



Things Climate Alarmists Do to Silence Debate

In a [Forbes article](#) posted on February 16,  Dr. J. Marshall Shepard, an expert in climate and weather, cites the Yale Program on Climate Change's assertion that citizens fall into six distinct categories on how they feel about climate change. According to the assessment, they are either alarmed, concerned, cautious, disengaged, doubtful, or dismissive. And those dismissive ones, according to Shepard, are the worst.

The Yale [study's](#) authors define a "dismissive" this way: "The Dismissive are very sure it [climate change] is not happening and are actively involved as opponents of a national effort to reduce greenhouse gas emissions."

Shepard's *Forbes* article is entitled "11 Things Climate Change 'Dismissive' People Say on Social Media." In it, Shepard listed 11 things that a "very loud, persistent, aggressive and vitriolic" minority of people say regarding so-called climate change on social media — his point being that those who are "dismissive" of claims of catastrophic climate change seem ridiculous.

As a matter of full disclosure, it is likely that, according to the authors of the U.S. government's National Climate Assessment, I could be deemed "dismissive," even though I fully believe that climate change is happening. In fact, I don't know anybody who is "sure" that climate change is not happening. Since climate is a long-term average of weather, change is in its very nature. I agree with most climate experts, such as Dr. Shepard, who like to use at least 30 years' worth of data to determine climate. Climate "change" is definitely real. As a statistical average, any time a weather event occurs outside the norm — such as the recent polar vortex — that average will go up or down a little bit, depending on what is being measured. No serious person can or should "deny" this — because like a baseball player's hitting statistics, climate is an average.

As for being against any "national effort to reduce greenhouse gas emissions," then, yes, count me dismissive, I guess. Especially when those efforts involve onerous government oversight and high levels of taxation.

As for Shepard's list of 11 things he has allegedly seen on social media that the "dismissive" among us routinely cite as evidence against climate change, I find him dismissive of counter arguments, logic, facts, and context.

Ice Ages

First, Shepard is critical of the claim that present warming is just part of a natural cycle. He says, "Ice ages always seem to come up and some statement about natural cycles." He claims that it is "stunning" that such statements are used since most high-minded scientists know all about these cycles, and don't deny their existence.

But he fails to explain why the point about these natural cycles is moot — in other words, to explain how we know that what is happening is not part of a natural cycle. Instead, he condescendingly notes that climate change (so called) is not an "either/or" discussion" but an "and" discussion. Shepard leaves us



Written by [James Murphy](#) on February 27, 2019

to guess just what his point is supposed to be. I'm assuming the "and" is the increased carbon dioxide (CO₂) in our atmosphere.

Funny thing about CO₂: The scientists never tell us what the perfect amount of CO₂ in our atmosphere should be. They can't tell us that because they don't know. We know that in the late 1850s, its level was at 280 parts per million (ppm) in the atmosphere, and currently it's just above 400 ppm. And we know that in the distant past on Earth, CO₂ levels were much higher than at present. Yet climate radicals look at the number 400 ppm and simply declare it to be too high.

Climate catastrophists also never tell us how low is too low for CO₂. As scientists, they must know that plants need CO₂. And biological scientists tell us that if CO₂ levels fall to 150 ppm, complex plant life — which is basically anything we eat or what feeds anything we eat — ceases to become viable. From where I'm sitting, 400 ppm sounds a lot better than 280 ppm.

A Magazine Article From 1975

Shepard then lampoons the fact that dismissives repeatedly bring up past claims made by scientists about global cooling occurring and cite a *Newsweek* article from 1975 saying that global cooling was on the way. He cites this one specific article as an example of misinformation. But *Newsweek* was not the only source frightening people about global cooling. Not only did [Time](#) and other magazines of the day publish similar stories, a scientific consensus (remember that word?) also existed, though scientists had the good sense not to claim that a ridiculous number of scientists, such as 97 percent, agreed. Last November, the good folks at [Watts Up with That](#) were kind enough to study 190 peer-reviewed papers of the time and found that 86 of those papers predicted a cooling world back in the '70s, with 30 of those studies claiming that a new Ice Age was possible. Fifty-six of the studies said that climate would remain stable, and only 46 of them predicted global warming.

Citing One Random Study

Shepard also claims that those who are dismissive of man-made climate change often cite random, outlier studies that seem to disprove anthropogenic global warming — i.e., that the dismissives are not relying on a consequential body of evidence to back up their claims. However, the studies being cited only seem random because they are, generally, hidden by mainstream media and climate-change-compliant search engines. Those of us who follow such studies closely are very aware that there are many studies demonstrating that the claims of climate catastrophe are simply wrong. For instance, there are the [2018 studies](#) by Northumbria University and UC-San Diego observing that a grand solar minimum may be on the way, along with cooler weather and climate. We also know about the data results of [NASA's SABER instrument](#), aboard its TIMED satellite, that shows the same thing. Then there's the [University of Auckland study](#) that shows that the tiny island nation of Tuvalu, which carbon-credit salesman Al Gore told us would be underwater by now, has actually grown in size.

One wonders if Dr. Shepard has read any of those studies. When he accuses people of having confirmation bias, he should probably look in the mirror first.

"Grand Poobah" Effect

Here Shepard claims that dismissive types will often cite a scientist who is a climate-change heretic — possibly a Roy Spencer or Judith Curry — when making their anti-climate-change position. Apparently, relying on the opinion of scientists is wrong. The pot is really calling the kettle black here. Climate hysterics do this all the time. Al Gore spent two entire movies citing scientists about global warming. Whatever point Shepard was attempting to make was not made, therefore I'm being "dismissive" of it.



Written by [James Murphy](#) on February 27, 2019

Doubt and Its Merchants

Too, he claims that uninformed dismissive types often attack the grant process in science. Though he doesn't flesh out the argument, he appears to mean that dismissives claim that climate alarmists only take the side they do because it's necessary to get government grants, and apparently, that's not a fair or significant argument.

But the money involved in climate science is actually a very good point against it. The most significant money for climate study grants is tied up by universities, organizations, and governments that have a vested interest in getting certain outcomes from these studies, namely that climate change is man's fault. Does Shepard really wish for us to believe that the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (UN IPCC) or any other funding source has no interest in what these studies find?

Climate science has become so intricately involved in politics that, in many cases, the "scientific findings" that result from studies are, essentially, worthless. Dr. Shepard may wish to read Canadian climatologist Dr. Tim Ball's book [The Deliberate Corruption of Climate Science](#) for more information on the subject.

In that book, Dr. Ball points out, "I watched my chosen discipline — climatology — get hijacked and exploited in service of a political agenda, watched people who knew little or nothing enter the fray and watched scientists become involved for political or funding reasons — willing to corrupt the science, or, at least, ignore what was really going on."

More of the Same

Dr. Shepard goes on to level a few other accusations against folks who are "dismissive" of climate change — all baseless. Apparently, some commenters *credential* themselves, claiming false credentials on social media. That happens all the time on every subject regardless of political affiliation, so again, what's his point?

He also uses the old canard that climate skeptics don't understand the difference between climate and weather, with people claiming that *cold-weather* events argue against global warming, which reflects weather, not climate. It's a decent argument until one realizes that, again, climate alarmists *do this all the time*. Any unusual weather event — be it hurricane, drought, flood, polar vortex, snow in the Sahara, or anything else — is blamed on climate change. There's even a new branch of climate science called [Attribution Science](#), which looks to pin weather events on man-made climate change.

Finally, one of the last tropes that Shepard complains about is dismissives' use of the fact that climate alarmists now usually chant against "climate change," rather than "global warming," as proof that unusual warming isn't really happening. According to him, it's unreasonable to question why the name was changed. But honestly, everyone knows why the name was changed. When warming slowed down in the early part of this century, the globalists who are pushing these predictions of chaos still needed to be able to blame everything on man. So, in the absence of warming, the catch-all term "climate change" was invented. That way, any weather that occurred could be blamed on man.

Condescension literally drips from Shepard's keyboard. He is either a true believer in global warming or in the global socialism that would be foisted on us all if we adhere to the so-called solutions to solve its problems. After all, those scientists and socialists like to believe that they're on the forefront of saving mankind from apocalypse.

The problem is, they are doing no such thing, which should be obvious to most anyone who has investigated the claims. For instance, when climate alarmists are confronted by scientists who disagree



Written by [James Murphy](#) on February 27, 2019

with them, they run. One of the best depictions of this was brought out in a [John Stossel television segment](#) where he tried to find a climate scientist willing to debate human-caused climate change with Dr. Roy Spencer of the University of Alabama at Huntsville. Spencer doesn't deny climate change, but he does question the amount that man is responsible for it and whether the alarmists are correct in forecasting catastrophic global warming. Stossel couldn't find one scientist willing to debate Spencer. One scientist, NASA's Gavin Schmidt, said he would appear on the show, but only if it were not in the format of a debate. It's ridiculous. It's the equivalent of a kid who calls another classmate stupid but then runs and hides behind the teacher come recess in fear of the fight that might occur.

Most climate alarmists evidently know that the facts are not on their side. Therefore, they can't allow any debates. Their political movement would die quickly under such scrutiny. Dissent must be silenced, and they believe that the best way to do that is to marginalize anyone who disagrees. And they must be "very loud, persistent, aggressive and vitriolic" about it. Their only choice is to hide behind phony consensus claims, reiterating that the science is settled. It is a propaganda technique worthy of Joseph Goebbels. Just keep repeating the same lie loudly over and over again, and people will come to believe it.



Image: sfe-co2 via iStock / Getty Images Plus



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.



Subscribe

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.