



Written by [Alex Newman](#) on April 24, 2019

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

Trump Climate Panel Attacked

When documents emerged showing that the Trump administration was preparing to create a committee to review federal “climate science,” alarmists became apoplectic, claiming the panel would be entirely composed of “climate deniers,” despite only one person’s name being released. The climate lobby’s hysteria over President Donald Trump and “global warming,” already thought to be at dangerous levels, went up another notch to unprecedented new heights. A coalition of globalist national security professionals, mostly from the Obama administration, even claimed reviewing the science would be a threat to “national security.” Two Cabinet secretaries from the Obama administration, former Secretary of State John Kerry and former Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel, joined in.



And considering the panel’s implications, it is easy to see why — their whole “New World Order,” as they call it, is riding on the hypothesis that the gas exhaled by humans is “pollution.” But a powerful truth-seeking coalition is rallying around the administration’s effort to clear the air.

The collective freak-out over Trump’s proposed Presidential Committee on Climate Security (PCCS) highlights the fact that the hysteria surrounding the man-made global-warming hypothesis is unscientific, experts said. And according to skeptical scientists, it proves the need for the committee and suggests that the whole “climate science” edifice must be re-examined by competent, credible experts who have no vested interest in the outcome.

Indeed, more than a few scientists and experts noted that if the science on “climate change” were truly settled, then Democrats, tax-funded climate alarmists, and the establishment media would all be celebrating a new committee to confirm their conclusion. Instead, the shrieking over Trump’s plan to investigate the matter strongly suggests something very fishy is going on, critics argued. There is a good chance that even more ClimateGate-style *fraud* could be revealed.

The clamor over this proposal first broke out in late February. That is when documents emerged showing that the White House was planning a committee of federal scientists. Their job: re-examine widely disputed conclusions on climate change released by government bodies in recent years, and advise the president on the issue. The documents, first reported by the *Washington Post*, showed that the planned PCCS would be organized under the National Security Council.

Despite the feverish reactions, the committee would be a purely advisory body. Its primary task would be “to advise the President on scientific understanding of today’s climate, how the climate might



Written by [Alex Newman](#) on April 24, 2019

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

change in the future under natural and human influences, and how a changing climate could affect the security of the United States,” the documents show, adding that existing “scientific and national security judgments have not undergone a rigorous independent and adversarial scientific peer review to examine the certainties and uncertainties of climate science, as well as implications for national security.”

Especially problematic to the man-made global-warming theorists was the prestigious scientist selected to lead the committee, Princeton University physicist and national security advisor on emerging technologies Dr. William Happer. Happer is a widely respected scientist who happens to disagree with the increasingly discredited hypothesis that man’s emissions of CO₂ — a small fraction of one percent of all the greenhouse gases in the atmosphere — control the climate.

“CO₂ will be good for the Earth,” Happer told *The New American* magazine at a 2016 climate conference in Phoenix that brought together leading scientists and experts in various fields to expose the lies and alarmism (where this reporter was a speaker). “If you look at geological history, CO₂ levels are unusually low right now, it’s very seldom that they’ve been this low. Many plants are not growing as good as they could if they had more CO₂, so CO₂ by itself will be very good for the Earth — more will be a good thing.”

In an on-camera interview from G. Edward Griffin’s Freedom Force International conference on climate change, Dr. Happer also said it was “pretty clear that we’re not going to see dangerous climate change” as a result of human CO₂ emissions. “If nothing else, the Earth has already done this experiment many times, because in the geological past CO₂ levels have been four times, five times, even higher than today, and life flourished all over the Earth and in the oceans too,” he said, adding that climate models have predicted drastically more warming than has been observed in the real world and that the alarmist movement was “vicious” in attacking those who disagree. “So it’s nonsense; [CO₂ is] not a pollutant.”

Photo credit: AP Images

This article appears in the April 22, 2019, issue of The New American.

Alarmist Freak-out

After news of the committee broke, anti-Trump climate alarmists in the media took their cue. Much of the faux outrage and vitriol from the establishment was simply outlandish. CNN, for example, could barely contain its disdain, running a column blasting the climate panel as “a waste of time and money.” Vox, meanwhile, warned that Happer has “bizarre, backward views about climate science.”

Democrats in the House of Representatives sent a furious letter to the president making all sorts of wild demands and claims. A group of a dozen or so Democrat senators went even further, calling the committee “dangerous.” “Climate change is widely acknowledged to be a global threat, and enabling climate skeptics to undermine the views of our nation’s scientific leaders on this critical issue is dangerously misguided for both our national and economic security,” they wrote, claiming that Happer “denies” the “overwhelming body of scientific evidence on the topic.”

But in reality, as this magazine and many other sources have documented, the alleged science upon which the man-made global-warming hysteria is based is highly suspect at best. Self-styled “climate scientists” have been repeatedly exposed in unethical behavior, including hiding and manipulating data that contradicts their hypothesis. And for decades the predictions of the alarmist movement have been



Written by [Alex Newman](#) on April 24, 2019

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

remarkably wrong about virtually everything. From the man-made global-cooling claims of the 1970s and '80s saying that the Arctic ice cap needed to be melted and that a global government should be set up, to the man-made warming theories of recent decades demanding global government and predicting melting ice caps and warmer winters, reality keeps debunking the alarmism.

Even former members of the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) — the body often cited as proof that the “science is settled” — have blown the whistle on massive fraud, only to be ignored or demonized by alarmists. The New American magazine recently interviewed former UN IPCC sea-level reviewer Dr. Nils-Axel Morner, who resigned and became a whistleblower after the UN body refused to correct easily discredited misinformation on sea levels and other matters despite his bringing it to their attention. “There is no rapid sea-level rise going on today, and there will not be,” he explained, citing observable data and his more than 50 years of research in the field. In fact, he warned of a looming cooling period: “On the contrary, if anything happens, the sea will go down a little.”

The Implications Are Massive

The debate over climate and the totalitarian solutions being proposed to solve the climate problems have been raging for decades. But with the man-made warming hypothesis imploding, the battle is coming to a head. Independent physicist John Droz, who is working with a network of concerned scientists against the corruption of science, argued that the 30-year battle has reached a pivotal juncture with the proposed committee. If it succeeds, skeptics may win. If it fails, alarmists may win. And now, say sources, under tremendous pressure from the establishment media, the Democrat Party, Deep State swamp creatures, and even a handful of fringe “Republicans in Name Only” (RINOs), the administration is re-considering the committee and its mission.

In commentary about the ongoing uproar, Droz noted the absurdity of claiming a new committee would be a waste of money when the price tag for “climate” schemes is in the tens of trillions of dollars. “If the U.S. was about to spend an enormous amount of money, would you say that an investigation costing one-billionth(!) of the expenditure, would be a waste of money?” Droz asked, calling it the “\$64 trillion question.” “That’s what we are talking about here.” He also refuted the “waste of time” objection, noting that Trump has already made clear that without new facts, he does not intend to do anything consequential on the climate front.

As for the objection that the “science is settled,” Droz again highlighted the absurdity and unscientific nature of the claim. The issue of whether man’s CO2 emissions are driving dangerous warming or climate changes has not been resolved, he said. A genuine scientific assessment would require four components: It should be comprehensive, objective, transparent, and empirical. “There has never been a scientific assessment of the Global Warming issue, anywhere on the planet,” Droz observed, adding that the UN IPCC’s assessment reports failed on at least three of the four criteria.

Droz then debunked the false claim that 97 percent of the world’s scientists agree with the man-made warming hypothesis. “Fact one: there never has been a survey of the world’s 2+ million scientists on anything,” he wrote. “Fact two: There may indeed be a majority of certain subsets of scientists that hold an opinion about Global Warming. However, none of them has done a genuine scientific analysis of the Global Warming matter. Fact three: Science is never determined by a vote. Do you think that Einstein’s Theory of Relativity was accepted due to a poll — or because of scientific proof?”

Support Is Growing



Written by [Alex Newman](#) on April 24, 2019

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

Other prominent scientists agreed that the committee was sorely needed. Writing on the Daily Caller, climatologist Patrick Michaels said it was “about time” that a committee examined existing climate science. “And it’s about time that the truly sloppy, shoddy science that the previous administration used be shown in the light of truth,” said Michaels, who wrote seven books on climate, served as the Virginia State Climatologist and president of the American Association of State Climatologists, and was a research professor of environmental sciences at University of Virginia. “Let’s shine the light of truth on the notion that a temperature change equivalent to driving from Washington to Richmond is throwing the world into geopolitical chaos.”

Similarly, in a column for Townhall.com, climate skeptic Paul Driessen, who has degrees in geology and field ecology, derided the opposition to Trump’s committee. “For years, you Democrats, environmentalists, Deep State bureaucrats, government-grant-dependent scientists, news and social media have colluded to censor and silence man-made climate chaos skeptics, and stifle any debate,” he said, noting that the “Climate Industrial Complex” was now a \$2-trillion-per-year global behemoth. “All of you have huge financial, reputational and power stakes in this.”

Driessen explained that the climate alarmists hope to wrap up their “kangaroo court proceedings” without the other side being heard or being allowed to pre-sent evidence and cross-examine alarmist experts. “If your evidence is so solid and unimpeachable, you should be more than happy to lay it on the table, subject it to scrutiny, question our experts, and let us question yours — extensively and mercilessly,” he argued, calling the alarmists’ agenda un-American, totalitarian, anti-science, and more. “After all, the future of our planet is at stake — or so you claim. The future of our country certainly is.”

The ecologist-turned-attorney, author of the book *Eco-Imperialism: Green Power, Black Death*, offered some blunt advice to the president on this issue. “Mr. Trump: Please stand up to these Climate Totalitarians who want to destroy our nation, in the name of saving the planet from climate disasters that exist only in computer models, Hollywood movies, and self-serving assertions from the Climate Industrial Complex,” Driessen suggested. “Appoint your Presidential Committee on Climate Science right now. And may the best science win.”

James Taylor, senior fellow for environment and energy policy at the nonprofit Heartland Institute, said an inclusive climate-change panel is “exactly what we need to get as close to the truth as we can” on global warming. “Up to now, the panels put together by the federal government have been nothing more than a gathering of prominent alarmists rattling off activist talking points,” he told *The New American*. As an example, he noted that one of the lead authors of the widely ridiculed National Climate Assessment, released just before the latest UN global-warming summit, represented the alarmist Union of Concerned Scientists. “Clearly, a climate assessment written by the Union of Concerned Scientists is not credible,” Taylor said.

An objective review would no doubt reveal many such flaws, conflicts of interest, and more. “Alarmists fear and are vigorously objecting to President Trump appointing a science panel because they know an objective review of the science will poke gaping holes in the alarmist storyline,” he said. “But the proposed science panel is not about one side or another winning the debate, it is about discovering scientific truth by critical inquiry rather than political bullying.”

At *American Thinker*, David Archibald, who has lectured on climate science in Senate and House hearing rooms, argued that Dr. Happer’s committee could set the world free from the one-world-order



Written by [Alex Newman](#) on April 24, 2019

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

plotting totalitarians behind the warming hypothesis. “At the moment, the Marxist plotters bang on about the 97 percent scientific consensus on global warming,” he wrote. “They have created a sealed edifice of lies and have maintained it assiduously. After Dr. Happer’s report is released, the mantra of ‘Are you denying the science?’ will be turned on its head. Global warming has been a state-sponsored religion, with its priesthood funded from the public purse to the tune of \$2.5 billion a year in the U.S. alone. The priests of that cult will be plucked off the public teat, and the memory of what they preached will fade.”

Writing for the environmentalist Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow (CFACT), Dr. David Wojick ridiculed one of the pseudo-scientific claims made to undo the committee. In his insightful piece, Dr. Wojick pointed out that much of the hysteria over the examination of the climate hysteria is based on a critical fallacy: the notion that climate alarmism is the same thing as climate science. “This is wildly stupid,” he said. “It just shows that science news outlets like the *Science Mag* and E&E News have no real concept of what is actually going on, namely a serious scientific debate. It is no wonder then, that their readers also do not know what is going on. Even worse, this alarmist fallacy occurs in many other news outlet articles as well.”

The difference really is crucial. “Both alarmism and skepticism are based on climate science, but neither is the whole of climate change science, much less climate science, not even close,” noted Wojick, who has worked for Carnegie Mellon University, the U.S. Office of Naval Research, the Naval Research Lab, and the U.S. Department of Energy. “A quick search reveals that the scientific literature contains over 2 million articles that refer to ‘climate change.’ Alarmism and skepticism are differing claims about what this vast body of research adds up to. They are not that body itself, so it is wildly wrong to equate either view with climate science. The assessment of science is different from the science being assessed.”

Massive Coalition Forms to Back Trump

As the debate escalated, and the implications of it came into focus, a massive coalition of environmental organizations, activists, scientists, experts, and think-tank leaders signed a letter to Trump supporting the committee and Dr. Happer. The coalition supporting Trump and a re-examination of government “climate science” called for an independent scientific review of claims in federal climate reports to help set the record straight once and for all. Analysts said the process could help establish the credibility of government climate science — or the lack thereof.

The coalition letter, signed by almost 40 leading policy organizations and over 100 prominent leaders and scientists, argues that an independent review of federal global-warming reports is “long overdue.” “Serious problems and shortcomings have been raised repeatedly in the past by highly-qualified scientists only to be ignored or dismissed by the federal agencies in charge of producing the reports,” the leaders and organizations explained. Indeed, in multiple cases, federal bureaucracies such as the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the U.S. Department of Energy have been accused of fraudulently manipulating data and findings to support their conclusions.

“Among major issues that have been raised and that we hope the committee will scrutinize: the models used have assumed climate sensitivities to CO₂ concentrations significantly higher than recent research warrants; the models used have predicted much more warming than has actually occurred; predictions of the negative impacts of global warming have been made based on implausible high-end emissions



Written by [Alex Newman](#) on April 24, 2019

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

scenarios; the positive impacts of warming have been ignored or minimized; and surface temperature data sets have been manipulated to show more rapid warming than has actually occurred,” the signatories wrote.

The highly unscientific nature of the claims — many of which cannot be tested or falsified — also casts doubt on the alarmist findings contained in federal climate reports. “An underlying issue that we hope the commission will also address is the fact that so many of the scientific claims made in these reports and by many climate scientists are not falsifiable, that is, they cannot be tested by the scientific method,” explained the letter.

Perhaps the most alarming element of the whole saga is that this supposed science is serving as the pretext for trillions of dollars in government spending, as well as unprecedented empowerment of international bureaucracies such as the UN and its agencies. The man-made global-warming hypothesis also underpins drastic policy changes that restrict individual liberty and free markets. These harm everyone, and especially the world’s poorest people, for nebulous alleged benefits. As such, the science must be thoroughly reviewed, and it must be completely transparent, the coalition said.

“The conclusions and predictions made by these reports are the basis for proposed energy policies that could cost trillions of dollars in less than a decade and tens of trillions of dollars over several decades,” the letter explained. “Given the magnitude of the potential costs involved, we think that taking the insular processes of official, consensus science on trust, as has been the case for the past three decades, is negligent and imprudent. In contrast, major engineering projects are regularly subjected to the most rigorous and exhaustive adversarial review. We suggest that climate science requires at least the same level of scrutiny as the engineering employed in building a bridge or a new airplane.”

Among the lead organizations involved in gathering signatures for the letter was the nonprofit Heartland Institute, a leading scientific think tank on climate issues. The group, which has organized climate conferences and helps put together the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change and its flagship “Climate Change Reconsidered” reports examining the scientific literature, recently released a policy brief highlighting the national security threat to America posed by alarmist-inspired energy restrictions. Also playing a lead role was the Competitive Enterprise Institute. Both organizations, which focus on the environment, helped gather signatures and support.

“An unbiased, independent examination of the science of climate change by an official government body is long overdue,” said former Congressman Tim Huelskamp, Ph.D., president of the Heartland Institute. “It’s only necessary because government bureaucrats have put ideology above science and excluded the wealth of data and research that undermines their narrative that human activity is the main driver of catastrophic climate change.”

Other organizations involved include Heritage Action, FreedomWorks, American Energy Alliance, Citizens Against Government Waste, Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow, Climate Depot, 60 Plus Association, Science and Environmental Policy Project, Institute for Energy Research, Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, International Climate Science Coalition, Eagle Forum, Americans for Limited Government, Energy and Environment Legal Institute, Cornwall Alliance for the Stewardship of Creation, American Commitment, Hispanic Leadership Fund, Alliance for Wise Energy Decisions, and many more.

On the Brink



Written by [Alex Newman](#) on April 24, 2019

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

The tax-funded climate-alarmism lobby is in a panic. And it seems they have good reason to be terrified: After all the many scandals, such as Climategate and the more recent NOAA data suppression, it has become clear that the alarmism is not based on science at all. In reality, what drives the incessant claims that man's insignificant CO2 emissions lead to climate change is the fact that business models, globalism, taxpayer largess, and demands for ever-greater and more intrusive government all depend on the alarmism.

Trump, who has ridiculed the man-made warming hypothesis as a "hoax," is under massive pressure to surrender. For those who value real science, though, it is imperative that the alleged science underpinning alarmism be reviewed by independent experts. Supporters of the effort urge everyone to contact the White House at 202-456-1111 or through the White House Internet address (www.whitehouse.gov/contact) to encourage the president to act.

In the end, if the science were truly settled, the warming "cult," as leading scientists refer to the alarmist movement, would have nothing to fear from a scientific review. Queen Gertrude put it very well in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*: "The lady doth protest too much, methinks." Clearly the alarmists have something to hide.

Photo credit: AP Images



Written by [Alex Newman](#) on April 24, 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.