



POLAR BEARS GLOBAL WARMING

By Stu Burguiere

According to *An Inconvenient Truth* and other documentaries that people pretend they've seen, polar bears are drowning at incredible pace. Why? Global warming, of course! Now our government—bored with trying to figure out how to listen to terrorists' phone calls—is trying to make this version of the polar bears' plight official.

USA Today recently ran a story titled "Polar bears caught in a heated eco-debate." That really amazed me since I thought the debate was already over.

The article tells the story of the environmentalists' effort to make the polar bears an endangered species, thereby forcing the government to do something (i.e., take your money) to stop global warming.

On the surface, the logic would seem to make sense: ice is melting → polar bears are disappearing → it must be global warming → man is responsible → we have to stop the SUV's from killing polar bears → AHHHHHHHHH!!!!

But there's only one big problem: the polar bears aren't playing along. From *USA Today*: "Polar bears have increased from a population of 5,000 in 1972 to between 20,000 and 25,000 today."

If there was any question about the effectiveness of global warming hysteria, it should now be put to bed once and for all. We are actually considering making an animal that has increased its population by 400% in less than four decades into an endangered species.

Willie Soon, an astrophysicist at the Harvard Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics (and apparently a scientist who doesn't exist) added some context:

"Over the possibly 200,000 years the polar bear has existed as a species it has survived "very harsh conditions"

of extreme cold, such as ice ages and warmth, such as the last interglacial period, 100,000 to 110,000 years ago."

The truth is that polar bears are resilient, unlike the environmentalist arguments about them.

Richard Glenn, an Alaskan Inuit ice researcher, said that "marginal ice," which freezes in winter and melts in summer, will grow as multiyear ice disappears. "Even the Fish and Wildlife Service study," Glenn said, "acknowledges that...may be beneficial to ice seals and polar bears."

You might expect an Alaskan Inuit ice researcher to be an ally of environmentalists, but not in this case because the Inuit want to continue to *hunt* the polar bear.

Don't take this as a commentary on hunting in general. All of the hunting that has occurred hasn't hurt the overall population numbers at all; polar bears are unquestionably thriving. But 300 to 500 polar bears are shot every year. Somehow, Al Gore has convinced the world that the best way to try and ensure their survival is to attempt to control worldwide temperature. If they were in the midst of going extinct - and (it can't be repeated enough) **THEY ARE NOT** - you'd think a better solution would be to try and stop them from getting shot. Polar bear Kevlar vests, perhaps?

The polar bear is just one more example of how emotion is used to (successfully) control the argument. Simply because polar bears are cute when they open Coke bottles in commercials around Christmas time, the world is seemingly OK with ignoring all of this:

- Of the twenty subpopulations of polar bears, more than half are stable, "one or possibly two" are decreasing and two are actually *increasing*.

- The two populations of polar bears that are declining are in areas where it has gotten *colder* over the last fifty years. The increasing populations are in areas that have become warmer.

- The drowning polar bear scare, animated in *An Inconvenient Truth*, is largely based on four polar bears drowning after an "abrupt windstorm" in an area where polar bear populations are *increasing*.

- Stories about a 17% decline among polar bears in Canada's Hudson Bay have been everywhere. But this is the type of numbers game that environmentalists play. They pick the highest recent peak, of one specific group, and use that to start talking about extinction. In reality, the decline they talk about is only accurate if you specifically measure it from 1987. If you measure it from 1981 to today, the population has increased by 90%. That is an undeniable and dramatic amount of growth in a relatively short period of time.

- Without questioning any part of man-made global warming, cutting global emissions would save approximately 0.06 polar bears per year in the Hudson Bay population. 817 times that number die from hunting in that area every year.

All of these unbelievable facts, along with much more, is outlined in Bjorn Lomborg's irreplaceable book *Cool It* (something that you should own if you care about this topic at all. It's that good).

But Lomborg is vilified by environmentalists, even though just two pages after outlining the above facts about polar bears, he plainly states his opinion that "global warming is real and man-made." He is attacked for simply suggesting that other priorities, priorities that could save millions of lives *now*, are more important.

But the question still remains: why polar bears? And why do politicians act so irrationally about them?

Maybe it's because they just don't know how to handle something they perceive as a targeted minority — that is also *white*. ☹️

Send Stu hate mail at Stu@glennbeck.com