



Written by [William P. Hoar](#) on April 22, 2019

Published in the April 22, 2019 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 35, No. 08

Correction, Please!

Climate, Children, & Coercion

Item: Time, in its print issue for April 1, carries an article entitled “How the Green New Deal Is Forcing Politicians to Finally Address Climate Change.” The GND, according to the magazine, is “equal parts policy proposal and battle cry,” and it calls for the United States “to launch a broad ‘mobilization’ to decarbonize the economy while tackling a slew of other social ills.”



Prominent left-wing politicians have fallen over each other to back the GND. As Time puts it: “Nearly every Democratic candidate for the 2020 presidential nomination has endorsed the Green New Deal. Washington Governor Jay Inslee entered the race on a climate-themed campaign — something unthinkable just a few years ago, when Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump didn’t field a single question about climate change in their presidential debates.”

Item: Governor Jay Inslee, noted The Guardian (U.K.) for March 18, “speaks of [climate change] as an imminent threat to the US and the world.... ‘We have exactly one chance left to defeat climate change — and that’s during the next administration,’ he told a [New Hampshire] crowd.... ‘And when you have one chance at survival, we ought to take it.’”

Item: CNN, among the networks reporting on March 15, commented: “Children in 100 countries around the world are walking out of classrooms today to protest inaction on climate change. They say the governments are failing future generations by not cutting emissions and failing to get global warming under control.”

A CNN reporter highlighted a California seventh-grade activist who was protesting about global warming once a week in New York outside the United Nations headquarters, and promoted her demands for a “complete overhaul of the world’s biggest economy” to combat global warming.

CBS This Morning co-host Gayle King promoted the planned protests “in more than 130 U.S. cities and about 90 countries worldwide.”

Vox for March 14 summarized multiple accounts, describing how “Greta Thunberg, a 16-year-old climate activist from Sweden, has inspired kids in more than 112 countries to skip school.” Said Vox: “Thunberg, who has Asperger syndrome and was nominated Thursday for a Nobel Peace Prize by three Norwegian lawmakers, has managed to both channel and elevate the frustration and fear many young people feel about policymakers’ reticence to take climate change really seriously.”

Correction: It is not a coincidence that children’s marches against “climate change,” with radical activists manipulating youths, have been occurring at the same time as a push in the United States to lower the voting age to 16 for federal elections. In the words of House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.), “I think it’s really important to capture kids when they are in high school when they are interested in all



Written by [William P. Hoar](#) on April 22, 2019

Published in the April 22, 2019 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 35, No. 08

of this, when they are learning about government.” Capture their minds, indeed.

So how are these inexperienced youths obtaining their environmental wisdom? All too much comes from government schools and green propaganda originating from left-wing sources. We taxpayers are actually paying for most of it. Analyst David Wojick, Ph.D., an independent analyst with the Washington D.C.-based Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow (CFACT), asks rhetorically:

As our children skip school to chant climate alarmist slogans, you may wonder “Where do they get this stuff?” Of course they get some of it from their teachers, but these teachers get a lot of it via the U.S. Federal Government.

The sad fact is that a number of federal agencies either maintain or fund websites that specifically exist to push alarmist teaching materials. In many cases these alarmist materials are also federally funded.

He offers a long list of such sources. One includes various games and videos for young children from a NASA website called “Climate Kids.” Writes Dr. Wojick, “Here is part of the green message: ‘Some of the ways you can help may have to wait until you are a little older — like choosing an energy-efficient car, installing solar panels on the roof of your house, or choosing a green career.’”

The alarmists say here is our coming brave new world: America will be virtually 100-percent dependent on renewables in a decade. This, despite the fact that (according to 2017 figures of the U.S. Energy Information Administration) renewable energy sources now account for just around 11 percent of total U.S. energy consumption, after decades of government subsidies to promote them.

Also keep in mind that the Green New Deal is about more than lowering emission percentages. The GND offered by Pied Piper Representative Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (D-N.Y.) — with versions being echoed by so many would-be Democrat presidents — seemingly promises an eco-heaven on Earth. As summarized by Chris Edwards of the Cato Institute, it will

push the nation to reach zero greenhouse gases, upgrade all buildings, generate all power with zero emissions, overhaul transportation, and generate “massive growth” in clean manufacturing. It would supposedly provide all people education, training, a good job, high-quality health care, affordable and safe housing, economic security, clean water, clean air, healthy and affordable food, and access to nature.

It would do all this with spending, regulations, and government “ownership stakes.”

The plan’s promoters don’t like to talk about expenditures, in large part because this panacea can supposedly be covered by simply printing more money (the linchpin of Modern Money Theory). On the other hand, a columnist for the *Wall Street Journal* has pointed out that this “plan to socialize and reorganize much of the U.S. economy” really would not be free, with “a cost that by one estimate could approach \$100 trillion in the first decade.”

It’s a socialist grab bag, salted with “social justice,” including a demand to “promote justice and equity by stopping current, preventing future, and repairing historic oppression of indigenous communities, communities of color, migrant communities, deindustrialized communities.”

With such a magic potion available, it’s surprising these verdant New Dealers didn’t mandate an antidote for the heartbreak of psoriasis.

The socialist GND, with its “10-year national mobilization” goal, is arguably twice as presumptuous as



Written by [William P. Hoar](#) on April 22, 2019

Published in the April 22, 2019 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 35, No. 08

the Five-Year Plans in the USSR, which failed to achieve their goals every five years.

The greenies say this immense power play is necessary because, well, otherwise, there will be worldwide catastrophe. True enough, we did read that in the paper not long ago — so it must be true. Here's the word, via the Associated Press — sourced through the United Nations, which gives it a universal imprimatur:

A 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 by the year [xxxx].

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.

He said governments have a 10-year window of opportunity to solve the greenhouse effect before it goes beyond human control.

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 Associated Press in an interview on Wednesday.

Coastal regions will be inundated; one-sixth of Bangladesh could be flooded, displacing a fourth of its 90 million people. A fifth of Egypt's arable land in the Nile Delta would be flooded, cutting off its food supply, according to a joint UNEP and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency study....

Shifting climate patterns would bring back 1930s Dust Bowl conditions to Canadian and U.S. wheatlands, while the Soviet Union could reap bumper crops if it adapts its agriculture in time, according to a study by UNEP and the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis.

Perhaps you noticed that odd "xxxx" in the above first quoted sentence. (We did alter that to add suspense). That mention of the Soviet Union might have given you a clue about the age of the wire-service dispatch. Here's the kicker: The date on the apocalyptic AP account was *June 29, 1989*. The augured "xxxx" deadline was set at the year 2000 — so millions of us must be under water by now.

Actually, this is one of the countless (and feckless) prognostications asserting that "the world is ending" that have been disseminated over the years by greenster doomsayers.

Short-term models have their uses. But pretending that we can know the state of the world in, say, 100 years — with specifics and hard numbers based on current technology — does not make for a particularly good guess.

Not long ago, this writer was rereading a work by the estimable Michael Crichton. Among his many books is *State of Fear*, which has a copyright date of 2004 and was blasted by the *New York Times* in January 2005 because it tore holes in the establishment's global-warming scare. The late Crichton was more than a very successful fiction writer; he was also a screenwriter and film director and producer. He graduated summa cum laude from Harvard College, received his M.D. from Harvard Medical School, and was a postdoctoral fellow at the Salk Institute for Biological Studies. Crichton taught courses in anthropology at Cambridge University and writing at MIT.

In Crichton's remarks on January 17, 2003 at the California Institute of Technology, he also disparaged the very long-term computer models so favored by eco-radicals. These days, he said, large-scale computer models were generating their own data. "No longer are models judged by how well they reproduce data from the real world — increasingly, models provide the data. As if they were themselves



Written by [William P. Hoar](#) on April 22, 2019

Published in the April 22, 2019 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 35, No. 08

a reality.”

In that lecture, Crichton speculated about how people in, say, New York in 1900 might worry about horse pollution a century later. Yet, as he said, within a few years, “nobody rode horses except for sport.” Moreover, in 2000, “France was getting 80% its power from an energy source that was unknown in 1900. Germany, Switzerland, Belgium and Japan were getting more than 30% from this source, unknown in 1900”:

Remember, people in 1900 didn’t know what an atom was. They didn’t know its structure. They also didn’t know what a radio was, or an airport, or a movie, or a television, or a computer, or a cell phone, or a jet, an antibiotic, a rocket, a satellite, an MRI, ICU, IUD, IBM, IRA, ERA, EEG, EPA, IRS, DOD, PCP, HTML, internet, interferon, instant replay, remote sensing, remote control, speed dialing, gene therapy, gene splicing, genes, spot welding, heat-seeking, bipolar, prozac, leotards, lap dancing, email, tape recorder, CDs, airbags, plastic explosive, plastic, robots, cars, liposuction, transduction, superconduction, dish antennas, step aerobics, smoothies, twelve-step, ultrasound, nylon, rayon, teflon, fiber optics, carpal tunnel, laser surgery, laparoscopy, corneal transplant, kidney transplant, AIDS.

None of this would have meant anything to a person in the year 1900. They wouldn’t know what you are talking about.

Today, much as Crichton pointed out almost two decades ago, we are trying to create national policy based on the presumed state of the world of 2100. The long-term models, he noted, “just carry the present into the future. They’re bound to be wrong. Everybody who gives a moment’s thought knows it.”

Well, perhaps not *everybody*. Many folks, in Washington and elsewhere, apparently don’t have two significant thoughts to rub together.

What if we really did inflict the United States with the Green New Deal? Well, as pointed out by Nicolas Loris, a fellow in energy and environmental policy at the Heritage Foundation, this country could cut its carbon dioxide “100 percent and it would not make a difference in abating global warming.” In a February analysis, Loris continued:

[If one uses the same] climate sensitivity (the warming effect of a doubling of carbon dioxide emissions) as the U.N.’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change assumes in its modeling, the world would be only 0.137 degree Celsius cooler by 2100. Even if we assumed every other industrialized country would be equally on board, this would merely avert warming by 0.278 degree Celsius by the turn of the century.

We’re not fretting all that much about the minutiae of life in 2100. Is that short-sighted? Maybe. After all, we hear that there are a lot of fortune-tellers who are getting out of the business: It seems the future isn’t what it used to be.

— William P. Hoar

Photo credit: AP Images



Written by [William P. Hoar](#) on April 22, 2019


Published in the April 22, 2019 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 35, No. 08

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.