



Written by [Clinton Alexander](#) on February 10, 2016

Pentagon Shackles Military With Climate-change Directives

The Pentagon has handed top military personnel sweeping new directives aimed at combating and dealing with climate change. The new commands dictate that climate change be incorporated into literally every aspect of military training and preparedness — from training troops to joint ventures with allies. In addition to military preparedness and the ability to keep the citizens of our country and armed forces personnel safe, the U.S. military must now concern itself with climate change. Charged with a plethora of new directives, all military personnel must deal with new policies aimed at the ability to “access and manage risks associated with the impacts of climate change.”



The directives came in the form of a report entitled DOD DIRECTIVE 4715.21, CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION AND RESILIENCE. Effective January 14, 2016, the new commands apply to all areas of the United States Military: Military Departments, the Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Staff, the Combatant Commands, the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, the Defense Agencies, the DoD Field Activities, and all other organizational entities within the Department of Defense (DoD).

In order to “maintain an effective and efficient U.S. military,” all Department of Defense (DoD) personnel have been ordered to “adapt current and future operations” to the new directives. When planning and executing missions, military personnel have been ordered to consider any possible current or future climate repercussions and “develop and implement plans and procedures” accordingly.

The secretary of defense has been ordered to “Develop and oversee the implementation of DoD policy on climate change adaptation and resilience.” The military is now under orders to establish climate-change boards, councils, and working groups to “integrate climate change considerations into DoD programs, plans, and policies.” In fact, under the new guidelines, the Department of Defense has even given orders to create modeling and simulation efforts “in support of climate change impact.”

The assistant secretary of defense has been given the responsibility to oversee the “integration of climate change considerations, even to the extent of modifying weapons systems and other military equipment, and weigh future defense expenditures as to their ability to fit the new guidelines.” Overseeing the integration of climate change policies, the assistant secretary must also put into practice new climate-change training and education for the armed forces.

The chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has received new orders as well, among which is to collaborate with allies and partners to “optimize joint exercises and war games incorporating climate change.”



Written by [Clinton Alexander](#) on February 10, 2016

While any possible foresight aimed at preserving the safety, health, and well-being of our military personnel is wise, the new directives seem to place the safety of the environment as the number one concern. Now even combat commanders must take the environment into full consideration, adding new burdens onto personnel who already have the safety of their troops as a top priority.

Retired U.S. Army Lieutenant Colonel and former member of the U.S. House of Representatives Allen West commented recently concerning the new directives:

I suppose this is the reason why the engines on those Navy Riverine assault boats shut down — maybe they'd exceeded some arbitrarily-instituted emissions control levels? What exactly are commanders supposed to do in prioritizing climate change in their operations? Does this mean our tanks, infantry fighting vehicles, amphibious assault vehicles, helicopters, fighter jets, and all other military equipment are supposed to calculate effects on the climate before conducting operations? Will there now be some mandate stating that these types of combat equipment can only be operated for so many hours a day before reaching a "climate change threshold?"

West's comments would be humorous if they did not hit so close to the mark. Increasingly, reputable scientists who hold that sound scientific studies show little or no anthropogenic (man-caused) climate change have seen their names maligned and often their careers placed on the line. Now with a president who holds climate change to be a "foremost national security threat," the idea of forcing stunning new orders and commands centered on "climate change" seems to fit perfectly.

Dakota L. Wood, who served America for two decades in the U.S. Marine Corps, is the senior research fellow for defense programs at The Heritage Foundation. Speaking to the *Washington Times*, Wood said the directive is confused, saying in part, "It includes such a wide variety of issues with no explication or context." Wood is correct; military leaders must now worry not only about the success of a mission and the preservation of American lives, but plan missions and strategies in the same manner as President Obama when he refused to allow troops to engage ISIS fuel trucks in order to avoid an "environmental crisis."

By nature, the U.S. Armed Forces are under governmental control. Having the U.S. president as commander in chief, military personnel are bound to follow the directives no matter the cost, whether that cost comes in the way of funds, resources, time, or lives. So, while many scientists disagree on the extent of "climate change" and the degree to which mankind factors in the equation, the president has paid no heed to their opinion or their science, and the new military directives continue.

Over the years, a multitude of scientists have indeed come forward in dissent. Climate Depot, an "information center on climate news," published a report in December 2010 that documented over 1,000 scientists who have come forward in dissent over anthropogenic climate-change dogma.

In November 2012, the peer reviewed journal *Organizational Studies* surveyed 1,077 professional engineers and geoscientists. From that study, only one consensus came to light: The vast majority of respondents held that nature, not mankind, was the primary cause of recent climate change. Only 36 percent of those surveyed believed that humans were creating a global-warming crisis.

In the article [Meet the Climate Realists](#), *The New American* highlights Art Robinson, Ph.D. Said Robinson, "You can't prove science by polling. It doesn't matter how many scientists sign up behind an idea. It's no merit with respect to whether the idea is true or false." Robinson is correct, and more than 31,000 scientists have signed his petition to the United States government to "reject the global warming agreement that was written in Kyoto, Japan in December 1997, and any other similar



Written by [Clinton Alexander](#) on February 10, 2016

proposals.”

While significant numbers of reputable scientists not only debate, but outright disagree with, the idea of man-made climate change, President Obama has stated that there is no longer a debate on the subject. Claiming (falsely) the scientific community to be in near 100-percent agreement, the president has not only made congressionally-unauthorized commitments at the Paris Climate Conference (COP21), but is now enjoying his place as commander in chief of a military that must now consider climate impact before all else.

As the president, others in Congress, and an often-complicit mainstream media preach the religion of anthropogenic climate change, reputable scientists who respectfully disagree must be heard. Their opinion, logic, and indeed their science, must be heard. Allowing them to be shouted down as “climate deniers” is unacceptable. Many areas of life may be affected by new climate-change laws and agreements, not the least of which is the readiness and ability of the U.S. military to carry out its duties in a safe and effective manner.



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.