



Written by [William P. Hoar](#) on November 19, 2018

Published in the November 19, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 22

## Correction Please

### Global Apocalypse Looms — Again

**Item:** An “incredibly grim” prognosis on climate change also carries a “clarion call for global action,” blared the Los Angeles Times for October 8. According to the paper, a “major new report on global warming makes a chilling prediction: Without swift and sweeping worldwide intervention, some devastating effects of climate change will hit harder — and decades sooner — than previously expected.”



The L.A. Times went on: “Without dramatic steps to reduce use of fossil fuels and lessen the release of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases into the air, global temperatures could reach a tipping point in only a dozen years, the 728-page report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change warned.”

The report, issued by “leading climate scientists from across the globe” for the United Nations body on climate change, warned that this “could mean that within less than a generation, the planet could see even more catastrophic wildfires, worsening food shortages and a mass die-off of coral reefs, among other effects.”

**Item:** Following the IPCC’s latest report, Time magazine for October 22 (in a piece entitled “Climate catastrophe just 12 years away”) echoed the predictions about the “havoc” that would be wreaked by “man-made global warming” on “human civilization.”

**Item:** The New York Times, on the front page of its October 9 print edition — replete with full-color photographs of a child playing with the bones of dead livestock in Australia, wildfires in California, and the damage following a typhoon in Hong Kong — carped at what the president of the United States did not do, lamenting: “A day after the United Nations issued its most urgent call to arms yet for the world to confront the threat of climate change, President Trump boarded Air Force One for Florida — a state that lies directly in the path of this coming calamity — and said nothing about it.”

**Correction:** This United Nations report is but the most recent one being peddled by the merchants of doom. And the usual gaggle of weather whizzes is busy promoting solutions that are more harmful than the problems — to include the dismantling of capitalism itself.

Virtually every large storm is presented by the true-believing mass media as more proof of their intemperate claims. Here’s a typical example: Even before the latest UN scaremongering report was issued, the *Washington Post* (September 11) carried an editorial entitled “Another hurricane is about to batter our coast. Trump is complicit.” The editors predictably parroted: “Hurricane Florence is one of many signs of climate change, and those who deny it are complicit in the destruction.” When it comes “to extreme weather,” repeated the *Post*, “Mr. Trump is complicit. He plays down humans’ role in increasing the risks, and he continues to dismantle efforts to address those risks.”



Written by [William P. Hoar](#) on November 19, 2018

Published in the November 19, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 22

---

Subsequently, the president had the nerve to suggest (during a CBS interview) that he was dubious about the extent to which climate change might be man-made. Even more audacious, he also pointed out the obvious — namely, that some climate scientists do have a “political agenda.” The Left blew its collective stack.

Girding its figurative editorial loins, the *New York Times* trotted out the big guns, i.e., putting its “fact-checker” on the front lines. The “newspaper of record” told its acolytes that any uncertainties about climate change expressed are unquestionably false. Humans, per the headlined pronouncement, should be blamed for the planet’s weather. For more “proof,” the editors somehow found three like-minded scientists and inquired about their political bent, if any. Nope, they all not surprisingly affirmed, they didn’t have any.

One such scientist (an academic mastermind from the University of Illinois) went so far as to proclaim: “No scientists have political agendas. That’s just an excuse.” What this proves is that brains don’t equal either common sense or honesty. It has been routinely noted in recent years that most claims made by scientific researchers end up being incorrect. PLOS Medicine’s online article entitled “Why Most Published Research Findings Are Wrong” lists factors that influence the likelihood of a claim being correct, including these two: “The greater the financial and other interests and prejudices in a scientific field, the less likely the research findings are to be true,” and, “The hotter a scientific field (with more scientific teams involved), the less likely the research findings are to be true” — both of which apply to climate change in spades.

There is more from the Calamity Janes and Jims. All civilization is at threat, insist the mainstream press, accompanied by panic-stricken activists.

An archetypal *Washington Post* headline was both terse and tense: “Earth may have no tomorrow.” (Yet, somehow, we feel sure the paper would accept a check for a long-term subscription.)

Indeed, the London-based *Economist* — itself “green” to the gills — was not exaggerating in observing that the “world’s press reacted to the IPCC’s tome with alarm sometimes verging on hysteria. News bulletins, front pages and op-eds harangued governments to get their act together and ratchet up climate action.”

Recall that it wasn’t too long ago that these learned gurus intimated that the world could be saved if global warming were kept “well below” 2°C above pre-industrial temperatures. The Paris agreement of 2015 (disregarding the fact that it is generally unheeded by its signatories) declared that to be so. Now, however, the doyens of the planet’s climate insist that we must do even more and “pursue efforts toward 1.5°C” (about 2.7° Fahrenheit) above that level, lest we be overwhelmed in a global emergency.

Here’s yet another expert of note, as reported by the Associated Press. This “senior U.N. environmental official” says “entire nations could be wiped off the face of the Earth by rising sea levels if the global warming trend is not reversed.” The resultant “coastal flooding and crop failures would create an exodus of ‘eco-refugees,’ threatening political chaos, said Noel Brown, director of the New York office of the U.N. Environment Program, or UNEP.”

Governments, averred the wire-service account, “have a 10-year window of opportunity to solve the greenhouse effect before it goes beyond human control.” Otherwise, as the “warming melts polar icecaps, ocean levels will rise by up to three feet, enough to cover the Maldives and other flat island nations,” Brown told the AP.



Written by [William P. Hoar](#) on November 19, 2018

Published in the November 19, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 22

---

Sadly, that 10-year window of opportunity is closed. Accordingly (since this was in all the progressive papers and thus must be so), we are all dead already or certainly doomed — because that pre-mortem was *made more than 29 years ago*. (“U.N. Predicts Disaster if Global Warming Not Checked,” Associated Press, June 29, 1989). Please give our thoughts and prayers to planet Earth.

Yet, as it happens, those of us of a certain age also recall that our planet made it through the prognoses of the shrewd experts who assured us we were destined to expire from the coming “population bomb,” “global cooling,” and “nuclear winter,” among other major calamities that preceded dreaded global warming.

As for hurricanes: Yes, they are extremely dangerous and damaging. Their frequency in the last century shows a cyclical pattern. But even U.S. government agencies and the IPCC itself do not blame hurricanes on “global warming.” In a statement entitled “Global Warming and Hurricanes,” dated September 20, 2018, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory (GFDL) declared: “In the Atlantic, it is premature to conclude that human activities — and particularly greenhouse gas emissions that cause global warming — have already had a detectable impact on hurricane activity.”

It is noteworthy, as stressed by climate scientist Patrick Michaels in October, that that conclusion has been “the same about Atlantic hurricanes for years, long predating the Trump Administration.” (Michaels is the director of the Center for the Study of Science at the Cato Institute; he is also a past president of the American Association of State Climatologists.)

Even the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change acknowledged in its latest science report:

Current data sets indicate no significant observed trends in global tropical cyclone frequency over the past century and it remains uncertain whether any reported long-term increases in tropical cyclone frequency are robust, after accounting for past changes in observing capabilities.... No robust trends in annual numbers of tropical storms, hurricanes, and major hurricanes counts have been identified over the past 100 years in the North Atlantic basin.

That said, in order to make political points, some have been known to grab a small section of that long IPCC history data in an attempt to claim a new “trend.”

Moreover — as noted in the Daily Signal by David W. Kreutzer, Ph.D. — there has never been a time when climate was stable,

when weather events happened with smooth regularity. There have always been cycles — years and decades that included large numbers of hurricanes, and others with few.

Whether carbon dioxide levels rise, fall, or stay the same, we will continue to see hurricanes....

The fact that tragic weather events have not stopped is not evidence that carbon emissions are leading us to a climate catastrophe.

The UN’s climate-change campaign has long been political. In 2015, for example, *Investor’s Business Daily* observed that Christiana Figueres, executive secretary of the UN’s Framework Convention on Climate Change, had recently admitted, in the paper’s words, that “the goal of environmental activists is not to save the world from ecological calamity but to destroy capitalism.”

In Brussels, in February of 2015, Figueres declared: “This is the first time in the history of mankind that



Written by [William P. Hoar](#) on November 19, 2018

Published in the November 19, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 22

---

we are setting ourselves the task of intentionally, within a defined period of time, to change the economic development model that has been reigning for at least 150 years, since the Industrial Revolution.”

Adios progress. These pseudo-scientific solons apparently oppose increases in the living standards of mankind.

Even if its global climate forecasts are absurd, the body dealing with doom and gloom is not going to quit. It has big plans about how the world should be run. As summarized by the *Wall Street Journal*, the UN insists “global carbon emissions must fall 45% by 2030 — twice as much as its earlier forecasts — and the world must wean itself entirely off fossil fuels over three decades to prevent a climate catastrophe that will include underwater coastlines and widespread drought and disease.”

First we were told the magic goal was getting to two degrees (centigrade) of warming over pre-industrial levels; then it turned out that the real line was 1.5 degrees. No one really believes either goal is attainable, but never mind.

As the *Journal* also observed, humanity is doomed under the model of the IPCC regardless of what is done:

Nonetheless, the IPCC is urging immediate, drastic and large-scale economic changes that would affect everything from the kinds of cars people drive to foods they eat. Millions of acres of farmland would have to be converted into forests or plastered over with solar panels.

Some \$2.4 trillion in annual investment in climate mitigation and adaptation — about 2.5% of world GDP — would also be needed over the next two decades.

Reaching the IPCC’s latest goals is not economically and practically possible, notes Bjorn Lomborg, president of the Copenhagen Consensus Center. This is also the conclusion of new Nobel laureate William Nordhaus.

Lomborg, the author of the *Skeptical Environmentalist*, has demonstrated this futility; some figures from Lomborg follow:

The IPCC says carbon emissions need to peak right now and fall rapidly to avert catastrophe. Models actually reveal that to achieve the 2.7-degree goal the world must stop all fossil fuel use in less than four years. Yet the International Energy Agency estimates that in 2040 fossil fuels will still meet three-quarters of world energy needs, even if the Paris agreement is fully implemented.

The U.N. body responsible for the accord estimates that if every country fulfills every pledge by 2030, CO2 emissions will be cut by 60 billion tons by 2030. That’s less than 1% of what is needed to keep temperature rises below 2.7 degrees. And achieving even that fraction would be vastly expensive — reducing world-wide growth \$1 trillion to \$2 trillion each year by 2030.

Lomborg is trying to apply some common sense to the issue, saying: “When a ‘solution’ to a problem causes more damage than the problem, policymaking has gone awry. That’s where we often find ourselves with global warming today.”

Don’t look for reasonableness among environmental Chicken Littles, who are sure that the sky is falling. They are better known for their bird droppings.

— William P. Hoar



Written by [William P. Hoar](#) on November 19, 2018

Published in the November 19, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 22

---

*Photo: AP Images*



Written by [William P. Hoar](#) on November 19, 2018

Published in the November 19, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 22

## 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.