



Written by [Daniel Sayani](#) on March 3, 2011

Govt Scientists Propose Nuclear War to Curb Global Warming

In what sounds like a page out of George Orwell's classic novel 1984, where "perpetual war for perpetual peace" is the de facto state of affairs, government scientists released a report on Monday, February 28, claiming that an all-out nuclear war is an acceptable and pragmatic solution to the "festering problem" of global warming.



The report was released by scientist [Luke Oman](#) (an employee of the NASA Goddard Space Flight Center in Greenbelt, Maryland), who, along with his colleagues, used a computer-simulated model to determine the climate's response to the smoke from fires brought about by regional nuclear war.

Oman and his colleagues claim that a "relatively confined, regional conflict" involving nuclear weapons would immediately "cool" a globe that they purport to be rapidly warming as a result of human consumption of fossil fuels.

Global Nuclear War for Global Warming Reduction

According to the research, a regional nuclear war would immediately cause average global temperatures to drop by 2.25 degrees Fahrenheit for the next two to three years. The most extremely affected areas (the tropics, Europe, Asia, and Alaska) would cool down by 7.2 degrees, according to computer models. Even a decade after nuclear detonation, average world temperatures would remain nearly a full degree lower.

Scientists believe that such a nuclear explosion would send dust, soot, and ash into the sky, blotting out the sun for weeks. Smoke from the resulting fires would carry five million metric tons of black carbon into the earth's atmosphere, where it would absorb the sun's heat.

Aside from the obvious destruction of human life (ignored by the report) that would result from nuclear war, the ensuing "nuclear winter" would have tragic consequences. The soot emitted from such a nuclear conflict would thin the ozone layer allowing more of the Sun's ultraviolet rays to hit the Earth.

Global precipitation levels would fall by 10 percent, and coupled with the drop in global temperatures and colder air, would result in widespread crop failures, famine, disease, and starvation, the scientists say. Oman [continues](#):

Our results suggest that agriculture could be severely impacted, especially in areas that are susceptible to late-spring and early-fall frosts.

[A precedent for the dangers of global cooling is seen in] the crop failures and famines



Written by [Daniel Sayani](#) on March 3, 2011

experienced following the eruption of the Mount Tambora volcano in Indonesia in 1815. This volcanic eruption ushered in “the year without summer,” a time of famines and unrest.

According to [National Geographic](#):

All these changes would also alter circulation patterns in the tropical atmosphere, reducing precipitation by 10 percent globally for one to four years, the scientists said. Even after seven years, global average precipitation would be 5 percent lower than it was before the conflict, according to the model.

In addition, researcher Michael Mills, of the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Colorado, found large decreases in the protective ozone layer, leading to much more ultraviolet radiation reaching Earth’s surface and harming the environment and people.

Nuclear Proliferation as a Tool of the Environmentalist Menace

Another aspect of the issue that must be considered is the fact that some global warming activists are advocates of nuclear power — a surprising stand, since environmental extremists, now in favor of government mandating a reduction in carbon emissions, were traditionally opposed to the building of nuclear power plants, as well. Their unwarranted fears were heightened by the minor mishap at the [Three Mile Island](#) power plant in 1979, as well as the catastrophic accident at the Ukrainian Soviet [Chernobyl](#) power plant — which lacked the safeguards found in U.S. plants — in 1986. But times have changed and even President Barack Obama, for instance, is a prominent supporter of nuclear power who, in his 2010 budget, proposed to triple federal loan guarantees for new nuclear reactors up to \$54 billion.

As a Senator and as a candidate for President, Obama was an advocate for the nuclear lobby. Employees of the Exelon Corporation, the Chicago-based utility that is the largest operator of nuclear plants in the United States, have been among Obama’s biggest campaign donors, giving him more than \$330,000 over his career, according to the Center for Responsive Politics.

In addition, James Lovelock, developer of the “Gaia Hypothesis,” which typifies the pagan orientation of those who elevate the biosphere to an object of worship, and one of the world’s leading environmentalists, is a prominent advocate of nuclear power. He even established the [organization](#) Environmentalists for Nuclear Power.

Lovelock claims that nuclear power represents the “only viable green power solution,” and has stated in his book *The Ages of Gaia* (named after the Greek goddess of the earth) that a nuclear holocaust would be just another instance of shifting population dynamics:

I have never regarded nuclear radiation or nuclear power as anything other than a normal and inevitable part of the environment. Our prokaryotic forebears evolved on a planet-sized lump of fallout from a star-sized nuclear explosion, a supernova that synthesized the elements that go to make our planet and ourselves.

The continued development of nuclear power is even [identified](#) by Oman as a channel of environmentalist policy-formation:

Moreover some solutions to global warming can contribute to nuclear instability. Nuclear power plants, because of their low greenhouse gas emissions, have been suggested as a way to mitigate global warming, but as part of their fuel cycle can be used as sources of highly-enriched uranium and plutonium, and therefore can be used for nuclear weapons production.



Written by [Daniel Sayani](#) on March 3, 2011

Such environmental influence has even contributed to the nuclear proliferation of America's most heinous enemies in the world. Under the guise of environmentalist advocacy of "green power," Iran and communist North Korea successfully earned the approval of the United Nations and the International Atomic Energy Agency for their sustained development of nuclear weapons.

Perhaps by design, these regimes coaxed the world into granting them approval for a program of massive nuclear proliferation under the deceptive façade of instating "sustainable" energy sources. This Russian- and Chinese-backed geopolitical cabal obtained help from the rest of the world to construct nuclear power plants ostensibly for power production, but with the ulterior motive of building weapons.

Nuclear Population Reduction and the Quest for Climate Sustainability

NASA's latest announcement accompanies an [earlier research](#) report released by Oman, along with other anthropogenic global warming climatologists such as Alan Robock. In 2007, Oman and Robock also claimed that regional nuclear war would result in "sufficient population loss" that would reduce global warming on its own.

This echoes sentiments raised by other environmentalists, whose radical agenda elevates the environment to a status above that of human beings.

Given this philosophical orientation on the worth of human beings, it comes as no surprise that such environmentalists consider nuclear war as an "option" for fulfilling the environmentalist goal of "reducing global warming."

This option indicates the cheapening of human life in the environmentalist perspective. Pursuing a policy of systematic population reduction as a means of curbing global warming has been seriously considered by environmentalists, who loathe the idea of "overpopulation."

While nuclear winter takes this to a more catastrophic level, the link between the population reduction advocates and global warming sycophants is undeniable.

The environmentalist [Sierra Club](#), for instance, advises that Americans support "family-planning programs" as a means of slowing global population growth, in its fact sheet on global warming and population.

It comes as no surprise that the same left-leaning politicians who are endorsed by the Sierra Club and the League of Conservation Voters are also endorsed by Planned Parenthood and NARAL Pro Choice America.

The same anti-human life claims are also advocated by the [United Nations Population Fund](#) (UNPF), which promotes "reproductive rights" (read: contraception and abortion) as a solution for global warming:

There are strong linkages and correlation between population growth and emission of greenhouse gases that cause climate change, and ... communities experiencing high population growth are also most vulnerable to the negative effects of climate change. Gender perspectives [ie. Feminism] must be incorporated into climate policymaking.

The older, less palatable language of "population control" must give way to a new rhetoric which seeks to mitigate population growth through the language of women's rights, reproductive choice, and access to family planning resources. This was a lesson learned at the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development — that the language of population control must be replaced by a rhetoric of environmentally sustainable population dynamics.



Written by [Daniel Sayani](#) on March 3, 2011

In addition, the group Population Connection also advocates the draconian concept of “zero population growth” under the guise that population reduction will curb global warming. In fact, the group says that its main goals are “protecting the planet, defending women’s rights [to family planning services], and ensuring social justice:

One easy and cost-effective way to reduce emissions is to slow the rate of population growth. Contraception is inexpensive and decades of experience allows programs to deliver contraception safely and efficiently. Population stabilization is by no means a panacea for mitigating climate change. It’s time to open a second front in the battle against global warming by stressing the need for population stabilization — sooner rather than later.

While one would hope that environmentalists would not seriously propose nuclear war as a means of curbing global warming (although Oman himself admits that nuclear war would be the quickest way to stop global warming), there is nonetheless a clear and verifiable record of global warming advocates also calling for massive human population reduction.

Such a hypothetical calamity would also be grossly efficient. Explosions from the bombs considered in the study, representing just 0.03 percent of the global nuclear stockpile, would throw approximately five million tons of black carbon into the upper atmosphere, blocking sunlight and causing a plunge in temperature equivalent to a massive volcanic eruption.

Even just one regional nuclear conflict could result in massive global cooling; a nuclear conflict between India and Pakistan could well result in widespread global cooling, for instance, as both countries possess enough nuclear weapons to actualize the research report’s projections.

While environmentalists would achieve their desired goal of efficient population reduction through such a nuclear calamity, the results would be staggering: thousands would be killed, and famine, mass starvation, and genetic diseases, among other horrors, would rear their destructive heads — results desired by this school of environmentalism.

Many environmentalists — eager to impose their “green agenda” — have long championed population reduction, and in recent years have conquered the nuclear bogeyman that once made them foes of nuclear energy to become advocates of the expansive development of nuclear capabilities as an efficient means of curbing the tide of what they perceive as rampant global warming. However, they continue to favor governmental, rather than private enterprise, solutions to environmental and energy challenges. This propensity towards public rather than private enterprise is evident in this latest taxpayer-funded, government-sanctioned research, entitled “Nuclear Warfare for Global Cooling.”



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.



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.

Subscribe