



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on January 8, 2017

Let's Stop With the Carbon Con Already

The side that defines the vocabulary of a debate, wins the debate. So we could ask: as we fight the global-warming scam, why are we using the language of the scammers? It's harder to combat "carbon" taxes, "carbon" credits and callow "carbon" appeals if we accept that at issue is "carbon."

Calling CO₂ "carbon" is like calling H₂O "hydrogen." Carbon is about as useful to a plant aspiring to photosynthesize as a tank of hydrogen is to a dehydrated man in a desert. Carbon dioxide and carbon are not the same thing any more than a fox and foxglove are the same thing.

If chemical formulas are meaningless and one element or atom between friends can be ignored, try inhaling copious amounts of CO. It's also "carbon," being in fact more "carboney" ratio-wise than CO₂. But carbon monoxide is poisonous to fauna and flora while carbon dioxide is plant food, which is why botanists pump it into greenhouses.

Likewise, would you like some chlorine with your food, sir? Sodium is poisonous; chlorine is poisonous. Combine the two — NaCl — and you have table salt. Chemistry is our friend.


It would be nice to think that the carbon crew is just being friendly and familiar. But not only would calling CO₂ Mr. Dioxide be just as inaccurate, there's clearly an agenda here. Carbon, the primary element in coal, conjures up images of spewing sky-blackening soot into the air. It's a dark brand of marketing.

In fact, I challenge those crafting "carbon tax" bills to call CO₂ "carbon" in their legislation's text. They won't because I suspect it wouldn't stand up in court, as factories *don't actually emit carbon*. The alarmists will either specify carbon dioxide or define, tendentiously, what "carbon" means for the "purposes of the bill."

Of course, carbon isn't really a villain, either. It's the fourth-most abundant element in the universe, and man is known as a "carbon-based life form." Given the latter, if extra atoms and elements and how they react with each other can be ignored when formulating labels and definitions, we could say that Al Gore's birth was a carbon emission.

Honest people should reclaim the language and reboot the debate by rejecting "carbon" talk. As for those knowingly using the term for propaganda purposes, they should have a huge carbon footprint placed firmly on their carbon-based posteriors.

[Contact Selwyn Duke](#), [follow him on Twitter](#) or log on to [SelwynDuke.com](#)





Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.

Subscribe