about Al Gore**

7 Web search "Club of Rome". This will tell you everything you need to know about the
 8 ignorance of Al Gore.
 9

10 **The assertion that 97% of scientists agree with the IPCC is wrong! This high consensus was**
 11 **touted because the three hundred manuscripts published between 2009 and 2013 were**
 12 **chosen for review on the basis of their seeming conformity to a certain point of view.**
 13 **Rejected for the review and survey of scientists were the more than seven hundred**
 14 **manuscripts written by scientists who had different statistics and conclusions from the ones**
 15 **that were wanted. Therefore, the agreeing part is 33%. We are 67%ers.**




16 **Discovery: Reduction in**

17 **Photosynthesis Correlation to Atmospheric CO₂ Increase. 65 more**
 18 **conferences have invited me to present this. I have not accepted any**
 19 **invites because we have no funding.**
 20



21 I sent these statistics to all 220 IPCC scientists by email.

22 Not one of them objected to the statistics. Atmospheric CO₂ is a binary system statistically. The
 23 two causes are CO₂ emissions and loss of photosynthesis. Each cause is multi-variate. We have
 24 had mostly flat human emissions (0.3 GT/yr vs. 0.6 GT/yr) since 2014. However, atmospheric CO₂
 25 is still going up, and the rate of rise is increasing. In 2018, the Rxy correlation coefficient was 0.73
 26 and not statistically significant (not cause and effect). In 2019 it is now 0.63 and dropping. The
 27 data is [here](#):

28 **Carbon Dioxide Does Not Freeze in the Atmosphere** In the mesosphere, the pressure is 1
 29 millibar. At this pressure, CO₂ freezes at -100°C. The temperature in the mesosphere is -90°C.





1




2
3
4
5
6
7
8

This 2010 graph is the only one you will see online. They do not want you to know how emissions of CO₂ have slowed down worldwide.



1
2

Carbon dioxide emissions correlate to 363 ppm and is a contributor, not the cause of the rise.



3


This tank model is like your kitchen sink. Standing water in the sink is increasing residence time. By this model, we need to shut the input and fix the drain. We cannot shut the input because the “natural” emissions are 20 billion tons/yr. We must increase photosynthesis.

8


9 *The oscillation at Mauna Loa* starts as a very strong signal in South
 10 America and then fans out larger and larger until Barrow’s Alaska. The
 11 countries in South America burn the Amazon Rainforest, the densest
 12 forest in the world, from October/ November through May of the next
 13 year. Since 1950, an average of 30 million acres per year have been
 14 deforested and burned. So much CO₂ has been released that the trees
 15 and plants have grown too fast and died. This massive decay is what

56


1 caused the Amazon Rainforest to switch to an oxygen sink and carbon
 2 dioxide producer.
 3 Hundreds of papers have been published on this.
 4 Currently, the Amazon output is 15 GTyr^{-1} of CO_2 .




Mauna Loa cycles



globalforestwatch.org 390->8.6 gtyr-1




12 The Amazon Rainforest deforestation is a 0.98 cause and effect to the rise of carbon
 13 dioxide since 1957.
 14
 15



1
2
3
4
5

Amazon Rainforest $R_{xy} = -0.99$ The loss of oxygen worldwide is a 0.99 cause and effect to the destruction of 2 billion acres of the Amazon Rainforest since 1950! The correct solution is to stop non-sustainable deforestation of those forests like the Indian and Amazon Rainforests and plant 200 billion native trees and shrubs.



6
7

India stopped deforestation and is planting trees!


China is planting billions of trees!

10 Pakistan planted 1 billion trees in 2018, 2 billion more in 2019, and they will plant 8 billion more in the next four years! Peru stopped deforestation in 2020! Already planting 3 billion trees and the global garden greening atmospheric CO₂ minimum on October 4th was 407.51 ppm. Dr Pieter Tans said it should be 408.6 +/- 0.5. For November the rise was -0.45 ppm. (11/1= 411.02, 4/20=410.57), November of 2017 it was 2.7 ppm rise. November 2018 1.85 ppm rise. 8 billion more trees scheduled in the next 4 years. We can easily plant 100 billion trees in the USA and in 10 years will consume an extra 10 billion tons annually.

16

Recent Daily Average Mauna Loa CO₂

October 07:	408.20 ppm
October 06:	407.82 ppm
October 05:	408.00 ppm
October 04:	407.51 ppm
October 03:	407.53 ppm




17
18

19 Effect of 24+ billion trees planted in the last 48 months.

Recent Daily Average Mauna Loa CO₂

March 13: 414.11 ppm
 March 12: 414.11 ppm
 March 11: 414.37 ppm
 March 10: 413.78 ppm
 March 09: 413.95 ppm
 Last Updated: March 14, 2020



Hourly (red circles) and Daily (yellow circles) averaged CO₂ values from Mauna Loa, Hawaii for the last 31 days.

1
2



3
4

This drone can plant 40,000 trees per day.

5
6

I put in a complaint to Department of Commerce Inspector general about Mauna Loa CO₂ fraud. They started investigating 4/24/20. Please

7
8

download the rain-forest stop document and follow it weekly. Over 1000 people have been doing this since last June. To lower atmospheric Carbon dioxide quickly.

9
10

- 1. Put pressure on Brazil and other Amazon rain-forest countries to stop deforestation ASAP. Also stop the biomass burning that puts 300 million tons of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere each year. This has caused 50ppm of the recent rise in atmospheric carbon dioxide concentration. Then after 10 years finish burning what is needed at 10% per year for 10 years.**

11
12
13
14
15

- 1 2. Provide space where public can come and plant trees and shrubs. All
2 government-owned lands. Very small cost. Need website with
3 document for each planting area.
- 4 3. Plant shrubs in all freeway medians and sides. This is revenue plus in a
5 two-year cycle. Plant native shrubs at a minimal spacing so all light is
6 used in photosynthesis. This will take in 1 ton of CO2 emissions per
7 acre per year right at the source. The space would not need to be
8 mowed every week in the summer.
- 9 4. Get schools involved and planting massive number of trees and shrubs.
10 In their property and the government property as in 1 above.
- 11 5. Parks can add trees and shrubs.
- 12 6. Close any climate change research group. Not needed, unless doing
13 photosynthesis work.
- 14 7. Tax incentive for business to plant trees and shrubs.
- 15 8. Wild fire attention. Get a retainer for the 747 plane and use it from
16 the start on any wild fire.

17 Forest management by “strip logging” which was developed by Oregon State
18 Forestry. This strip 30 to 60 yards wide (depending on the height of the trees)
19 will provide ongoing logging opportunities, making these cuts. The side trees
20 and shrubs will naturally reseed these cuts. These seeds are matched
21 genetically to the local soil and climate. They grow much faster because of
22 this. No reseeded is needed or desired. These cuts make an excellent
23 firebreak.

24 We have an experiment on US 26 eastbound just west of Portland, Oregon. A
25 permit obtained from Oregon Department of Transportation. These sensors
26 are NIST certified and calibrated within one part per million. Graph 9 shows
27 the rate of rise of atmospheric carbon dioxide less than 3 ppm/yr. The blue
28 line represents the difference between the treed area and a non-treed area.
29 Each location has a wind directional measurement. This measurement can
30 confirm bad data from crosswind for example. This experiment proves we
31 can plant native shrubs and trees by roads and freeways instead of grass. This
32 freeway has 161,000 autos per day on it, and approximately 460 auto exit
33 (Sylvan exit 71) per day between the two sensor locations. The final day of
34 testing was 6/12/2021.

Procedure:

Place sensors at 6am daily for two weeks every other month for one year.

Pick up sensors at 7pm and analyze the data.

Put SD memory card from sensor into computer. Import the data into an Excel spreadsheet.

Repeat for other sensor.

For each 10 seconds subtract the treed area from the non-tree area.

Sort data for "smallest to largest" from subtraction result.


Remove negative numbers in the subtraction result.

The negative numbers are from wind gusts. We tracked this many times.

Calculate average for the day.

Repeat.

Things to note in the graph. At no time did the blue line go below the red line. On December 20th, a very dark and rainy day the difference was 9 ppm. In April through June we had very little rain. The graph shows this as lower difference. For photosynthesis, we need these things, light, vegetation, moisture and carbon dioxide. Experiment Summary: This experiment proves we can plant native trees and shrubs instead of grass and they will eventually consume all the carbon dioxide from the vehicles. This is applicable for $\pm 50^\circ$ from the equator.





2
3 **The second year finished on 5/16/2022 with over 4 million more data points.**
4 **This moved the experiment from Theory to Scientific Law!**

5 Native western Oregon plants.

6 Sweet bay

7 Photinia

8 Juniper

9 Knick

10 Leaf holly

11 Red twig Dogwood

12

13 Where to plant

14 Medians Photinia, Sweet bay, Leaf holly, Red twig Dogwood

15 On/Off ramps Photinia, Sweet bay, Juniper, Knick

16

17 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

18 I hereby certify that on July 24th, 2024, a true and correct copy of the
19 above document was electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court using
20 paper. A copy of the document will be served upon interested parties via
21 the US mail and email. Additionally, a courtesy copy is being provided as
22 follows:

23

24 Scott Ashford,
25 Scott.Ashford@oregonstate.edu,
26 Jeff Nason
27 jeff.nason@oregonstate.edu
28 Philip Mote
29 philip.mote@oregonstate.edu;

62

1 Edward Feser
2 osu.provost@oregonstate.edu

3 Via hand delivery
4 Via U.S. Mail, 1st Class,
5 Postage Prepaid
6 Via Overnight Delivery
7 Via Facsimile

8 Via Email
9 Via CM/ECF notification

10 to the extent registered DATED: July 24, 2024.

11 By: David White

12 Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(e)". says (e)(1) "following state law for serving a summons
13 in an action brought in courts of general jurisdiction in the state where the
14 district court is located or where service is made; However, by Oregon law
15 email service is allowed. UTCR 8 21.10 (2) explains a document may be a
16 pleading or many other documents.