



CLIMATE TRUTH FILE 2020

YOUR 2020 **SKEPTICAL** CLIMATE CHANGE TALKING POINTS REPORT



COMMITTEE FOR A CONSTRUCTIVE TOMORROW

By Marc Morano

Publisher of ClimateDepot.com and author of *The Politically Incorrect Guide to Climate Change*

Released at the United Nations Climate Summit in Madrid (COP 25) on December 10, 2019

CLIMATE DEPOT

How to Talk About Climate Change Issues & Alleged “Solutions” – 2020

INTRODUCTION: Global warming hype and hysteria continue to dominate the news media, academia, schools, the United Nations, and the U.S. government. The Green New Deal being pushed on Capitol Hill and in the 2020 presidential race is based upon “solving” an alleged “climate crisis.”

Teen school-skipping climate activists are testifying to the U.S. Congress and the United Nations and young children are being recruited for lawsuits against the U.S. government for its alleged climate “inaction.” The phrase ‘climate emergency’ has emerged as the favorite for climate campaigners.

But the arguments put forth by global warming advocates grossly distort the true facts on a host of issues, ranging from rising sea levels and record temperatures to melting polar caps and polar bears, among others. In short, there is no “climate crisis” or a “climate emergency.”

The UN, climate activists, the media, and academia are using the climate scare as an opportunity to lobby for their alleged “solutions” which require massive government expansion and central planning.

This talking points memo is designed to arm people with the voices of the rising number of scientists, the latest data, peer-reviewed studies on key facts so they can better engage in climate change debate with those advocating the UN/Al Gore/Green New Deal positions.

The global warming movement has morphed into a coalition of “climate cause deniers.” They deny the hundreds of causes and variables that influence climate change and instead try to pretend that carbon dioxide is the climate “control knob” overriding all the others factors and they pretend that every bad weather even it somehow “proof” of their “global warming.”

Footnotes and weblinks are provided to source material in this document.

Claims of an alleged “97% consensus” of scientists are “pulled from thin air”

Despite former Vice President Al Gore’s claim in 2019 that [“It’s beyond consensus of 99 percent of the scientists,” the facts say otherwise](#). There is absolutely no scientific “consensus” about catastrophic man-made climate change. Claims that 97 or 99 percent of scientists agree are not backed up by any “credible” study or poll.

UN IPCC lead author Dr. Richard Tol: “The 97% is essentially pulled from thin air, it is not based on any credible research whatsoever.” ¹

The claim that “97% of scientists agree” is in part based on 77 anonymous scientists from a survey. So at least one of the 97% “consensus” claims are not based on thousands of scientists or even hundreds of scientists – but only on 77. ²

Another study, authored by blogger John Cook, claimed 97% consensus of climate studies agree. But scientists [were quick to debunk it](#). Climatologist Dr. David Legates of the University of Delaware and three co-authors reviewed the same studies as did Mr. Cook and their research revealed “only 41 papers – 0.3 percent of all 11,944 abstracts or 1.0 percent of the 4,014 expressing an opinion, and not 97.1 percent – had been found to endorse” the claim that humans are to blame for a majority of the current warming. ³

97% “consensus” is “propaganda”

[MIT Climate Scientist Dr. Richard Lindzen on 97% Consensus: “It is propaganda.”](#)

[Dr. Lindzen](#): “They never really tell you what they agree on. It is propaganda. So all scientists agree it’s probably warmer now than it was at the end of the Little Ice Age. Almost all scientists agree that if you add CO₂ you will have some warming. Maybe very little warming. But it is propaganda to translate that into it is dangerous and we must reduce CO₂, etc.”

Princeton Professor Emeritus of Physics William Happer in 2017 drew parallels to the “consensus” on witches. “I don’t see a whole lot of difference between the consensus on climate change and the consensus on witches. At the witch trials in Salem the judges were educated at Harvard. This was supposedly 100 percent science. The one or two people who said there were no witches were immediately hung. Not much has changed,” Happer quipped.

¹ UN IPCC Lead Author Dr. Richard Tol in testimony to U.S. Congress [Full Committee Hearing – Examining the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Process](#) - May 29, 2014

² UN IPCC Lead Author Dr. Richard Tol - September 3, 2015

³ The Myth of the Climate Change ‘97%’ - JOSEPH BAST And Dr. ROY SPENCER - Wall Street Journal - May 26, 2014

CO₂ is not the “control knob” of the climate

There is a lack of connection between higher levels of CO₂ and warming. During the Ice Age, CO₂ levels were 10 times higher than they are today. ⁴

There are many, many factors which impact climate – including volcanoes, wind oscillations, solar activity, ocean cycles, volcanoes, tilt of the Earth’s axis, and land use. CO₂ is just one factor, and not the control knob of the climate.

University of Pennsylvania geologist Dr. Robert Giegengack has declared, “CO₂ is not the villain that it has been portrayed.”

Today’s levels of roughly 400 parts per million (PPM) of CO₂ are not alarming. In geologic terms, today’s CO₂ levels are among the lowest in earth’s history. ⁵

“Climate change is governed by hundreds of factors, or variables, and the very idea that we can manage climate change predictably by understanding and manipulating at the margins one politically selected factor (CO₂), is as misguided as it gets. Its scientific nonsense,” University of London professor emeritus Philip Stott has noted.

Atmospheric scientist Hendrik Tennekes, a pioneer in the development of numerical weather prediction and former director of research at the Netherlands’ Royal National Meteorological Institute, has declared: “I protest vigorously the idea that the climate reacts like a home heating system to a changed setting of the thermostat: just turn the dial, and the desired temperature will soon be reached.”

According to Greenpeace co-founder Dr. Patrick Moore: “We had both higher temperatures and an ice age at a time when CO₂ emissions were 10 times higher than they are today.” An Ice Age occurred when CO₂ was 10 times higher than today.

There is no “climate emergency”

Princeton Physicist Dr. Will Happer, a former Trump Science Advisor [ripped the claims of a “climate emergency” in 2019.](#)

“We are here [at the UN climate summit in Madrid] under false pretenses, wasting our time talking about a non-existent ‘climate emergency.’” Happer explained from Madrid. “It’s hard to understand how much further the shrillness can go as this started out as ‘global warming’ then it was ‘climate change’ or ‘global weirding’, ‘climate crisis’, ‘climate emergency’. What next? But stick around it will

⁴ Greenpeace Co-Founder Dr. Patrick Moore - Feb. 25, 2014 testimony [before the U.S. Senate Environment & Public Works Committee](#)

⁵ Geologist [Dr. Robert Giegengack, former chair](#) of Department of Earth and Environmental Science at the University of Pennsylvania

happen. I hope sooner or later enough people recognize the holiness of this bizarre environmental cult and bring it to an end."



University of Colorado's Dr. Roger Pielke Jr. [explained how the UN helped shape](#) the hysterical nonsense of a 'climate emergency.' The UN IPCC switched to "extreme scenarios" in the most recent report and thus "helped to create the climate apocalypse, a scary but imaginary future," Pielke explained in 2019.

Pielke Jr.: "The decision by the IPCC to center its fifth assessment report on its most extreme scenario has been incredibly consequential. Thousands of academic studies of the future impacts of climate change followed the lead of the IPCC, and have emphasized the most extreme scenario as 'business as usual' which is often interpreted and promoted as where the world is heading. For instance, so far in 2019 two new academic studies have been published every day that present this most extreme scenario as 'business as usual' and predict extreme future impacts. Journalist promote these sensationalist findings, which are amplified by activists and politicians and as a consequence climate change becomes viewed as being more and more apocalyptic."

Pielke Jr. added: "The bottom line for today is to understand that a fateful decision by the UN IPCC to selectively anoint an extreme scenario from among a huge range of possible futures has helped to create the climate apocalypse, a scary but imaginary future."

Actress [Barbra Streisand helped pioneer the phrase 'climate emergency'](#) back in 2005. Streisand: "Al Gore passionately stressed that our world no longer has a climate problem, we are in a climate emergency." Streisand also told ABC's Diane Sawyer that we were "in a global warming emergency state."

The world is not going to end in 11 or 12 years due to "climate change."

Green New Deal pusher Rep. [Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez \(AOC\) famously predicted in 2019: "We're Like the World Is Going to End in 12 Years if We Don't Address Climate Change."](#)

But relax. AOC is wrong.

"When" vs. "if" or "Could" Environmentalist Michael Shellenberger [ripped the "curious" verb tenses in journal Nature study](#) warning of a "global cascade" of tipping points in 2019. "I interviewed the lead author of the Nature Comment, Professor Timothy Lenton of the University of Exeter, I asked him about a verb tense I found curious. Lenton notes that the West Antarctic ice sheet "might have passed a tipping point" but goes on to say "when this sector collapses, it could destabilize the rest of

the West Antarctic ice sheet like toppling dominoes — leading to about 3 metres of sea-level rise on a timescale of centuries to millennia.”

“When you say ‘when,’” Shellenberger asked, “does that mean it’s an inevitability that it will collapse?”

“Well, we can’t rule out that it’s on the way out,” Lenton said...

“So the right word in your view is ‘when’ not ‘if?’” Shellenberger asked.

Shellenberger also noted: “Justin Ritchie, a researcher at the University of British Columbia, highlighted 11 conditional statements in the four paragraphs summarizing the complicated causality for a ‘global cascade’ of tipping points. ‘I might be the only one,’ writes Ritchie, ‘but after reading it I’m actually less convinced about imminent climate tipping points. One example: if it takes 11 ‘if’ statements to support an opinion, then it’s time to revisit the opinion’s substance.” (The word ‘could’ is used 26 times.)”

Climate Tipping Points date back to at least 1864. Explained: “As early as 1864 George Perkins Marsh, sometimes said to be the father of American ecology, warned that the earth was ‘fast becoming an unfit home for its “noblest inhabitant,” and he warned of “climatic excess, as to threaten the depravation, barbarism, and perhaps even extinction of the species.””

FAMOUS CLIMATE PREDICTIONS

THAT HAVEN'T COME TRUE.

1970



"Between 1980 and 1989, some 4 billion people, including 65 million Americans, would perish in the 'Great Die-Off.'" -Paul Ehrlich

2006



"Humans may have only 10 years left to save the planet from turning into a total frying pan."
-Al Gore

2019



"The world is going to end in 12 years if we don't address climate change."
-Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez

In 1989, the UN was trying to sell their "tipping point" rhetoric to the public. U.N. Warning of 10-Year 'Climate Tipping Point' Began in 1989 – According to the 1989 AP article, "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 2000. Coastal flooding and crop failures would create an exodus of 'eco-refugees,' threatening political chaos."

It's difficult to keep up with whether it is hours, days, months, or a millennium. Here are a few recent examples of others predicting "tipping points" of various duration.

HOURS: [Flashback March 2009: 'We have hours' to prevent climate disaster — Declares Elizabeth May of Canadian Green Party](#)

Days: [Flashback Oct. 2009: UK's Gordon Brown warns of global warming 'catastrophe'; Only '50 days to save world'](#)

Months: Prince Charles claimed a [96-month tipping point in July 2009](#)

Years: [2009: NASA's James Hansen Declared Obama Only Has First Term to Save The Planet! — 'On Jan. 17, 2009 Hansen declared Obama only 'has four years to save Earth' or Flashback Oct .2009: WWF: 'Five years to save world'](#)

Decades: [1982: UN official Mostafa Tolba, executive director of the UN Environment Program \(UNEP\), warned on May 11, 1982, the 'world faces an ecological disaster as final as nuclear war within a couple of decades unless governments act now.'](#)

A Millennium: [Flashback June 2010: 1000 years delay: Green Guru James Lovelock: 'Climate change may not happen as fast as we thought, and we may have 1,000 years to sort it out'](#)

Perhaps the best summary of the tipping-point phenomenon comes from UK scientist Philip Stott. "In essence, the Earth has been given a 10-year survival warning regularly for the last fifty or so years. We have been serially doomed," Stott explained.

Scientists reject CO₂'s alleged magical powers?

[MIT Climate Scientist Dr. Richard Lindzen explained that believing CO₂ controls the climate "is pretty close to believing in magic."](#) " Doubling CO₂ involves a 2% perturbation to this budget. So do minor changes in clouds and other features, and such changes are common. In this complex multifactor system, what is the likelihood of the climate (which, itself, consists in many variables and not just globally averaged temperature anomaly) is controlled by this 2% perturbation in a single variable? Believing this is pretty close to believing in magic," Lindzen explained.

President Trump's "own scientists" DID NOT refute his skeptical climate change views.

The 2018 federal National Climate Assessment warned of dire consequences from man-made global warming. But even a cursory reading of The National Climate Assessment reveals it is a pre-determined report written by environmental activists and overseen by President Obama's former UN Paris climate pact negotiator, Andrew Light. The National Climate Assessment is a political report masquerading as science. The media hyped a rehash of frightening climate change claims by Obama administration holdover activist government scientists. The National Climate Assessment report reads like a press release from environmental pressure groups – because it is. Two key authors are longtime Union of Concerned Scientist activists, Donald Wuebbles and Katharine Hayhoe. [Scientists outside the federal bureaucracy ripped the National Climate Assessment report as "tripe," "embarrassing" and "systematically flawed."](#)

Rising CO₂ is Greening the Planet

A [2018 STUDY revealed that rising carbon dioxide levels are greening the Earth.](#)

The study, published in the journal *Nature Climate Change*, found that “Carbon Dioxide Fertilization” was “Greening Earth.” “From a quarter to half of Earth’s vegetated lands has shown significant greening over the last 35 years largely due to rising levels of atmospheric carbon dioxide,” the study found. It was conducted by an international team of 32 authors from 24 institutions in eight countries and used satellite data from NASA and data from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. “The greening represents an increase in leaves on plants and trees equivalent in area to two times the continental United States,” according to the study.

Prominent scientists say don’t fear CO₂ and instead tout its benefits.

Excerpt from *The Politically Incorrect Guide to Climate Change*: “Einstein’s Successor” Touts the Virtues of Carbon Dioxide: Renowned physicist Freeman Dyson of Princeton’s Institute for Advanced Study, who has been called Einstein’s successor, says, “I like carbon dioxide, it’s very good for plants. It’s good for the vegetation, the farms, essentially carbon dioxide is vital for food production, vital for wildlife.”

Princeton professor Dr. William Happer testified to Congress: “Warming and increased CO₂ will be good for mankind ... CO₂ is not a pollutant and it is not a poison and we should not corrupt the English language by depriving ‘pollutant’ and ‘poison’ of their original meaning.”

MIT climate scientist Richard Lindzen mocked claims that carbon dioxide is dangerous. “CO₂, it should be noted, is hardly poisonous. On the contrary, it is essential for life on our planet and levels as high as 5000 ppm are considered safe on our submarines and on the space station (current atmospheric levels are around 400 ppm, while, due to our breathing, indoor levels can be much higher),” he said in 2017.

Nobel Prize winning scientist Dr. Ivar Giaever explained: “The Earth has existed for maybe 4.5 billion years, and now the alarmists will have us believe that because of the small rise in temperature for roughly 150 years (which, by the way, I believe you cannot really measure) we are doomed unless we stop using fossil fuels...You and I breathe out at least thirty tons of CO₂ in a normal life span, but nevertheless the Environmental Protection Agency decided to classify rising carbon-dioxide emissions as a hazard to human health.”

Ivy League geologist Robert Giegengack, former chair of the Department of Earth and Environmental Science at the University of Pennsylvania, has noted that “for most of Earth’s history, the globe has been warmer than it has been for the last 200 years. It has rarely been cooler.” “I’m impressed by the fact that the present climate, from the perspective of a geologist, is

very close to the coldest it's ever been." Giegengack also said, "The concentration CO₂ in the atmosphere today is the close to the lowest it has ever been." Giegengack has authored two hundred peer-reviewed studies and spent much of his academic career doing field research on the history of climate on almost every continent.

The Green New Deal is neither "Green" or "New"

"Global warming" is merely the latest environmental scare with the same big government solutions. The deal claims to be "a 10-year plan to mobilize every aspect of American society at a scale not seen since World War II to achieve net-zero greenhouse gas emissions."

But the "Green New Deal" has very little to do with the environment or climate. The Deal claims free college or trade schools for every citizen, ensuring "safe, affordable, adequate housing," incomes for all who are "unable or unwilling" to work, etc.

The cost of the Green New Deal is not cheap. Bloomberg News reported in 2019 that it could cost \$93 Trillion (or \$65k per year per family) over 10 years, according to the group American Action Forum. "That includes between \$8.3 trillion and \$12.3 trillion to meet the plan's call to eliminate carbon emissions from the power and transportation sectors and between \$42.8 trillion and \$80.6 trillion for its economic agenda including providing jobs and health care for all."

The Green New Deal is using the "global warming" scare as merely the latest environmental scare with the same solutions of wealth redistribution and central planning. 2019 Green New Deal proposed "solution": Government would have "appropriate ownership stakes" in ALL Green New Deal businesses.

Flashback: The 1970 proposed solution to overpopulation: Amherst College professor Leo Marx warned in 1970 about the "global rate of human population growth. All of this is only to say that, on ecological grounds, the case for world government is beyond argument."

In 2012, then-UN climate chief Christiana Figueres declared she sought a "centralized transformation" that is "going to make the life of everyone on the planet very different" in order to fight "global warming."

Architects of Green New Deal admit it is NOT about the climate

AOC's staff has bragged that the Green New Deal is about wealth redistribution, not climate. Former Ocasio-Cortez [campaign aide Waleed Shahid admitted](#) that Ocasio-Cortez's GND was a "proposal to redistribute wealth and power from the people on top to the people on the bottom."

In addition, [AOC's Chief-Of-Staff Saikat Chakrabarti](#) also revealed that the [Green New Deal was not about climate change](#). *The Washington Post* [reported in 2019](#): Chakrabarti had an unexpected disclosure. "The interesting thing about the Green New Deal," he said, "is it wasn't originally a


climate thing at all.” “Do you guys think of it as a climate thing?” Chakrabarti continued. “Because we really think of it as a how-do-you-change-the-entire-economy thing.”

Even *The New York Times* recognizes the Green New Deal as a cover for other non-environmental issues and economic agendas. [Is the Green New Deal ‘merely a cover for a wish-list of progressive policies?’ asks the NYT Editorial Board.](#) “Is the Green New Deal aimed at addressing the climate crisis? Or is addressing the climate crisis merely a cover for a wish-list of progressive policies and a not-so-subtle effort to move the Democratic Party to the left? At least some candidates – Amy Klobuchar of Minnesota among them – seem to think so... Read literally, the resolution wants not only to achieve a carbon-neutral energy system but also to transform the economy itself,” the *NYT* Editorial Board wrote.

A major labor union (which endorsed Hillary & Obama twice for President) unloaded on the “Green New Deal” in 2019 as “unrealistic manifesto” that will “destroy workers’ livelihoods” and cause “economic and social devastation.” Labor leader Terry O’Sullivan, the President of the Laborers’ International Union of North America, explained, “It is difficult to take this unrealistic manifesto seriously, but the economic and social devastation it would cause if it moves forward is serious and real ... threatens to destroy workers’ livelihoods, increase divisions and inequality, and undermine the very goals it seeks to reach. In short, it is a bad deal.”

Green New Deal Cannot Magically Transform American Energy

Despite the Green New Deal’s lofty rhetoric of phasing out energy such as coal, oil, and gas, the reality is that [in 1908, fossil fuels accounted for 85% of U.S. energy consumption and 100 years later, in 2015, that energy balance is more or less the same.](#)



Folly of wind and solar as climate “solutions”

Time Magazine’s ‘Hero of the Environment’ Michael Shellenberger exposed wind/solar power [claims in 2019, explaining that “renewables can’t save the planet.”](#) “I came to understand the environmental implications of the physics of energy. In order to produce significant amounts of electricity from weak energy flows, you just have to spread them over enormous areas. In other words, the trouble with renewables isn’t fundamentally technical—it’s natural. Dealing with energy sources that are inherently unreliable, and require large amounts of land, comes at a high economic cost,” Shellenberger wrote.

Shellenberger continued: “As for house cats, they don’t kill big, rare, threatened birds. What house cats kill are small, common birds, like sparrows, robins and jays. What kills big, threatened, and endangered birds—birds that could go extinct—like hawks, eagles, owls, and condors, are wind turbines. In fact, wind turbines are the most serious new threat to important bird species to emerge in decades. The rapidly spinning turbines act like an apex predator which big birds never evolved to deal with.”

He added: “In order to build one of the biggest solar farms in California the developers hired biologists to pull threatened desert tortoises from their burrows, put them on the back of pickup trucks, transport them, and cage them in pens where many ended up dying.”

Energy rationing is the result of climate “solutions”

Environmentalist Michael Shellenberger broke from his fellow greens on renewable energy. “We Shouldn’t Be Surprised Renewables Make Energy Expensive Since That’s Always Been The Greens’ Goal,” [Shellenberger explained in 2019.](#)

Shellenberger continued: “Environmentalists have for decades argued that energy is too cheap and must be made more expensive in order to protect the environment. Greens viewed energy as the source of humankind’s destruction of the natural world and sought to restrict energy supplies in order to slow and eventually reverse the destruction. Indeed, the reason environmentalists turned against nuclear energy in the 1960s was that it was cheap and effectively infinite. Greens got the relationship between energy and the environment backward. As people consume higher levels of energy the overall environmental impact is overwhelmingly positive, not negative. As we consume greater amounts of energy we can live in cities, stop using wood as fuel, and afford to have fewer children. And as humans use more energy for agriculture in the form of tractors and fertilizers, we are able to grow more food on less land, allowing marginal lands to return to grasslands, forests, and wildlife. Unlike the original New Deal, a Green New Deal would thus result in what Greens call ‘de-growth,’ not growth.”

Claims of “Hottest Year on Record” are scientifically meaningless

Global temperatures have been holding nearly steady for almost two decades according to satellites from the Remote Sensing Systems (RSS) and University of Alabama at Huntsville (UAH).⁶

[2018 is the 3rd year in a row of cooling global temperatures](#) – So far 2018 was the third year in a row that the globe has cooled off from its El Nino peak set in 2015.

Norwegian Professor [Ole Humlum explained](#) in his 2018 “State of the Climate Report”: “After the warm year of 2016, temperatures last year (in 2018) continued to fall back to levels of the so-called warming ‘pause’ of 2000-2015. There is no sign of any acceleration in global temperature, hurricanes or sea-level rise. These empirical observations show no sign of acceleration whatsoever.”

While 2005, 2010, 2015, and 2016 were declared the “hottest years” or “near -hottest,” based on heavily altered surface data by global warming proponents, a closer examination revealed the claims were “based on year-to-year temperature data that differs by only a few HUNDREDTHS of a degree to tenths of a degree Fahrenheit – differences that were within the margin of error in the data.”⁷

MIT climate scientist Dr. Richard Lindzen ridiculed “hottest year” claims. “The uncertainty here is tenths of a degree. It’s just nonsense. This is a very tiny change period,” Lindzen said. “If you can adjust temperatures to 2/10ths of a degree, it means it wasn’t certain to 2/10ths of a degree.”

In 2015, the Associated Press was forced to [issue](#) a “clarification” on “hottest year” claims, [stating](#) in part: “The story also reported that 2014 was the hottest year on record, according to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and NASA, but did not include the caveat that other recent years had average temperatures that were almost as high – and they all fall within a margin of error that lessens the certainty that any one of the years was the hottest.”

Climatologist Pat Michaels explained that, in any case, the world’s temperature “should be near the top of the record given the record only begins in the late 19th century when the surface temperature was still reverberating from the Little Ice Age.”

“Hottest year” claims are [purely political statements](#) designed to persuade the public that the government needs to take action on man-made climate change. In addition, the claims of “hottest year” are based on surface data only dating back to the late 19th century, and also ignore the temperature revisions made by NASA and NOAA that have enhanced the warming trend by retroactively cooling the past.⁸

⁶ [The Pause Lives on: Global Satellites: 2016 not Statistically Warmer than 1998](#) – Climatologist Dr. Roy Spencer - January 4, 2017


⁷ Dr. David Whitehouse [noted the 'temperature pause never went away'](#) - January 19, 2017

⁸ Climate analyst Tony Heller - [Real Climate Science - February 14, 2017](#)

Earth's temperature is not outside the range of natural variability.

Nobel Prize-winning physicist Ivar Giaever points out that “.8 degrees is what we're discussing in global warming. [Just] .8 degrees. If you ask people in general what it is, they think – it's 4 or 5 degrees. They don't know it is so little.”

Award-winning climate scientist Lennart Bengtsson stated: “We are creating great anxiety without it being justified ... there are no indications that the warming is so severe that we need to panic.”
“The warming we have had the last 100 years is so small that if we didn't have meteorologists and climatologists to measure it we wouldn't have noticed it at all.”




Patrick Moore @EcoSenseNow · Mar 24

Always remember to check the Y-Axis in graphs meant to exaggerate trends. This is the trend in global temperature since 1880 using a Y-Axis that doesn't even span the full range of temperatures commonly found on Earth (-120F - +130F.

Some catastrophe isn't it!

#CelebrateCO2!!



Climatologist Roy Spencer [wrote](#): “Global warming and climate change, even if it is 100 percent caused by humans, is so slow that it cannot be observed by anyone in their lifetime. Hurricanes, tornadoes, floods, droughts and other natural disasters have yet to show any obvious long-term change. This means that in order for politicians to advance policy goals (such as forcing expensive solar energy on the masses or creating a carbon tax), they have to turn normal weather disasters into ‘evidence’ of climate change.”

Many peer-reviewed studies have found the Medieval Warm Period and the Roman Warming Period was as warm or warmer than current temperatures.⁹

⁹ [‘More than 700 scientists from 400 institutions in 40 countries have contributed peer-reviewed papers providing evidence that the Medieval Warm Period was real, global, & warmer than the present’](#) - March 8, 2013

Prominent scientists are bailing out of the so-called “consensus” on “global warming.”

[Renowned Princeton Physicist Freeman Dyson: "I'm 100% Democrat and I like Obama. But he took the wrong side on climate issue, and the Republicans took the right side."](#) Dyson: “The effects of CO₂ on climate are really very poorly understood ... The experts all seem to think they understand it, I don't think they do. ... Climate is a very complicated story. And we may or may not understand it better (in the future). The main thing that is lacking at the moment is humility. The climate experts have set themselves up as being the guardians of the truth and they think they have the truth and that is a dangerous situation.”

[Nobel Prize-Winning Scientist Dr. Ivar Giaever, Who Endorsed Obama Now Says Prez. is "Ridiculous" & "Dead Wrong" on "Global Warming."](#) Dr. Ivar Giaever: “Global warming is a non-problem” – “I say this to Obama: Excuse me, Mr. President, but you're wrong. Dead wrong.” “Global warming really has become a new religion.”¹⁰

[Climate scientist Dr. Anastasios Tsonis retires, then declares “I am a skeptic” in 2019 – Offers to debate – Rejects ‘denier’ label: ‘We don’t live in medieval times.’](#) Tsonis, an emeritus distinguished professor at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, authored more than 130 peer-reviewed papers and nine books. “I am a skeptic not just about global warming but also about many other aspects of science. ... Climate is too complicated to attribute its variability to one cause. We first need to understand the natural climate variability (which we clearly don't; I can debate anybody on this issue). Only then we can assess the magnitude and reasons of climate change.” “If science were settled, then we should pack things up and go home,” he added. “The fact that scientists who show results not aligned with the mainstream are labeled deniers is the backward mentality. We don't live in medieval times,” he added.

[Green Guru James Lovelock reverses belief in "global warming": Now says "I'm not sure the whole thing isn't crazy."](#) Condemns Green movement: “It's a religion really, It's totally unscientific.”¹¹

UN IPCC Japanese Scientist Dr. Kiminori Itoh, an award-winning PhD environmental physical chemist: Global warming fears are the “worst scientific scandal in history ... When people come to know what the truth is, they will feel deceived by science and scientists.”¹²

UN IPCC Lead Author Dr. Richard Tol ripped the warmist narrative: Tol called Gore's claims “complete madness.” “It disturbs me hearing people like Al Gore say that he is worried about the future of his grandchildren. Complete madness.”¹³

¹⁰ 65th Nobel Laureate [Conference in Lindau, Germany - July 1,, 2015](#)

¹¹ UK [Guardian - Sept. 30, 2016](#)

¹² [Climate Depot Special Report - August 21, 2013](#)

¹³ Climate Depot [Special Report - January 7, 2016](#)

Green New Deal would have NO impact on climate even if you believe the UN & Al Gore's scientific claims

[A 2019 study by American Enterprise Institute found that Green New Deal Would Have 'No Effect' On Climate Change – even if you use UN 'science,' GND's temperature impact would be 'barely distinguishable from zero'.](#) Excerpt: A new study from the American Enterprise Institute: “In total, completely enacted, funded, and efficiently meeting goals, – things AEI does not anticipate the GND would ever do -- – the full plan would cut the global increase in temperature by a whopping “0.083 to 0.173 degrees,” a number, the report says, is “barely distinguishable from zero.”

In 2019, [Climatologist Dr. Patrick Michaels ran the Green New Deal's alleged climate impact](#) through the National Center for Atmospheric Research's so-called “MAGICC” climate model simulator, developed with funding from the Environmental Protection Agency. The results? “I seriously think the effect would – at best – be barely detectable in the climate record,” Patrick Michaels explained. “The year-to-year variation is very close to the total amount of warming that would be ‘saved’ by 2100, according to EPA's own model,” Michaels said.

Green New Deal, EPA policies & UN pacts are not an “insurance policy” against “climate change.”

Would anyone purchase fire insurance on their home that had a huge upfront premium for virtually no payout if you home burned down? If you answered YES to such an “insurance” policy, then Congress, the EPA, and the UN have a deal for you with their “climate” regulations. If we actually did face a man-made climate crisis and we had to rely on the U.S. Congress or the United Nations to save us, we would all be DOOMED.

Youth climate activists badly misled by adults (who should know better)

Teen school-striking activist Greta Thunberg has declared: “I want you to feel the fear I feel.” Thunberg also explains: “[This is my cry for help. Why should we be studying for a future that's soon to be no more?](#)”

Thunberg told the UN in 2019, “How dare you!?” “This is all wrong. I shouldn't be up here. I should be back at school on the other side of the ocean...You have stolen my dreams and my childhood with your empty words.”



“Nobody takes you seriously unless you’re a 16-year-old schoolgirl”

Other teen climate activists continue to claim that governments can “fix” the climate. [Seattle teen Jamie Margolin testified to Congress in 2019](#): “Everyone who will walk up to me after this testimony saying I have such a bright future ahead of me, will be lying to my face. It doesn’t matter how talented we are, how much work we put in, how many dreams we have, the reality is, my generation has been committed to a planet that is collapsing.” She demanded “urgent climate action” in order to “salvage life on earth” and begin “climate recovery.”

But policies such as the Green New Deal, the UN Paris climate pact, carbon taxes, or EPA rules, would not be able to “salvage” the planet even if we actually did face a climate “emergency” – which we don’t.

Environmentalist Michael Shellenberger, honored by Time Magazine as a “hero of the environment” [pushed back hard on scaring kids](#) in 2019, explaining that “climate alarmism hurts us all.”

Shellenberger explained: “I am concerned by the rising eco-anxiety among young people. My daughter is 14 years old. While she herself is not scared, in part because I have explained the science to her, she told me many of her peers are.”

Shellenberger continued: “Several people asked me about climate ‘tipping points,’ such as the collapse of ice sheets from Antarctica and Greenland, the escape of methane gas from melting tundra, the slowing of circulation in the Atlantic ocean, and the drying out and burning up of the Amazon. In response I pointed out that nowhere does IPCC predict any of those things would be

catastrophic to human civilization much less apocalyptic...There is simply no science that supports claims that rising sea levels threaten civilization much less the apocalypse.”

[Oklahoma students walked out of school in 2019, demanding better policies on climate: “We have created a system of prioritizing oil & gas over people’s lives,” they claimed.](#) But in reality, fossil fuels have created a system that prioritizes human achievement and environmental improvement. As societies use oil and gas to develop, they develop wealth and infrastructure which ultimately clean up the air and water and eliminated slash and burn agriculture. Modern societies are not “addicted” to oil or gas, they are “addicted” to longer life, better health, lower infant mortality rates and more resilience to bad weather events.

The Green New Deal, the UN Paris agreement, carbon taxes, and EPA regulations can’t control the climate

University of Pennsylvania Geologist Dr. Robert Giegengack noted: “None of the strategies that have been offered by the U.S. government or by the EPA or by anybody else has the remotest chance of altering climate if in fact climate is controlled by carbon dioxide.”¹⁴

Danish statistician Dr. Bjorn Lomborg, the President of the Copenhagen Consensus Center, noted in 2017 about the UN Paris agreement: “We will spend at least one hundred trillion dollars in order to reduce the temperature by the end of the century by a grand total of three tenths of one degree ... the equivalent of postponing warming by less than four years. ... Again, that is using the UN’s own climate prediction model.” Lomborg added: “If the U.S. delivers for the whole century on President Obama’s very ambitious rhetoric, it would postpone global warming by about eight months at the end of the century.”

[In 2015: President Obama’s EPA Chief admitted the regulations have no measurable climate impact. - “One one-hundredth of a degree?” EPA Chief McCarthy defends regs as “enormously beneficial” – Symbolic impact.](#)

[Former Obama Department of Energy Assistant Secretary Charles McConnell slammed EPA climate regs as “Falsely sold as impactful” – “All U.S. annual emissions will be offset by 3 weeks of Chinese emissions.”](#)

Sea level rise is not accelerating

Sea levels have been rising since the last ice age. Global sea levels have been naturally rising for ~20,000 years. There is no evidence of an acceleration of sea level rise, and therefore no evidence of any effect of mankind on sea levels. According to tide gauges, sea levels are rising LESS than the

¹⁴ Climate Depot [Special Report - November 2016](#)

thickness of one nickel (1.95 mm thick) per year or about the thickness of one penny (1.52 mm thick) a year. ¹⁵

Former NASA Climatologist Dr. Roy Spencer's research showed: "Sea level rise, which was occurring long before humans could be blamed, has not accelerated and still amounts to only 1 inch every 10 years."

Norwegian Professor Ole Humlum [explained in his 2018 "State of the Climate Report"](#): "Data from tide gauges all over the world suggest an average global sea-level rise of 1–1.5 mm/year, while the satellite record suggests a rise of about 3.2 mm/year. The large difference between the two data sets still has no broadly accepted explanation."

University of Pennsylvania Geologist Dr. Robert Giegengack explains, "At the present rate of sea-level rise it's going to take 3,500 years to get up there [to Al Gore's predicted rise of 20 feet]. So if for some reason this warming process that melts ice is cutting loose and accelerating, sea level doesn't know it. And sea level, we think, is the best indicator of global warming."

Miami is sinking

Climatologist Dr. Roy Spencer's research on Miami flooding and sea level rise: "That flooding is mostly a combination of (1) natural sea level rise (I show there has been no acceleration of sea level rise beyond what was already happening since the 1800s), and (2) satellite-measured sinking of the reclaimed swamps that have been built upon for over 100 years in Miami Beach."

Instead of debating climate, activists have now been calling for jailing skeptics

Instead of engaging in debates, prominent climate activists now call for jailing skeptics. Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., declared he wanted to jail his climate skeptics. "They ought to be serving time for it," Kennedy said in 2014.

And [Bill Nye "The Science Guy" entertained the idea of jailing climate skeptics for "affecting my quality of life" in 2016, while U.S. Senators and top UN scientists called for RICO-style charges against skeptics.](#)

A [Danish academic even suggested that UN might use military force to enforce the climate agenda.](#) In an [interview](#) Professor Ole Wæver, an international relations professor at the University of Copenhagen, warned in 2019: "If there was something that was decided internationally by some more centralized procedure and every country was told 'this is your emission target, it's not

¹⁵ Hockey [Schtick website - August 25, 2014](#)

negotiable, we can actually take military measures if you don't fulfil it', then you would basically have to get that down the throat of your population, whether they like it or not."

The UN and other organizations push manmade "global warming" fears to further a political agenda

The UN and EPA regulations are pure climate symbolism designed to promote a more centrally planned energy economy. The UN and EPA regulations are simply a vehicle to put politicians and bureaucrats in charge of our energy economy and "save" us from bad weather and "climate change."

UN official Ottmar Edenhofer, co-chair of the IPCC Working Group III, admitted what's behind the climate issue: "One must say clearly that we redistribute de facto the world's wealth by climate policy ... One has to free oneself from the illusion that international climate policy is environmental policy. This has almost nothing to do with environmental policy anymore." ¹⁶

In 2009, former Vice President Al Gore touted U.S. cap-and-trade legislation as a method to help bring about "global governance." ¹⁷

UN climate chief Christiana Figueres declared in 2012 that she is seeking a "centralized transformation" that is "going to make the life of everyone on the planet very different." ¹⁸

Greta Thunberg [explained](#) in 2019: "The climate crisis is not just about the environment. It is a crisis of human rights, of justice, and of political will. Colonial, racist, and patriarchal systems of oppression have created and fueled it. We need to dismantle them all. Our political leaders can no longer shirk their responsibilities."

Thunberg's advisor, environmentalist [George Monbiot explained in 2019 that in order to prevent "climate breakdown," a complete change to our way of life has to occur: "We've got to go straight to the heart of capitalism and overthrow it," Monbiot explained.](#)

¹⁶ Interview with [UN IPCC's Ottmar Edenhofer - November 13, 2010](#)

¹⁷ Al Gore remarks - [July 7, 2009 at Oxford during the Smith School World Forum on Enterprise and the Environment](#)

¹⁸ [UK Guardian - November 21, 2012](#)



BY
PAUL MASON

UK 26 JUNE 2019

Tackling the climate crisis means the end of capitalism as we know it

Centralised state intervention, planning and ownership could be the only way to achieve the rapid reduction in carbon emissions we need.

The UN IPCC climate panel is a political organization masquerading as a scientific body

After extensive analysis, climate data analysis John Mclean concluded: “The UN IPCC is, in fact, no more than a craftily assembled government-supported lobby group, doing what lobby groups usually do.”¹⁹ Essentially, the UN IPCC is a lobbying organization that seeks to enrich the UN by putting it in charge of “solving” climate change. If the UN fails to find man-made global warming a problem, it no longer has a reason to continue the climate panel and therefore cannot be in charge of proposing “solutions” to climate change.

“The IPCC has actually become a closed circuit; it doesn’t listen to others. It doesn’t have open minds ... I am really amazed that the Nobel Peace Prize has been given on scientifically incorrect conclusions by people who are not geologists,” said [Indian geologist Dr. Arun D. Ahluwalia at Punjab University](#) and a board member of the UN-supported International Year of the Planet.

One [UN IPCC Lead Author revealed that during the climate report process, the UK Daily Mail reported that Robert Stavins of Harvard’s Professor of Business and Government “was one of only two scientists present, surrounded by ‘45 or 50’ government officials.”](#)

Climatologist Dr. Judith Curry [warned in 2019](#) of the UN led “drive to manufacture a scientific consensus” and the ‘tremendous political pressure on scientists’ to support policy making goals. Curry explained: “For the past three decades, the climate policy ‘cart’ has been way out in front of the scientific ‘horse’. The 1992 Climate Change treaty was signed by 190 countries before the balance of scientific evidence suggested even a discernible observed human influence on global climate. The 1997 Kyoto Protocol was implemented before we had any confidence that most of the recent warming was caused by humans. There has been tremendous political pressure on the

¹⁹ Climate data analyst John McLean - “The IPCC’s Fatal Founding Flaw” - [Quadrant Online - January 17, 2013](#)

scientists to present findings that would support these treaties, which has resulted in a drive to manufacture a scientific consensus on the dangers of manmade climate change. Fossil fuel emissions as the climate 'control knob' is a simple and seductive idea. However this is a misleading oversimplification, since climate can shift naturally in unexpected ways." ... We have no idea how natural climate variability (solar, volcanoes, ocean circulations) will play out in the 21st century, and whether or not natural variability will dominate over man-made warming."

Poor nations suffer most under climate policies

The alleged global warming "solution" of limiting emissions does not control climate, but hurts poor nations. Attempting to control weather and climate will have no impact on climate, but a huge impact on economic development of poor, developing nations due to so-called "solutions" of global warming that would limit development and ban many forms of life-saving carbon-based energy. Prof. Roger Pielke, Jr. warned that climate activists "promote green imperialism that helps lock in poverty" and "climate policy robs the world's poor of their hopes." ²⁰ An estimated 1 billion people still live without running water and electricity in the world. ²¹

In 2016 *The New Yorker* dubbed it "the Climate Summit of Money" at the UN - "It will cost sixteen & a half trillion dollars for world to meet its collective Paris goals." ²²

Environmentalist Michael Shellenberger [further explained in 2019](#): "Economic development has made us less vulnerable, which is why there was a 99.7% decline in the death toll from natural disasters since its peak in 1931. In 1931, 3.7 million people died from natural disasters. In 2018, just 11,000 did. And that decline occurred over a period when the global population quadrupled..."

What about claims of crop failure, famine, and mass death? That's science fiction, not science. Humans today produce enough food for 10 billion people, or 25% more than we need, and scientific bodies predict increases in that share, not declines. The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) forecasts crop yields increasing 30% by 2050. And the poorest parts of the world, like sub-Saharan Africa, are expected to see increases of 80 to 90%....Wheat yields increased 100 to 300% around the world since the 1960s, while a study of 30 models found that yields would decline by 6% for every one-degree Celsius increase in temperature...


All of this helps explain why IPCC anticipates climate change will have a modest impact on economic growth. By 2100, IPCC projects the global economy will be 300 to 500% larger than it is today. Both IPCC and the Nobel-winning Yale economist, William Nordhaus, predict that warming of

²⁰ "Climate policy robs the world's poor of their hopes" - [Dr. Roger Pielke and Daniel Sarewitz - Financial Times](#) - February 26, 2014

²¹ Reuters - [May 19, 2015 - One in seven people still live without electricity - World Bank](#)

²² *The New Yorker* magazine - ["THE CLIMATE SUMMIT OF MONEY"](#) - By Katy Lederer - February 24, 2016

2.5°C and 4°C would reduce gross domestic product (GDP) by 2% and 5% over that same period.”



Climate activists and the media confusing carbon dioxide with “pollution”

CO₂ is not “pollution.” The term “carbon pollution” is unscientific and misleading. Carbon Dioxide – CO₂ – is a harmless trace essential gas in the atmosphere that humans exhale (after inhaling oxygen).

Princeton Physicist Dr. Will Happer has said: “To call carbon dioxide a pollutant is really Orwellian.

You are calling something a pollutant that we all produce. Where does that lead us eventually?" ²³

Polar bear extinction fears not based on data

[New 2019 Study: Polar bears 'thriving' as their numbers may have 'quadrupled' – Attempts to silence research](#) - In *The Polar Bear Catastrophe That Never Happened*, a book published today by the Global Warming Policy Foundation (GWPF), Dr. Susan Crockford concludes that polar bears are actually thriving: "My scientific estimates make perfect sense and they tally with what the Inuit and other Arctic residents are seeing on the ground. Almost everywhere polar bears come into contact with people, they are much more common than they used to be. It's a wonderful conservation success story."

[STUDY: Polar bear numbers reach new highs – Population increases to the highest levels in decades.](#) "Far from the 2007 predictions of a 67% decline in global polar bear numbers, the new report reveals that numbers have risen to the highest levels in decades. The US Geological Survey estimated the global population of polar bears at 24,500 in 2005. In 2015, the IUCN Polar Bear Specialist Group estimated the population at 26,000 (range 22,000–31,000)⁷ but additional surveys published 2015–2017 brought the total to near 28,500. However, data published in 2018 brought that number to almost 29,500⁹ with a relatively wide margin of error. This is the highest global estimate since the bears were protected by international treaty in 1973."

Gore makes no mention of polar bears in his sequel

The polar bear catastrophe that never happened has been so embarrassing that Al Gore, after helping make the bears the poster child of his cause in his first film, failed to even mention them once in his 2017 sequel.

The International Union for the Conservation of Nature 2017 estimate of the current polar bear population is "the highest estimate in 50 years." ²⁴

Evolutionary biologist and paleozoologist Dr. Susan Crockford of the University of Victoria: "Polar bears have survived several episodes of much warmer climate over the last 10,000 years than exists today." ²⁵

She also wrote, "There is no evidence to suggest that the polar bear or its food supply is in danger of disappearing entirely with increased Arctic warming, regardless of the dire fairy-tale scenarios predicted by computer models."

²³ Dr. Will Happer's remarks at climate summit sponsored by the [Texas Public Policy Foundation - November 19, 2015](#)

²⁴ *The Washington Times* - Susan Crockford, an adjunct professor at the University of Victoria in British Columbia. - January 9, 2017

²⁵ Climate Depot Special Report - [2016 State of the Climate Report - November 2016](#)

Extreme weather failing to follow predictions

In 2017, Prof. Dr. Roger Pielke, Jr. testified to Congress there was simply [“no evidence’ that hurricanes, floods, droughts, tornadoes are increasing.”](#)²⁶

On nearly every metric, extreme weather is on no trend or declining trend on climate timescales. Even the [UN IPCC admitted in a 2018 special report](#) that extreme weather events have not increased. The IPCC’s special report found that “there is only low confidence regarding changes in global tropical cyclone numbers under global warming over the last four decades.” The IPCC report also concluded that there is “low confidence in the sign of drought trends since 1950 at global scale.”

Prof. Dr. Roger Pielke, Jr.’s 2014 testimony on the current state of weather extremes: “It is misleading, and just plain incorrect, to claim that disasters associated with hurricanes, tornadoes, floods, or droughts have increased on climate timescales either in the United States or globally.”²⁷

[A 2017 study on floods found ‘approximately the number expected due to chance alone’ – No ‘global warming’ signal.](#)

Another [2017 study in *Journal of Hydrology* found no increase in global floods – ‘Compelling evidence for increased flooding at a global scale is lacking.’](#)

But on nearly every metric, extreme weather is on no trend or declining trend on climate timescales. Climatologist Dr. John Christy [explained why](#) the extreme weather claims are unscientific: “The non-falsifiable hypotheses can be stated this way, ‘whatever happens is consistent with my hypothesis.’ In other words, there is no event that would ‘falsify’ the hypothesis. As such, these assertions cannot be considered science or in any way informative since the hypothesis’ fundamental prediction is ‘anything may happen.’ In the example above if winters become milder or they become snowier, the non-falsifiable hypothesis stands. This is not science.”

Tornadoes failing to follow “global warming” predictions

Big tornadoes have seen a drop in frequency since the 1950s. The years 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018 all saw at or near record low tornado counts in the U.S.²⁸

[2018 saw a record low tornado death toll & no violent \(EF4 or EF5\) tornadoes for first time since records began in 1950.](#) The Weather Channel reported that the United States saw the fewest

²⁶ Congressional Hearing – [House Science Committee on Science](#), Space and Technology - March 29, 2017 - Prof. Roger Pielke Jr.

²⁷ Prof. Roger Pielke Jr. testimony to [U.S. Senate Environment & Public Works Committee - July 18, 2013](#)

²⁸ NOAA Tornado data: 2016 ‘one of the quietest years since records began in 1954’ – Below average for 5th year in a row - [November 12, 2016](#)

tornado deaths on record with no EF4/5 tornadoes hitting the U.S. It marked the first time that none have hit in a calendar year since that record-keeping began in 1950, according to [The Washington Post](#).

In 2016, [NOAA tornado data revealed the year was “one of the quietest years since records began in 1954” and below average for 5th year in a row.](#)

Hurricanes are not getting worse

An August 2019 [NOAA statement concluded: “It is premature to conclude ... that global warming has already had a detectable impact on hurricane activity.”](#) The NOAA statement added that U.S. landfalling hurricanes “show a slight negative trend’ since ‘late 1800s.”

Norwegian Professor Ole Humlum explained in his 2018 “State of the Climate Report”: “Tropical storm and hurricane accumulated cyclone energy (ACE) values since 1970 have displayed large variations from year to year, but no overall trend towards either lower or higher activity. The same applies for the number of hurricane landfalls in the continental United States, for which the record begins in 1851.”

Dr. Roger Pielke, Jr. noted that the federal National Climate Assessment released in 2018 ignored one of its own expert reviewers, who wrote: “National Hurricane Center going back to the 1800s data clearly indicate a drop in the decadal rate of US landfalling hurricanes since the 1960s ... instead you spin the topic to make it sound like the trends are all towards more cyclones.”

In 2019, [extreme weather expert Dr. Roger Pielke, Jr.](#) explained: The [WMO \(World Meteorological Organization\) concluded](#), “no observational studies have provided convincing evidence of a detectable anthropogenic influence specifically on hurricane-related precipitation,” but also that [an increase should be expected this century](#) ... The WMO assessment concludes: “anthropogenic signals are not yet clearly detectable in observations for most TC (tropical cyclones) metrics.”

A study by a [NOAA Hurricane Researcher Chris Landsea found that using 1940s observational methods “only 2 of these \[recent\] 10 Category 5s would have been recorded as Cat 5 if they had occurred during the late-1940s period.”](#)

Hurricane Maria, which hit Puerto Rico in 2017, was not an unprecedented storm, with the eighth-lowest landfall pressure (917 mb) on record in the Atlantic Basin. Meteorologist Anthony Watts noted, “With Irma ranked 7th, and Harvey ranked 18th, it’s going to be tough for climate alarmists to try connecting these two storms to being driven by CO₂/global warming. But they’ll do it anyway.”

[Extreme weather expert Dr. Roger Pielke Jr. noted in 2019: The “13 yrs ending 2018 had fewest Cat 3+ USA landfalls since 1900 with 3.”](#) - “The most? 3 periods had 12, most recently 1915-1927. 13 yrs ending in 2018 saw a 14 total Cat 1+ (tied 2nd fewest). The most? 33: [between] 1938-1950.”

Climate analyst Kenneth Richard’s survey of scientific literature in 2018 found: “The peer-reviewed scientific literature robustly affirms that land-falling hurricane frequencies and intensities have remained steady or declined in recent decades. So have droughts, floods, and other extreme weather events.”

According to [NOAA, the U.S. had a record 11 straight years without Major \(Cat 3+\) landfalling Hurricane Strike that ended in 2017 with Hurricane Harvey. This streak is the longest since record-keeping began, according to NOAA data going back to 1851.](#) ²⁹

Atmospheric research scientist Dr. Philip Klotzbach’s research also revealed no trend in global accumulated cyclone energy (ACE) in the past 30 years. ³⁰

Droughts are NOT getting worse

“Droughts have, for the most part, become shorter, less frequent, and cover a smaller portion of the U. S. over the last century,” Professor Roger Pielke, Jr. observed. ³¹

A 2015 study found megadroughts in past 2000 years were worse and lasted longer than current droughts. ³²

In 2017, drought conditions in the U.S. dropped even more, as they were limited to only 1.6% of the continental U.S and California's “[Permanent Drought” came to an end.](#) ³³

Wildfires are not increasing

There is “[less fire today than centuries ago,](#)” as scientists and multiple studies counter the claim that wildfires due to “climate change.”

The following is an excerpt from author [Marc Morano's *The Politically Incorrect Guide to Climate Change*](#).

A 2016 [study published in *The Royal Society* journal](#) found: “There is increasing evidence that there is overall less fire in the landscape today than there has been centuries ago, although the magnitude

²⁹ NOAA data - [CNSNews.com - October 24, 2016](#)

³⁰ Atmospheric research scientist [Dr. Philip Klotzbach - September 20, 2016](#)


³¹ Dr. Roger Pielke Jr. [drought analysis - September 24, 2012](#)

³² The Earth Institute at [Columbia University - November 6, 2015](#)

³³ Vencore Weather - [Meteorologist Paul Dorian - April 10, 2017](#)

of this reduction still needs to be examined in more detail.”... “The ‘wildfire problem’ is essentially more a social than a natural one.”

“In the United States, wildfires are also due in part to a failure to thin forests or remove dead and diseased trees. In 2014, forestry professor David B. South of Auburn University testified to the U.S. Senate Environment and Public Works Committee that “data suggest that extremely large megafires were four-times more common before 1940,” adding that “we cannot reasonably say that anthropogenic global warming causes extremely large wildfires.” As he explained, “To attribute this human-caused increase in fire risk to carbon dioxide emissions is simply unscientific.”




Claims of more U.S. heat waves not supported in recent studies and data.

[Multiple studies find that long-term data shows US extreme heat waves have decreased since the 1930s. A study published in the *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology* found that US extreme heat waves have decreased from 1930-2010. According to the authors, “Several daily maximum \[Extreme Heat Events\] near the 1930’s led to 1930-2010 trends of daily maximum \[Extreme Heat Events\] decreasing.” The overall trend of US heat waves saw a decline from the](#)

1930s until the 1970s global cooling/coming ice age scare, followed by a warming with temperatures still not up to levels seen in the 1930s in the U.S.

Christy's research on the United States has found that "about 75% of the states recorded their hottest temperature prior to 1955, and over 50 percent of the states experienced their record cold temperatures after 1940."

Data from the Environmental Protection Agency agree. The [EPA website](#) features a 2016 chart labeled "the U.S. Heat Wave Index from 1895 to 2015," and it reveals that the worst U.S. heat waves by far happened in the 1930s.



EPA: "This figure shows the annual values of the U.S. Heat Wave Index from 1895 to 2015."

Antarctica ice melt fears not based on data

A 2015 NASA study found that Antarctica was NOT losing ice mass and "not currently contributing to sea level rise," but actually reducing sea level rise. ³⁴

³⁴ NASA Study: [Mass Gains of Antarctic Ice Sheet Greater than Losses - October 30, 2015](#)

The NASA study found that the ice mass gains of the Antarctic ice sheet are greater than their losses.

In 2018, the NASA research confirmed that Antarctica was still not losing ice mass. See: [NASA researcher: Despite recent claims, Antarctica is still GAINING ice](#) - NASA glaciologist Jay Zwally is working on a paper that will show the eastern ice sheet is expanding at a rate that's enough to at least offset increased losses the west. The ice sheets are "very close to balance right now," Zwally said.

Other Antarctica ice studies receive lots of media hype, but miss the key scientific significances. A 2019 hyped study that alleged a 6 times increase in Antarctic ice melt was found to be "[statistically insignificant](#)" by climate analysts. "Such a tiny loss in comparison to the total mass of the ice sheet, it's microscopic ... statistically insignificant."


In addition, though this 2019 Antarctic ice study used observational data, it also relied on [climate models – not actual data --- to simulate what the authors thought the actual ice conditions were and it gave them a huge ice fudge factor](#).

Another [2017 NASA study found](#) volcanic activity is heating up the western portion of the continent's ice sheet.

In addition, the Associated Press has a long history of hyping alleged catastrophic [Antarctic melt fears. The AP recycled the same scary Antarctic melt claims from 2014, 1990, 1979, 1922 & 1901](#).

Arctic sea ice not disappearing, despite “ice free” predictions

[2018 Arctic Ice Volume Holds Steady For A Decade. “Arctic sea ice volume data show earlier projections of ice-free Arctic summers were a sham. Sea ice now steady 10 years.”](#)



[A 2019 study revealed that the Arctic region was 4.6°C warmer than ‘Present Day’ during the decade of the 1930s.](#)

Recent Arctic ice changes are not proof of man-made global warming, nor are they unprecedented, unusual, or cause for alarm, according to experts and multiple peer-reviewed studies.




Theoretical and Applied Climatology

pp 1–16 | [Cite as](#)

A comparison of bioclimatic conditions on Franz Josef Land (the Arctic) between the turn of the nineteenth to twentieth century and present day

Authors

Authors and affiliations

Andrzej Arażny , Przemysław Wyszniński, Rajmund Przybylak

First Online: 10 January 2019

Summarising the key results of the analyses conducted in the study, it can be concluded that on FJL:

- Air temperature in 1899–1914 during three expeditions was 1.8–4.6 °C lower than the modern period in winter (Oct–Apr). However, during the 1930/31 expedition it was 4.6 °C warmer than the years 1981–2010. Our results relate to what has been called the ‘1930s warming’, referred to by various authors in the literature as the ETCW or the ETCAW.

Recent Arctic ice changes are not proof of man-made global warming, nor are they unprecedented, unusual, or cause for alarm, according to experts and multiple peer reviewed studies. [Six New Papers Link Arctic/North Atlantic Climate Changes To Natural Factors.](#)

Greenland ice is not disappearing

[‘A surprise’: NASA 2019 Study: Key Greenland glacier growing again after shrinking for years.](#) “A major Greenland glacier that was one of the fastest shrinking ice and snow masses on Earth is growing again, a new NASA study finds. The [Jakobshavn](#) glacier around 2012 was retreating about 1.8 miles and thinning nearly 130 feet annually. But it started growing again at about the same rate in the past two years, according to a study in [Nature Geoscience.](#)”

[Climatologists: ‘The death of the Greenland disaster story’ – ‘Taming the Greenland Melting Global Warming Hype.’](#) Climatologist Dr. Pat Michaels in 2016 on Greenland: “Humans just can’t make it warm enough up there to melt all that much ice.”

A 2006 peer-reviewed study published in the *Journal of Geophysical Research* concluded, “The warmest year in the extended Greenland temperature record is 1941, while the 1930s and 1940s are the warmest decades.” The paper, authored by B. Vinther, K. Andersen, P. Jones, K. Briffa, and J. Cappelen and titled “Extending Greenland Temperature Records into the Late 18th Century,” examined temperature data from Greenland going back to 1784.

A study by Danish researchers from Aarhus University in the same year found that “Greenland’s glaciers have been shrinking for the past century, suggesting that the ice melt is not a recent phenomenon caused by global warming.” Glaciologist Jacob Clement Yde was quoted in an August 21, 2006, Agence France-Presse report explaining that the study was “the most comprehensive ever conducted on the movements of Greenland’s glaciers.” As Yde explained, “Seventy percent of the glaciers have been shrinking regularly since the end of the 1880s.”

Climate model projections are not evidence

The scientific fact is that heralded “state-of-the-art” climate models can “show” any outcome their creator wishes them to. Penn State climate activist professor Michael Mann [admitted in 2017](#): “Predictions can never be ‘falsifiable’ in the present: We must ultimately wait to see whether they come true.”

Prominent scientists have exposed the climate model con. In 2007, top UN IPCC scientist Jim Renwick admitted that climate models do not account for half the variability in nature and thus are not reliable. “Half of the variability in the climate system is not predictable, so we don’t expect to do terrifically well,” Renwick conceded.

Former UN IPCC reviewer and climate researcher Dr. Vincent Gray of New Zealand, the author of more than one hundred scientific publications and an expert reviewer on every single draft of the IPCC reports going back to 1990, declared in that IPCC claims were “dangerous unscientific nonsense” because, “All the [UN IPCC does] is make ‘projections’ and ‘estimates.’ No climate model has ever been properly tested, which is what ‘validation’ means, and their ‘projections’ are nothing more than the opinions of ‘experts’ with a conflict of interest, because they are paid to produce the models,” Gray noted.

Atmospheric scientist Hendrik Tennekes, a scientific pioneer in the development of numerical weather prediction and former director of research at the Netherlands’ Royal National Meteorological Institute, compared scientists who promote computer models predicting future climate doom to unlicensed software engineers. “I am of the opinion that most scientists engaged in the design, development, and tuning of climate models are in fact software engineers. They are unlicensed, hence unqualified to sell their products to society,” Tennekes wrote.

Global warming does not cause wars, it is not a national security threat

The data and studies reveal that warm periods coincide with less conflict. This same argument was used by the CIA in 1974 to claim that “global cooling” would cause conflict and terrorism. ³⁵

The Center for Strategic and International Studies report noted the opposite of recent claims regarding “global warming” and war. “Since the dawn of civilization, warmer eras have meant fewer wars.” ³⁶

How many times do we have to “save the world”?

2019: The [UN admits 'historic' Paris climate pact did not save Earth after all! Now says: Cutting CO₂ 'not enough' – 'We must change food production to save the world.'](#)

But back in 2015, the UN Paris climate pact was supposed to have saved the planet! Here is how it was promoted:

Al Gore in 2015 on Paris pact: “Years from now, our grandchildren will reflect on humanity’s moral courage to solve the climate crisis and they will look to December 12, 2015, as the day when the community of nations finally made the decision to act.”

Secretary of State John F. Kerry in 2015: “This is a tremendous victory for all of our citizens, – not for any one country or bloc, but a victory for all of the planet, and for future generations.”

French foreign minister Laurent Fabius in 2015: “History is coming, in fact, history is here,” he said. “On 12 December 2015, we can have a historic day, a major date to go down in the history of mankind. The date can become a message of life.”

Now that the UN treaty 'solved' global warming in 2015, can we all just move on to something else?

Obviously not, as 2019 brought a huge expansion of the UN regulatory climate agenda, with new UN tipping points and reports on the alleged climate linked species extinctions. See: [Greenpeace Co-Founder Dr. Patrick Moore’s testimony to Congress: The UN is using species ‘extinction as a fear tactic to scare the public into compliance.’](#)

And a UN-led war on meat eating: [Eat insects? ‘Meat patch’ to stop cravings? New UN report takes aim at meat-eating – UN seeks expansion of climate agenda to regulate what you eat.](#)

³⁵ CIA 1974 National Security Threat: [Global Cooling/Excess Arctic Ice Causing Extreme Weather](#)


³⁶ Center for Strategic and International Studies [report - December 21, 2012](#)

Despite being told we already “saved” the planet with the 2015 UN Paris pact, we are being lobbied daily for the Green New Deal, carbon taxes, EPA and new species regulations, as well as meat - eating restrictions. A whole new round of proposals to ban energy and other products is under way. Bans have been proposed on everything from plastic straws, fracking, coal plants, lightbulbs, oil drilling, and meat. “Climate change” is not about the climate.

Environmentalist Michael Shellenberger [explained how climate fear is distorting public policy](#). “Journalists and activists alike have an obligation to describe environmental problems honestly and accurately, even if they fear doing so will reduce their news value or salience with the public. There is good evidence that the catastrophist framing of climate change is self-defeating because it alienates and polarizes many people. And exaggerating climate change risks distracting us from other important issues including ones we might have more near-term control over,” Shellenberger wrote.

Conclusion

Excerpt from Marc Morano's book, [The Politically Incorrect Guide to Climate Change](#):



It bears repeating: if we actually faced a man-made climate crisis and we had to rely on the UN or the EPA or Congress to save us, we would all be doomed! But more importantly, if we actually did face catastrophic global warming, the last “solution” we would want to seek would be one that saddles us with sovereignty-threatening, central-planning, wealth-redistributing, economy-crippling regulations and the most expensive treaty in world history.

If we did face a man-made climate change crisis, we would want to unleash the free market and entrepreneurship to come up with new technologies and make them viable and affordable—without banning or regulating current fossil fuel energy out of existence until we had replacements. If Al Gore is correct in his assertions that there are financial fortunes to be made for young

entrepreneurs and inventors in developing new forms of energy—and Al Gore himself has already made his climate fortune many times over—then all that is really needed is advancing technology.

The day Americans, or anyone on planet Earth, can go to their local Walmart and buy a solar panel and install it on their roof and get off the grid is the day climate “solution” debate ends. There is no need for central planning, or banning energy that is cheap and abundant in favor of energy that needs massive subsidies and is not yet ready for prime time. No need for a UN Paris pact, no need for carbon taxes and no need for a Green New Deal.

We need to stop climate campaigners from using an alleged climate change scare to get impose a political agenda on the U.S. and the world that couldn't otherwise get implemented. As the Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow, (CFACT) has noted, "There is all pocketbook pain, and no climate gain, from any plan to eliminate fossil fuels in the US. And any talk of a 'climate emergency' is an absurd attempt to force an irrational debate on a complex issue."

Lord Christopher Monckton, the former Thatcher adviser, summed up the climate “solution” debate this way in his testimony to the U.S. Congress: “The right response to the non-problem of global warming is to have the courage to do nothing.”

###