





Climate Alarmists Go Hysterical as Their Theory Melts Down

The year 2016 turned out to be disastrous for the global-warming Doomsday Lobby. This year is shaping up as one that will deliver an even bigger setback — politically, scientifically, economically, and socially — to the forces of climate alarmism. The big political blow last year came, of course, with the election of Donald Trump. His announcement earlier this year of his decision to pull the United States out of the UN's Paris climate accord sent climate activists across the globe into an apoplectic fury that continues unabated. President Trump's move on the Paris deal represents not only a tectonic shift from the position of the Obama administration, but the first major political reversal on this issue by an American administration — Republican or Democrat — in the past two-and-a-half decades.



However, while the political implications of the "Trump Effect" continue to dominate public discourse on global warming, there are many additional challenges that have sent the climate alarmists into full-blown panic mode. Because the "mainstream media" have been (and continue to be) so totally "in the tank" on this issue and have done their best to prevent the public from learning about these crucial developments, we will be examining a number of the most important of them in this article. They include the very inconvenient truths:

- "Pause" shock: Contrary to media hype, global temperatures have been stable "on pause" for the past 20 years;
- Sticker shock: The UN Paris deal would cost \$100 trillion, to supposedly achieve a minuscule reduction of a few *hundredths* of a degree Celsius;
- Data fraud: Scientists and researchers have repeatedly caught NOAA, NASA, and other government agencies "adjusting" the temperature data;
- Data shock: When fraudulent data adjustments are discounted, the climate-warming crisis disappears;
- Gore fail: Despite massive media promotion, Al Gore's 2017 movie sequel has been a colossal flop;
- Fear flop: Despite non-stop government and media fearmongering, fear of global warming rates at the bottom of public concerns;
- Debate fright: Trump administration calls for scientists to engage in an open, public debate have





Published in the September 4, 2017 issue of the New American magazine. Vol. 33, No. 17

alarmists in terror of exposure;

- Computer crash: Alarmists now admit that *all* of their climate computer models have epically failed and have greatly exaggerated planetary warming;
- Consensus fraud: The endlessly repeated "97 percent of climate scientists" claim has been exposed as being only a tiny 0.5-1 percent;
- Carbon profiteering: Al Gore and his corporate cronies intend to make billions by forcing the rest of us to pay for "carbon credits," "carbon taxes," and "carbon pricing";
- Elite hypocrisy: Celebrities, politicians, and billionaires call for sacrifice and imposing CO2 manacles on humanity while exempting their own lavish lifestyles;
- Cooling sun: Increasing numbers of scientists and scientific studies are predicting we are entering a Grand Solar Minimum, with years (or decades) of reduced solar activity and cooler Earth temperatures.

These and other developments would sound the death knell not only for the global-warming campaign, but for the UN itself, if they were widely known, which is why the politicians and the media shills promoting the anthropogenic (human-caused) global warming, or AGW, theme are so furiously flogging new fright stories to keep the American public distracted from learning the truth.

"Trump the Terrible"

"This decision is an immoral assault on ... everyone on this planet," declared New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio, after President Trump announced he was reversing President Obama's illegal and unconstitutional signing of the Paris climate agreement. Economist Jeffrey Sachs, director of Columbia University's Center for Sustainable Development and of the UN Sustainable Development Solutions Network, said Trump's withdrawal "is not just dangerous for the world; it is also sociopathic." "Without remorse, Trump is willfully inflicting harm on others," Sachs insisted, and "is knowingly and brazenly jeopardizing the planet."

Hedge-fund billionaire Tom Steyer, a left-wing pal of George Soros, called Trump's Paris exit "traitorous" and an "act of war." Activist Steyer tweeted: "If Trump pulls the US out of the #ParisAgreement he will be committing a traitorous act of war against the American people." Al Gore called Trump's move "reckless and indefensible."

Physicist Stephen Hawking offered some of the most extreme (and unscientific) fear-mongering, warning that President Trump's action could lead to irreversible damage and turn Earth into an unlivable planet like Venus. "We are close to the tipping point where global warming becomes irreversible. Trump's action could push the Earth over the brink, to become like Venus, with a temperature of 250 degrees, and raining sulphuric acid," Hawking absurdly claimed in a BBC interview.

On and on it goes, with ludicrous, Chicken Little, end-of-the-world predictions fused to anti-Trump execrations. The immigration-migration-refugee issue may be the only other topic that matches global warming for cranking up the Trump Derangement Syndrome to supernova intensity among globalists and true believers on the left. And as with the immigration issue, much of this AGW passion is aimed at sabotaging President Trump's efforts to undo the Obama agenda. Like so much of his "legacy," President Obama's "ratification" of the Paris climate treaty and his commitment of U.S. taxpayers to fund the massive scheme were completely unconstitutional. President Trump's executive action in this





Published in the September 4, 2017 issue of the New American magazine. Vol. 33, No. 17

matter merely reverses President Obama's illegal executive action. But of course, Trump has gone further, with actions that threaten to undo the terrible damage done by Obama's war on energy, especially his jihad against coal and carbon-based fuels.

Photo: AP Images

This article appears in the September 4, 2017, issue of The New American.

The "Pause" Shock

For more than two decades, our world has been subjected to a non-stop saturation bombing of apocalyptic headlines and nightmare scenarios regarding the "existential threat" of global warming. Since the United Nations "Earth Summit" in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, three generations of earthlings have been marinating in this anthropogenic global-warming fear sauce. Thus, it has come as a shock to many of these victims to learn that, contrary to the incessant AGW propaganda drumbeat, global surface temperatures have not been rising for the past 20 years. That's right, although you may not have heard or read about this fact amid all the constant bloviations by the politicians and media about the supposed climate crisis. However, it is a fact that even many of the top alarmists now acknowledge (even as many of them twist into pretzels in their attempts to explain it away). The New American has covered this issue in greater detail previously, but, in short, the headline-busting story is that the most accurate and comprehensive temperature data available — from orbiting satellites — show global temperatures have been remarkably stable for two decades, since around 1997. Our planet, which has been gradually, naturally warming for the past 150 years since emerging from the Little Ice Age of the 16th-19th centuries, has been on a temperature plateau for 20 years, oblivious to the dire climate proclamations of the UN, President Obama, Al Gore, and CNN. In scientific circles, this phenomenon is referred to as the warming "pause" or "hiatus." For years, any scientist who pointed to the pause data was immediately scorned and tarred by the alarmists as a "denier," a vicious smear that associated AGW skeptics with Holocaust denial. However, over the past couple of years, some of the leading AGW alarmist individuals and institutions have been forced by overwhelming evidence to admit that the pause is real. The list of former "pause deniers" includes such famous alarmists as Michael Mann, Phil Jones, Ben Santer, the British Met Office, and *The Economist* — to name a few. The warming pause is especially problematic for the climate-alarm lobby because it has occurred during a period in which man-made CO2 has been increasing dramatically. This flies in the face of alarmist claims that CO2 is the main driver of global warming. One of the alarmist tactics now is to claim that even though the pause is real, it doesn't mean the global-warming threat is any less real. They theorize that the "missing heat" has disappeared deep into the oceans, and that sometime in the near future it will emerge to wreak global havoc. It's a convenient theory, but only that — a theory — with little real evidence to buttress it. In the meantime, this huge story has been almost completely buried by the thought cartel, which is increasingly (and justifiably) referred to as the Fake News media.

Sticker Shock: \$100 Trillion

The price tag for the Paris climate treaty includes important issues beyond economics, such as loss of national sovereignty, draconian regulation, and loss of personal freedom. But the economic bottom line itself would be horrendous. According to Danish environmentalist/statistician Bjørn Lomborg, the cumulative price tag for the UN Paris climate agreement, by the end of the century, would be an astronomical \$100 trillion! Dr. Lomborg, who is president of the Copenhagen Consensus Center in





Published in the September 4, 2017 issue of the New American magazine. Vol. 33, No. 17

Denmark and believes in AGW, charges that the agreement would "cost a fortune, but do little to reduce global warming."

How big a fortune and how little a reduction? Using the UN's own figures, Dr. Lomborg calculates the cost will be \$1 trillion to \$2 trillion per year, for an inconsequential reduction measured in tenths to hundredths of a degree Fahrenheit over the entire century! To make matters worse, the United States would be held to strict standards, while mega-polluters China and India will be allowed to continue ramping up their energy consumption and pollution. While the agreement would require the United States to continue the Obama war on fossil fuels, more than 1,600 coal plants are planned or under construction in 62 countries, with China and India accounting for most of them.

Data Fraud

The scandal known as "Climategate," which erupted in 2009, has been largely forgotten, thanks to the Orwellian memory-hole service provided by the Fake News curators. In brief, that outrage involved emails showing top climate "scientists" sabotaging peer review, censoring and harming the careers of fellow scientists with whom they disagree, altering data, hiding data, criminally destroying data and other evidence legally subpoenaed by government bodies — and much more. Because the crimes and violations were whitewashed and the culprits were not held to account, even greater outrages have become institutionalized. Earlier this year, a whistleblower at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) came forward to expose the corruption of science by top NOAA officials to aid the political agenda of President Obama. Dr. John Bates, a retired principal scientist at NOAA's National Climatic Data Center, charged that in 2015 Dr. Thomas Karl and other NOAA officials had rushed to publish a report that would help the Obama administration push the UN Paris accord. The Karl/NOAA study was an attempt at discrediting the problematic 20-year pause in global warming. The study, which falsified data to prove that the pause had never existed (and hence became known as "The Pausebuster" paper), had a strong impact on the Paris treaty negotiators and helped win global support for the deal. Typical of the AGW alarm lobby, Dr. Karl, NOAA, and the Obama administration stonewalled repeated requests by Congress, fellow scientists, and Freedom of Information Act requests by the public for the access to the data used in the report.

Dr. Bates charges that "Tom Karl constantly had his 'thumb on the scale' ... in an effort to discredit the notion of a global warming hiatus and rush to time the publication of the paper to influence national and international deliberations on climate policy."

This was not the first time that a U.S. government agency has been caught in the act of blatant corruption and politicization of science to push AGW hysteria. NOAA, NASA, EPA, Department of Energy, and other agencies have been engaging in "secret science" — fraudulent practices with hidden data — for years. As far back as 1990, NOAA, NASA, and the Global Historical Climatology Network (GHCN) had begun a massive and radical series of "adjustments" that injected a dramatic warming bias into the temperature data. Those changes included: 1) dropping thousands of weather stations globally, overwhelmingly from cooler regions (northern latitudes, higher elevations, and rural areas); 2) dropping cold months from the annual records; 3) switching to new, automated thermometers that have a proven warming bias; and 4) increasing reliance on out-of-compliance urban weather stations affected by the urban heat island effect. In addition, these agencies have been caught repeatedly "adjusting," "smoothing," "homogenizing," and "correcting" data — always in a warming direction, and invariably refusing to release the data that is used to produce the frightening predictions and media alarms.





Published in the September 4, 2017 issue of the New American magazine. Vol. 33, No. 17

Even worse was NOAA's data published in July 2010 showing hundreds of absurd temperatures for the Great Lakes area, with many locations supposedly registering temps of more than 200, 300, even more than 600 degrees Fahrenheit! That's right, hot enough to boil water

(212 °F), melt lead (621 °F), and vaporize Lake Michigan. When this obviously fallacious data was publicly exposed, NOAA took down the erroneous Web page, but did nothing to guarantee that the extreme bias the false data had injected into the warming record would be corrected.

This AGW data-fraud phenomenon is global in nature, infecting the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and most national agencies dealing with climate research. The British Met Office and the Australian Bureau of Meteorology (BOM) are but two of the government bodies recently embroiled in data-fraud scandals. The BOM is currently being called out by, among others, Australian climate scientist Dr. Jennifer Marohasy, who has been documenting the BOM's fraudulent "adjustments" of temperature records to fit the AGW narrative.

Data Shock: What Warming?

A recently released blockbuster study by three respected climate researchers claims that inappropriate "adjustments" to the global average surface temperature datasets (GAST) record can account for virtually all of the much-hyped "hottest year ever" propaganda that we have been subjected to for the past several years. The new study, entitled "On the Validity of NOAA, NASA and Hadley CRU Global Average Surface Temperature Data & The Validity of EPA's CO2 Endangerment Finding," was coauthored by Drs. James P. Wallace III, Craig D. Idso, and Joseph S. D'Aleo. The authors found that if the invalid GAST "adjustments" are discarded, there is virtually no warming trend to speak of. That, of course, is precisely what the "pause" (as shown by satellite data) declares. In other words, if we are to consult the most reliable, publicly available temperature data — not data secretly "adjusted" and hidden from public inspection — then there is nothing about global temperatures to even get excited about, much less to panic over. The Wallace-Idso-D'Aleo study thus confirms the thesis of leading climate scientists such as Professor Richard Lindzen and Judith Curry that the current temperatures are well within the natural variability that our planet has experienced over recorded time.

Crashing Models of Doom

When not actually engaging in fraudulent data "adjusting," leading climate alarmists can usually be found using their generous taxpayer funding to construct fanciful scenarios with expensive computer models. In 2014, the UN's IPCC published its latest iteration of its mammoth report predicting global-warming apocalypse. Known as the Fifth Assessment Report (AR5), this AGW "Bible" utilized 73 computer models, all of which have been proven wrong. All of the vaunted computer models predicted varying degrees of increased warming as atmospheric concentrations of carbon dioxide (CO2) increased. Not only was every single model proven wrong, but they missed the mark by wide margins. Dr. John Christy, professor of atmospheric science and director of the Earth System Science Center at the University of Alabama Huntsville, analyzed all 73 UN computer models. Among his findings: "All 73 models' predictions were on average three to four times what occurred in the real world."

One hundred percent failure! How could it get more epic than that? But besides Dr. Christy's critique, we have many other authorities who have condemned the now-infamous record of the climate modelers. In fact, in order to stem the rising tide of criticism, some of the top alarmists — including Benjamin Santer and Michael Mann — joined in co-authoring an admission on the failures of the computer







Published in the September 4, 2017 issue of the New American magazine. Vol. 33, No. 17

models, published in *Nature Geoscience* on June 19, 2017. The Santer-led team admitted that "model overestimation of tropospheric warming" was "substantially larger" than what actually occurred, as measured by instruments. The co-authors issued no mea culpas, nor did they apologize for any of their earlier "denier" smears and other attacks on those who had questioned their "research."

Crashing "Consensus"

Of the many scams that form the larger mega-scam known as anthropogenic global warming, the "97 percent consensus" is one of the most audacious, most repeated, and (arguably) most effective. It is also one of the most fraudulent.

The actual "97 percent" lie is the product, principally, of two propaganda exercises masquerading as scientific "studies" by Australian alarmist John Cook and Harvard "historian of science" and virulent AGW promoter Naomi Oreskes. The lie comes in several different flavors, with varying descriptions of the alleged scientific cohorts, and what those cohorts allegedly believe. It is sometimes claimed that "97 percent of climate scientists" believe in global warming. At other times, "climate" is left out of the equation, giving the impression that it is a reference to 97 percent of all scientists. Some citations of the fictitious number also allege that this 97 percent believe in catastrophic (as opposed to naturally occurring, or man-made but noncatastrophic) global warming.

President Barack Obama provided one of the more extreme examples of the latter type when he infamously declared in a tweet on May 17, 2014: "Ninety-seven per cent of scientists agree: #climate change is real, manmade and dangerous."

Both the Oreskes and Cook studies are colossal frauds, and the 97-percent "consensus" claim cannot be sustained by any reasonable reality check of their methodologies. In neither case did the authors poll any global body of "scientists" or "climate scientists." In both cases, the authors searched databases for abstracts of articles on global warming. Then, based upon reading several thousand of these abstracts

- the vast majority of which took no position on, or were equivocal regarding, the anthropogenic factor
- they unjustifiably assigned the near-unanimous "consensus" designation.

Debate Fright

Dr. Steven Koonin is giving the AGW catastrophe choir seizures. Dr. Koonin, a physicist and professor at New York University, was an undersecretary of the Energy Department in the Obama administration. He has seen the chicanery of the catastrophists up close, and has proposed a scientific "debate" of sorts. Actually, he proposes a "Red Team-Blue Team" exercise, in which eminent scientists on both sides of the AGW debate would calmly, rationally, openly engage — presenting evidence for their positions. No "secret science," no hidden data "adjustments." The response by the gatekeepers of AGW dogma to Dr. Koonin's reasonable proposal is highly revealing. Michael Mann denounced it as "un-American." Benjamin Santer, Naomi Oreskes, and Kerry Emanuel co-authored a Washington Post article calling the idea "dangerous." Others are insisting it would be redundant, wasteful, and a sellout to the fossil-fuel industry. It would appear that the supposed champions of science are actually doing all in their power to kill actual scientific inquiry.

Headlong, Dead Rush

A growing awareness of all of the developments mentioned above undoubtedly contributed to Donald Trump's election victory last November. The American people are well aware that the establishment





Published in the September 4, 2017 issue of the New American magazine. Vol. 33, No. 17

politicians of both major political parties are corrupt and that the Fake News media has been — and is — lying to us on a host of important issues. It is becoming increasingly apparent that the global-warming bandwagon has been leading us toward the goal that socialist Christiana Figuerres, the chief of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, admitted was "a complete transformation of the economic structure of the world." It appears the desperate drivers of that bandwagon have decided that their only viable option is to continue the bluff, furiously flogging their frightful scenarios, before all the wobbly wheels come off the wagon and their colossal sham is fully exposed.

Photo: AP Images







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.