


The Green New Deal plan to end fossil fuels is a wrecking ball and will end badly like the Greek myth of the 'SIRENS SONG. New paper "annihilates" the foundation of the greenhouse theory as the earth cools.

The false climate change consensus stifles debate hiding the truth of corrupted science data from the public.

ROK CREATORS.COM
© 09

BOKBLUSTER.COM



AN INCONVENIENT TRUTH

“In New Zealand, as elsewhere, criticism even of the claim of consensus is censored, for example, NZ’s major source of mainstream news, Stuff.

Likewise google fails to fairly publish doubt about the shoddy science behind so called ‘climate change,’ why?

Stuff accepts the overwhelming scientific consensus that climate change is real and caused by human activity. We welcome robust debate about the appropriate response to climate change, but do not intend to provide a venue for denialism or hoax advocacy. That applies equally to the stories we will publish in **Quick! Save the Planet** and to our moderation standards for reader comments.

”

“I would rather have questions that can’t be answered than answers that can’t be questioned.” Richard Feynman

ABSTRACT

Greek mythology reminds that when humans mess with Mother Nature listening to SONGS OF SIRENS things will end badly. Today the SIRENS are the fraudulent Paris Accord, and the New Green Deal with the SIRENS singing the end of fossil fuel energy. This song will end the march of progress on all fronts in Western civilization and wreak havoc on health, economics and safety. Our greatest environmental hazard is caused by lack of grid electricity in developing countries killing millions annually from household smoke. Justin Trudeau is the SIREN singing that raising carbon taxes will have zero economic impact when new study finds “*Real GDP could decline by about 2.1% compared to the case without the tax, and the economy will lose approximately 200,000 jobs.*” Fraser Institute. and all this harm without any effect on the climate. Unreliable wind and solar are crowding out the safety of reliable fossil fuels in severe winter blizzards leave a growing death toll around the world. Major peer reviewed research debunks the so-called greenhouse effect as a ‘fictitious

mechanism' or a 'phantasm to be neglected' and confirms there is no climate crisis needing government action following the SIRENS. Just as the sailors were fooled in mythology the world is LURED into group think by fudged and corrupted data of government paid scientists. Also, political leaders including Obama and Trudeau deceive the public by conflating invisible non toxic carbon dioxide with pollution.



Artist [Herbert James Draper](#)

Location [Ferens Art Gallery, Kingston upon Hull](#)

The term "[siren song](#)" refers to an appeal that is hard to resist but that, if heeded, will lead to a bad conclusion. W.

[#siren](#) [#mermaid](#) [#MonstrumPBS](#)

The Fatal Song of the Sirens | Monstrum

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4IYisDTeycY>

The Green New Deal Explained

This call to end fossil fuels and build green jobs is fiercely debated

- [FACEBOOK](#)
- [TWITTER](#)
- [LINKEDIN](#)

By [DEBORAH DSOUZA](#)

Updated Oct 8, 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- Ocasio-Cortez's GND
- What's in the Green New Deal?
- GND and the Presidential Debates
- Trump-Pence on the Green New Deal

- President Biden's Clean Energy Revolution
- What's at Stake?
- What It Will Cost/How We Pay for It
- Investing in a GND Economy

The term “Green New Deal” was first used by Pulitzer Prize-winner Thomas Friedman in January 2007. America had just experienced its hottest year on record (there have been five hotter since), and Friedman recognized that there wasn't going to be a palatable, easy solution to climate change as politicians hoped. It was going to take money, effort, and upsetting an industry that has always been very generous with campaign contributions.

Transitioning away from fossil fuels, he argued in a New York Times column, would require the government to raise prices on them, introduce higher energy standards, and undertake a massive industrial project to scale up green technology.¹

“The right rallying call is for a ‘Green New Deal,’” he wrote, referencing former President Franklin D. Roosevelt's [domestic programs](#) to rescue the country from the Great Depression. “If you have put a windmill in your yard or some solar panels on your roof, bless your heart. But we will only green the world when we change the very nature of the electricity grid—moving it away from dirty coal or oil to clean coal and renewables.”

Since then, the “Green New Deal” has been used to describe various sets of policies that aim to make systemic change. The United Nations announced a Global Green New Deal in 2008.² Former President Barack Obama added one to his platform when he ran for election in 2008,³ and Green party candidates, such as Jill Stein and Howie Hawkins, did the same.⁴

But the Green New Deal is a big part of policy debates in the country today largely due to the remarkable ascent of Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (D-NY), the youngest woman to be elected to the House of Representatives and already a favorite to run for president in 2024.⁵ Her ambitious and wide-ranging proposal, which was a centerpiece of her campaign, addresses an issue 60% of Americans say is already affecting their local community and promises to tackle economic inequality through the creation of high-quality union jobs.⁶ The Green New Deal has also been helped by a grassroots outfit called the [Sunrise Movement](#), which

organized that [much-talked-about protest](#) at Sen. Dianne Feinstein's office in February 2019.

Ocasio-Cortez's GND

That same month, Ocasio-Cortez and Sen. Ed Markey (D-Mass.) introduced in Congress a [14-page nonbinding resolution](#) calling for the federal government to create a Green New Deal.⁷ The resolution has more than 100 co-sponsors in Congress and attracted several Democratic presidential candidates, though not the ultimate winner—Former Vice President Joe Biden (see below).

On March 26, 2019, lawmakers in the Senate voted 57-0 against advancing the resolution with 43 out of 47 Democrats voting "present" in order to not take a formal position.⁸ The Democrats were protesting Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) bringing up the vote without scheduling hearings and expert testimonies first.

While the idea of a Green New Deal and the threat of climate change have been known by politicians for years, this is the most detailed plan yet to transform the economy presented to the American people, even though it is itself extremely vague and more a set of principles and goals than of specific policies.

The resolution says the U.S. must take a leading role in reducing emissions because it is technologically advanced and has historically been responsible for a disproportionate amount of greenhouse gas emissions, as displayed below in a chart from the World Bank.

It details how climate change affects the economy, the environment, and national security, and outlines goals and projects for a 10-year national mobilization.

The plan also emphasizes environmental and social justice. It acknowledges how historically oppressed groups—indigenous peoples, people of color, the poor, and migrants—are more likely to be affected by climate change and asks that they be included and consulted. Its progressive spirit is reflected in the calls for the protection of workers' rights, community ownership, universal healthcare, and a job guarantee.

What's in the Green New Deal?

The main goal of the plan is to bring U.S. greenhouse gas emissions down to net-zero and meet 100% of power demand in the country through clean, renewable, and zero-emission energy sources by 2030.⁷ The Green New Deal also calls for the creation of millions of jobs to provide a job guarantee to all Americans, along with

access to nature, clean air and water, healthy food, a sustainable environment, and community resiliency.

These goals are to be accomplished through the following actions on the part of the federal government:

- Providing investments and leveraging funding to help communities affected by climate change
- Repairing and upgrading existing infrastructure to withstand extreme weather and ensuring all bills related to infrastructure in Congress address climate change
- Investing in renewable power sources
- Investing in manufacturing and industry to spur growth in the use of clean energy
- Building or upgrading to energy-efficient, distributed, and “smart” power grids that provide affordable electricity
- Upgrading all existing buildings and building new ones so that they achieve maximum energy efficiency, water efficiency, safety, affordability, comfort, and durability.
- Supporting family farming, investing in sustainable farming, and building a more sustainable and equitable food system
- Investing in transportation systems, namely zero-emission vehicle infrastructure and manufacturing, public transit, and high-speed rail
- Restoring ecosystems through land preservation, [afforestation](#), and science-based projects
- Cleaning up existing hazardous waste and abandoned sites
- Identifying unknown sources of pollution and emissions
- Working with the international community on solutions and helping them achieve Green New Deals

Green New Deal and the Presidential Debates

The Green New Deal was brought up in the 2020 Presidential and Vice-Presidential debates and in campaigning by both parties. In the first Presidential debate, while saying he wanted crystal clean water and air, President Trump disparaged his Democratic opponent Joe Biden's plan to deal with climate change calling it a Green New Deal and saying it would cost \$100 trillion. Biden denied the charge saying, "That's not my plan."⁹

In the Vice-Presidential debate, Vice-President Pence said that Biden and Harris wanted to bury the economy under a \$2 trillion Green New Deal, noting that Harris

was one of the original co-sponsors. Without referring to it by name, Harris disputed Pence's claims regarding banning fracking, taxing Americans making less than \$400,000; she promoted Biden's plans regarding clean energy as a job creator.¹⁰

Trump-Pence on the Green New Deal

Trump acknowledged that human activity contributes to climate change "to an extent," but also said "science doesn't know," recently. Trump and Pence wanted to keep fossil fuels in the energy conversation both to appeal to those workers and to keep the U.S. relevant as a gas and oil exporter.¹¹

Mike Pence, making similar charges to those of President Trump, said at the VP debate, "They [Biden-Harris] want to bury our economy under a \$2 trillion Green New Deal. [They] want to abolish fossil fuels, and ban fracking, which would cost hundreds of thousands of American jobs all across the heartland."¹⁰

President Biden's Clean Energy Revolution

Although President Biden has declined to endorse the Green New Deal, Vice President Harris was an original sponsor. Harris, however, says she fully supports the Biden climate plan. Called "A Clean Energy Revolution," the plan has many of the same goals as the Green New Deal but on a less ambitious time frame and at a lower cost.¹²

For example, the Green New Deal aspires to net-zero greenhouse gas emissions and 100% clean, renewable energy sources by 2030. Biden's plan achieves that goal by 2050. The Green New Deal is estimated to cost about \$93 trillion to implement. The proposed Biden plan would involve a Federal government investment of \$1.7 trillion and private sector, state, and local buy-in of about \$5 trillion.¹²

What's at Stake?

A common rebuttal to opponents from supporters of the Green New Deal is that although it will be expensive to implement, not doing so will be more expensive in the long run.

Over the past decade, the federal government has spent \$350 billion due to extreme weather and fire events, according to a 2017 report by the U.S. Government Accounting Office.¹³ But it will only get uglier, according to experts.

Reports by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and the U.S. Global Change Research Program say the global average temperature exceeding pre-

industrialized levels by 2 degrees Celsius or more will cause more than \$500 billion in lost economic annual output in the U.S. by the year 2100. Forest areas affected by wildfires in the U.S. will at least double by 2050, and there is a risk of damage to \$1 trillion of public infrastructure and coastal real estate in the U.S.

In order to stop temperatures from rising beyond 1.5 degrees Celsius—the target aimed for in the 2015 [Paris Agreement](#)—global emissions need to go to zero by 2050. This means that the window to avoid the most severe impact is rapidly closing.

How Much Will It Cost and How Do We Pay for It?

The very real existential threat to the planet makes the Green New Deal a unique mission statement that is hard to ignore or dismiss.

But critics have called it too socialist, too extreme, or too impractical. Some are even worried "their hamburgers would be taken away."¹⁴

The U.S. currently gets 80% of its energy from coal, petroleum, and natural gas. Hence, the kind of overhaul the deal is calling for would be very expensive and require significant government intervention. The center-right American Action Forum pegs the cost at \$93 trillion.

The Green New Deal resolution doesn't mention how the U.S. government, which has \$22 trillion of debt, would pay for it.

[Tax Policy Center](#) senior fellow Howard Gleckman has said the plan may slow the economy by adding to the debt and even drive jobs overseas.

"Instead of the Green New Deal, the federal government could adopt a revenue-neutral [carbon tax](#) to decrease emissions without exacerbating the fiscal imbalance," said Jeffrey Miron, director of economic studies at the [Cato Institute](#).

Edward B. Barbier, the American economics professor who wrote the report that formed the basis of the UN's Green New Deal, said that, instead of deficit funding, the government should use revenues that come from dismantled subsidies and environmental taxes.¹⁵

On the other hand, Ocasio-Cortez has told CBS's "60 Minutes" that "people are going to have to start paying their fair share in taxes" to pay for the Green New Deal and suggested tax rates of 60% to 70% for the very wealthy.¹⁶

Advocates of the Green New Deal who promote a heterodox macroeconomic framework called [Modern Monetary Theory](#) (MMT), including Ocasio-Cortez, believe the government shouldn't be too concerned about the cost. "The federal government can spend money on public priorities without raising revenue, and it won't wreck the nation's economy to do so," a group of prominent MMT supporters wrote in an op-ed for The Huffington Post.¹⁷ "The U.S. government can never run out of dollars, but humanity can run out of limited global resources. The climate crisis fundamentally threatens those resources and the very human livelihoods that depend on them."

There are also savings to be expected, say Green New Deal supporters.

The Green Party, whose [plan](#) also calls for America to move to 100% clean energy by 2030 and a job guarantee, says it will result in healthcare savings, (there will be fewer cases of disease linked to fossil fuels) and military savings (there will be no reason to safeguard fuel supplies abroad). In addition, it advocates for a robust carbon fee program.

Healthcare and other savings were also touted in a [2015 study](#) by a group of scientists from Stanford University and the University of California, Berkeley that said it is possible for the U.S. to replace 80% to 85% of the existing energy systems with ones powered entirely by wind, water, and sunlight by 2030 and 100% by 2050.

Investing in a GND Economy

Passage of the Green New Deal is extremely unlikely in the current political climate. However, it's worth looking at investing opportunities that may arise if it influences action at the state level or gets the green light in the future.

Global bank UBS has said the Green New Deal is indicative of a longer-term trend towards more sustainable and green ways of producing and consuming. Chief Investment Officer (CIO) strategist Justin Waring, who recommends investing in environmentally oriented sustainable investments, said, "In addition to tapping into the themes' return potential, such an investment also represents a type of 'hedge' against the possibility of more-aggressive environmental legislation. It may seem counterintuitive, but if you are worried about environmental legislation, you might want to invest in environmentally friendly investments."

Josh Price, an energy analyst at Height Capital Markets, told MarketWatch that while the resolution isn't "a near-term catalyst for us by any means," the biofuels and renewables space is an interesting place to look for "slow-money, long-time-

horizon guys." ¹⁸ He mentioned NRG Energy ([NRG](#)), AES ([AES](#)), Xcel Energy ([XEL](#)) Renewable Energy Group ([REGI](#)), and Darling Ingredients ([DAR](#)) as stocks to watch.

While a Green New Deal doesn't explicitly call for eliminating fossil fuel usage, it would hit the industry hard. Nuclear energy stocks are best avoided as well in such a scenario since many don't consider it to be a safe, renewable, or clean source and it isn't a part of the resolution. On the other hand, the semiconductor sector and electric vehicles industry would be among the winners.

<https://www.investopedia.com/the-green-new-deal-explained-4588463>

New cloud research debunks greenhouse effect –

“the very foundation of the theory is getting annihilated.”

“Cloud-radiative effects (CREs) are defined by the difference between the all-sky radiation flux and the clear-sky flux and can be divided into shortwave (SW) and longwave (LW) components. Through CRE, clouds exert a strong and fundamental influence on the global mean climate.”



Cloud cover in the lower troposphere has a dominant effect on temperatures.




FIGURE 2. [2] Global temperature anomaly (red) and the global low cloud cover changes (blue) according to the observations. The anomalies are between summer 1983 and summer 2008. The time resolution of the data is one month, but the seasonal signal is removed. Zero corresponds about 15°C for the temperature and 26 % for the low cloud cover.

Earlier research about Cloud impacts on warming in 2011 is background for the study just published in Sept. 2021
Something is Rotten with the GHE Greenhouse Effect.

- [Published: 17 November 2011](#)

Cloud Adjustment and its Role in CO₂ Radiative Forcing and Climate Sensitivity: A Review

- [Timothy Andrews,](#)
- [Jonathan M. Gregory,](#)
- [Piers M. Forster](#) &
- [Mark J. Webb](#)

[Surveys in Geophysics](#) **volume 33**, pages619–635(2012)[Cite this article](#)

- **3936** Accesses
- **47** Citations
- **6** Altmetric
- [Metricsdetails](#)

Abstract

Understanding the role of clouds in climate change remains a considerable challenge. Traditionally, this challenge has been framed in terms of understanding cloud feedback. However, recent work suggests that under increasing levels of atmospheric carbon dioxide, clouds not only amplify or dampen climate change through global feedback processes, but also through rapid (days to weeks) tropospheric temperature and land surface adjustments. In this article, we use the Met Office Hadley Centre climate model HadGSM1 to review these recent developments and assess their impact on radiative forcing and equilibrium climate sensitivity. We estimate that cloud adjustment contributes ~0.8 K to the 4.4 K

equilibrium climate sensitivity of this particular model. We discuss the methods used to evaluate cloud adjustments, highlight the mechanisms and processes involved and identify low level cloudiness as a key cloud type. Looking forward, we discuss the outstanding issues, such as the application to transient forcing scenarios. We suggest that the upcoming CMIP5 multi-model database will allow a comprehensive assessment of the significance of cloud adjustments in fully coupled atmosphere-ocean-general-circulation models for the first time, and that future research should exploit this opportunity to understand cloud adjustments/feedbacks in non-idealised transient climate change scenarios.

Austrian Analyst: Things With Greenhouse Effect (GHE) Aren't Adding Up..."Something Totally Wrong"

By P Gosselin on 11. September 2020

Share this...

Something is rotten with the GHE

By Erich Schaffer

Introduction

The greenhouse effect (GHE) is a well established theory which most people consider a solid fact, even those who are otherwise "critical" over global warming. On the other side there are some voices who "deny" the GHE with flat earther-like arguments, which seemingly only adds to the credibility of the theory. This is a very odd situation, since there are huge issues with the GHE hidden in plain sight.

"Without GHGs, the Earth would be a frozen planet with a temperature of only -18°C , or 255°K ". This definition is all too familiar to us all and the experts naming it are legion. The 255°K is the result of a (relatively) simple formula.

$$(342 \times ((1-0.3) / 1) / 5.67e-8)^{0.25} = 255$$

342W/m² is the amount of solar radiation (the exact number may vary), 5.67e-8 is the Stefan-Boltzmann constant and ^{0.25} (or the 4th root) represents the Stefan-Boltzmann law according to which radiation is a function of temperature to the power of 4.

Black body assumption trouble

The interesting part however is (1-0.3 / 1). 0.3 is the albedo of Earth and 1-0.3 is thus the absorptivity, which is the share of solar radiation the Earth absorbs (~70%). The 1 below the comma, which is usually omitted, represents emissivity, which is the share of LWIR emitted by the Earth relative to a perfect black body of the same temperature. In other words, it is being assumed Earth would be emitting just like a perfect black body if it were not for GHGs. And that is where the trouble starts.

The basic problem

Quite obviously there are two factors that “violate” the assumption named above.

1. The surface of the Earth, mainly consisting of water, is not a perfect emitter, pretty much like any real surface. Although it is not the scope of this article, it can be shown there is a significant deviation from 1 (in the 0.91 to 0.94 range). One needs to look up Fresnel equations, the refractive index of water and so on to sort out this subject.
2. Clouds interfere massively with LWIR emissions. Actually this is common wisdom, as “clear nights are cold nights” and most people have made the according experience. Even the IPCC states clouds would block a 50W/m² of SW radiation, retain a 30W/m² of LWIR and thus have a net CRE (Cloud Radiative Effect) of -20W/m² [1]. Of course those -50W/m² of SW CRE are already included in the formula above (part of the 30% albedo), while the 30W/m² of LW CRE are not.

For this reason we need to make some minor corrections to the GHE as presented above. Basically Earth receives some 240

W/m² of solar radiation (= 0.7 x 342) and is meant to emit some 390 W/m² at 288°K at the surface. Next to a temperature of 33°K, the GHE would thus amount to about 150W/m² respectively (=390-240).

Since in reality the surface is not a perfect emitter, the 390W/m² are totally inaccurate. In fact it is easy to call it “fake science” whenever someone claims this number, or an even higher one. Rather we need to reduce this figure by at least 20 W/m² to allow for a realistic surface emissivity. Next we need to allow for the 30 W/m² that clouds provide and thus our GHE shrinks from 150 W/m² to a maximum of only 100 W/m² (150 - 20 - 30).

For the sake of clarity we should rename the GHE to GHGE (greenhouse gas effect) as this is the pivotal question. How much do GHGs warm up the planet? It is important so see that GHGs were attributed with their specific role in a kind of “diagnosis of exclusion”. If it were not for GHGs, what would be the temperature of Earth? Any delta to the observed temperature can then be attributed to GHGs.

Such a “diagnosis of exclusion” is always prone to failure, be it in the medical field or anywhere else. Essentially a large number of variables need to be taken into account and the slightest mistake in the process, will necessarily cause a faulty outcome. For that reason it should be considered an approach of last resort, maybe helpful to treat a patient or solve a criminal case. As a starting point in physics it is a no-go, and as we can see, it delivers wrong results. But maybe that is the reason why it was chosen in the first place. Faulty approaches give a certain freedom of creativity.

GHGE being notoriously exaggerated

Still, we have not broken any barriers so far. Yes, the GHGE is notoriously being exaggerated and anyone who claims Earth would be 255°K cold if it were not for GHGs, is either incompetent, or simply lying. You cannot excuse such a claim as “simplification”, since exaggerating the GHGE by some 50% at least is certainly beyond negligible.

On the other side, this does not deny the global warming narrative at all. One might consider downgrading climate sensitivity a bit, which would only result in climate models better matching reality. Even then, this will only put things on a healthier and more appropriate basis, eventually supporting the theory of CO₂ induced global warming.

Digging deeper

So far I have not introduced anything substantially new, but only pointed out to what is known and yet constantly forgotten. Especially the CRE in its quoted magnitude is pretty much an undisputed fact of science. Although I do not know exactly what the origins of these estimates were, experts like Veerabhadran Ramanathan already zeroed in on it in the 1970s. Satellite driven projects like ERBE or CERES later confirmed and specified those estimates.

The net CRE of -20W/m² thus can be found in the IPCC reports, NASA gives detailed satellite data on it, and even “sceptics” like Richard Lindzen name and endorse it[2]. Such a solid agreement is not just good for my argumentation above, it is also great for the GHGE itself. In fact the negative CRE is pretty much a *conditio sine qua non*. If clouds were not cooling the planet, the scope for GHGs might become marginal.

There are indeed some issues with the CRE I need to talk about and things are not nearly as settled as I just suggested.

1. Whatever experts name a net CRE of about -20 W/m², they refer to the same sources, which are ERBE and CERES satellite data.
2. This are not satellite data at all, but models which are getting fed with some satellite data, among others.
3. These models were largely developed by the same people who predicted the negative CRE in the first place. They might not even have a (significant) GHGE if the result would not turn out how it did.
4. A closer look on these model results show totally inconsistent outcomes over time. Regions with

massively negative local CREs turned into having positive CREs, and vice versa.[3]

5. The only thing which really held constant over time was the overall negative CRE of the named magnitude. Of course, that is a precondition to the GHGE and cannot be put into question, if “climate science” wants to have an agenda.

There is yet another side to it. Obviously the net CRE is the sum SW and LW CREs, which can easily be formulated as $CRE_{sw} + CRE_{lw} = CRE_{net}$. Since the CRE_{lw} is what is being forgotten so notoriously (as it diminishes the GHGE), we could assume there might be a motivated tendency to minimize the CRE_{lw} . Given the logical restrictions, this can be achieved by making the CRE_{net} as negative, and the CRE_{sw} as small as possible. In other words, there is a trinity of issues with the CRE.

1. The -50 W/m^2 of SW CRE. This figure is pretty low as compared conventional wisdom, according to which clouds make up for about 2/3s of the albedo, or almost -70 W/m^2 .
2. The net CRE of some -20 W/m^2 . We are going to have a look into this hereafter.
3. The LW CRE of $+30 \text{ W/m}^2$ which is reducing the GHGE as shown above, but for some strange reason tends to be “forgotten”.

Putting things to the test

Since the net negative CRE is “confirmed” by nothing but models of dubious nature, since logic might suggest the opposite (to cut a long story short) and the whole GHGE theory totally depends on it, this question made a perfectly legit target for fact checking. It is the one pivotal question it all boils down to. Is the CRE negative indeed and how could we possibly put it to the test?

As on my previous works in forensic science it seemed mandatory to pass by any conventional approach subject to predictable restrictions. Rather you will have to go beyond the understanding of those who might conspire so that their possible defences turn futile. And of course this would require brute force

of intellect, creativity and a bit of luck to find an appropriate leverage.

At least the latter turns out to be a friendly gift by the NOAA. Under the title “QCLCD ASCII Files” the NOAA provided all METAR data from US weather stations[4]. Regrettably they pulled these valuable data from their site soon after I downloaded it, and the alternative “Global-Hourly Files” is not quite working[5].

The METAR data, as far I understand, are taken at airports and contain, next to usual meteorologic data, cloud conditions originally meant to assist aircraft operating around these airports. The data are anything but perfect for our scope and are subject to a couple of restrictions. As a rule, cloud condition is only reported up to 12,000 ft, yet individual exceptions may occur. Then this cloud condition is reported in 5 different “flavours”, which are CLR, FEW, SCT, BKN and OVC, or combinations of which. For our purpose any combination will be reduced to the maximum cloud condition.


Even if this is not an ideal data pool, it meets a lot of necessary requirements. First it is a totally independent data source, which has never been meant to be used for climate research. Second these data have been collected by many people, who may have made individual mistakes in the process, but were certainly not systemically biased. Third these data are thus “democratic” in nature, not controlled by the bottle neck of a few experts. Eventually, and that is the most important point, we need no models here, but we can look straight onto the empiric evidence.

The Result

First I need to tell how such basic research gives you amazing insights otherwise not available anywhere.

You will not get to see what you like to, or expect to see, but what there is. Just like Christopher Columbus searching for India and finding America, you will have to take things for face value. Analyzing the data back and forth, using different perspectives,

this was not a simple look up to confirm a certain expectation, but rather a process of continuous learning. Accordingly there are lots of results giving excellent insights into the nature of clouds, or their impacts on climate respectively.




This graph was taken from Harvard's educational site [6] on the subject. Here, like in later iterations of the ERBE / CERES modelling, the northern Pacific is meant to be one of the areas with a massively negative CRE, which are of special interest to me.


Since the Aleutian islands are US territory, my NOAA data set included 10 stations located right there.

WBAN	Location	Latitude	Longitude	StationHeight
00110	NELSON LAGOON AIRPORT	56.017	-161.167	
25518	CHIGNIK AIRPORT	56.31139	-158.37306	16
25616	DUTCH HARBOR AIRPORT	53.895	-166.5433	13
25617	SAND POINT AIRPORT	55.31944	-160.52083	21
25624	COLD BAY AIRPORT	55.22083	-162.7325	103
25628	ST. GEORGE AIRPORT	56.6	-169.565	125
25704	ADAK NAS	51.88333	-176.65	19
25713	ST PAUL ISLAND AIRPORT	57.15528	-170.22222	28
25715	ATKA AIRPORT	52.22028	-174.20611	56
45715	EARECKSON AIR STATION AIRPORT	52.71667	174.1	97

For the years 2016 and 2017, these stations report about 325,000 valid datasets, with almost 60% of which being overcast. So it is indeed a very cloudy region.



Once we resolve the cloudiness/temperature correlation by season, we find a very typical outcome. OVC skies are correlated with lower temperatures in spring and early summer, and with higher temperatures throughout the rest of the year. This pattern has been seen in all subsets featuring distinct seasons and is due to surface temperatures lagging behind solar intensity.




It is an analogy to the day/night cycle, where clouds hold down day time temperatures, while keeping nights relatively warm. It is about the relation of incoming SW to outgoing LW radiation. As clouds interfere with both radiative fluxes, their primary effect will be relative to which of these fluxes is stronger. In spring surface temperatures lag behind solar intensity, LW emissions will be relatively weak and thus clouds are cooling. In autumn this relation naturally reverses and then clouds are warming.

Note: These “tidal effects” are a direct representation of the LW CRE. Although it goes way beyond the scope of this article, such data are very helpful in assessing the actual magnitude of the LW CRE.

A huge surprise

Finally, if we add up the above results and look at the annual average (thus seasonally adjusted), we are in for a huge surprise (or possibly no more at this point). The correlation between clouds and temperature is strictly positive. The more clouds, the warmer it is, and that is in a region where models suggest a massively negative CRE.

Obviously something is totally wrong here.



I am confident the METAR data are correct, and I am certain my analysis is correct, since I have gone over it many times and the outcome is consistent with all the different perspectives. Instead, the ERBE/CERES models are wrong when compared to empiric evidence a.k.a. “reality”. That is not much of a surprise given a track record of inconsistent results.

And as much as the Bering Sea looks like “a perfect match” to fact check these models, the problems go far beyond the region. No matter wherever I looked, a negative CRE could not be found.

Just the tip of the ice berg

Yet this is just the tip of the iceberg. Of course, you need to check for biases to see how much a correlation also means causation, and there are a few. Humidity, as much as it may serve as an indicator for the assumed GHG vapour, is indeed correlated with cloudiness (78% rel. humidity with CLR, 85% with OVC), but this delta is a) influenced by rain and b) too small to explain what we see.

More importantly, this analysis is all about low clouds up to 12,000 ft and it is undisputed the net CRE turns more positive the higher up clouds are. Then there is the subject of rain chill, which makes clouds look statistically colder than they are. Finally temperatures are sluggish relative to ever changing cloud conditions and we would certainly see a larger delta in temperatures if respective cloud conditions were permanent.

Systemic GHE failure

Unlike what I named before, this is not just a scratch on the GHE theory, but systemic failure. If clouds warm the planet indeed, and all the evidence points this way, the very foundation of the theory is getting annihilated. Not that GHGs might not play a certain role in Earth's climate, but the size of the GHGE will be only a fraction of 33°K, and one that is yet to be precisely determined.

[1] 5th AR of the IPCC, page 580

[2] <https://wattsupwiththat.com/2020/06/29/weekly-climate-and-energy-news-roundup-414/>

[3] https://www.researchgate.net/figure/Comparison-of-annual-mean-SW-LW-and-net-CRE-of-E55H20-E61H22-and-E63H23-to-CERES-40_fig2_335351575

[4] <https://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/data-access/quick-links>

[5] Documentation does not fit the data format, for some reason I am unable to locate temperature readings, the format itself is hard to read, and finally for some reason these data, station by station, do not correspond to those of the "QCLCD ASCII Files"

[6] <https://www.seas.harvard.edu/climate/eli/research/equable/ccf.html>

Huge GHE Hoax: The Dark Secret Behind Surface Emissivity

Plenty Of Physics Flaws Accumulate Into A Huge GHE Hoax: The Dark Secret Behind Surface Emissivity

By P Gosselin on 27. September 2020

-
-

By Erich Schaffer

Magic is all about illusion, and so is “climate science”.

Nothing about the GHE is as it seems and so far the “critical” side has failed to see through it. No longer!

Examining the key question of surface emissivity, usually downplayed as a non-issue, reveals highly significant insights relativizing the common narrative and revealing another profound flaw in the theory. Eventually this will lead to a totally disruptive Eureka moment.

Did you know that even the moon has a GHE? If we adapt our “GHE formula” to the circumstances on the moon, we can easily calculate the maximum temperature it should yield at the equator (with the sun at the zenith). All we need to do is to allow for the specific albedo (~0.12) and the amount of solar radiation, which is about 1368W/m².

$$(1368 * ((1-0.12) / 1) / 5.67e-8) ^{0.25} = 381.7^{\circ}\text{K}$$

Since the albedo is a bit uncertain (in the 0.11 to 0.13 range), let us just say 382°K straight. So the moon, at the equator, should theoretically yield a temperature of up to 382°K. The observed (average) maximum temperature however is about 394K [1][2][3][4], 12°K hotter than it should be. The same formula that tells us Earth had a GHE of 33°K, suggests 12°K of GHE on the moon. Houston, there is a problem! By the way, if the albedo was 0.3, like that of Earth, the formula would give us 360.5°K in this case, with a GHE of 33.5°K. Sounds strangely familiar, right?

Of course, we know there is NO GHE on the moon, since it does not hold an atmosphere. Instead, there must be something wrong with our theoretical approach, the formula itself. And if the very formula that determines the GHE of Earth is wrong, as just demonstrated, it might be about time to ring the alarm bells.

What went wrong?

There are two ways to get to the correct result with regard to the moon. First, we could simply ignore the albedo, or set it to zero respectively, and then the formula gives the correct result of 394°K. This is pretty odd, since we know the albedo is real and ignoring it is wrong, and yet it seems to work. That is why the second approach makes way more sense. Next to including an albedo of 0.12, giving us an absorptivity of 0.88, we also assume an emissivity of 0.88, so that the two cancel each other out. Then again, the result is 394°K and everything is fine. In fact, an emissivity of 0.88 is the only value consistent with an albedo of 0.12 and an observed temperature of 394°K.


The mistake we initially made is easy to identify. We started with assuming an emissivity of 1, while in reality it is far lower. Such a mistake will always give you a calculative temperature which is too low, and thus an erroneous “GHE”. Bearing that potentially fatal mistake in mind, how do leading climate experts around the globe account for it? They say emissivity is 1, or so close to 1 that it is negligible, and certainly there was no reason to question it any further.

This unawareness carries well into the “critical” arena, where the question would usually be resolved by looking up textbooks. It turns out, this is totally insufficient since a) textbooks are mostly wrong and b) it does not help understanding the nature of the problem. It is pretty odd, given that what I am going to reveal is really climate science 101. If you don’t know that, you know nothing! And it seems no one knows.

So, what is the surface emissivity?

It should be easy to answer since NASA is operating some research projects on the subject, with satellites “measuring”

surface emissivity. Measuring may be a bit too much, since the actual data need interpretation in the context of models and so on. Anyhow, those measurements show a quite significant deviation from 1, especially with arid regions.[5]:




Now we would only need to calculate a weighted average of these data and we would finally have a definite answer on what surface emissivity of Earth is, right? WRONG!

Regrettably it is far more complicated, and, spoiler alert, ironically much simpler eventually in the end (we'll get to that shortly).

Inadequate global surface emissivity data

There are two huge issues with these data. First, quite obviously, water has been completely exempt and since it covers 71% of the planet, we cannot ignore it. Second, the sensors usually top out at 15 μm (or less) and that leaves around 50% of the emissions

spectrum at 288°K unchecked, as the chart below shows (black being the uncovered range).




The satellite data thus only cover 50% of 29%, or about 15% of global surface emissivity, giving zero information on the remaining 85%. This is totally insufficient, like predicting the US presidential election by only polling California. However, the problems we encounter ironically also lead the way to a solution.

A sunset over water is a beautiful sight. You see the sun over the horizon, and a strong reflection of the sun in the water. It would never look anything like it if the sun was higher up in the sky. Of course there is a reason for it, a law of physics, and that is exactly what we are after.

Fresnel equations allow us to determine precisely how much light is getting reflected on the surface of water, depending on the angle of incidence. I will not try to explore the formulas themselves, as they look quite complicated. Thank God they are not so hard to apply. All you need to know is the refractive index of water with regard to visible light ($N = 1.33$)[6][7], that of air ($N=1$) and then you get two results for s- and p- polarized light.

Then you just take the average of those two curves and you get the final result.


A chart tells us more than a thousand words:



With the sun at the zenith, or anything near to it, water reflects only 2% of sunlight. But if the sun is close to the horizon, shining onto the water at a flat angle, most of sun light gets reflected, which is one of the reasons why sun sets look so beautiful.

Physically speaking sunlight is nothing but electromagnetic radiation, just like LWIR, and thus the same physics apply. We only have to adapt the formula slightly to show how well water emits LWIR. First we need to know the appropriate refractive index in the LW range ($N=1.27$)[9] and then we just invert the result, since we do not search for radiation reflected, but rather

what is being emitted.



As we can see water is an excellent vertical emitter, with an emissivity of 0.986. This number so close to 1 that you could say the difference was indeed negligible. But that is only part of the truth. With flatter angles the picture changes dramatically and finally turns to 0 emissivity towards the horizon.

Satellites do not measure water emissivity

At this point it should become clear why satellites do not measure water emissivity. To minimize atmospheric disturbance, satellites need to look straight down onto the surface, which in this case is kind of pointless. The more interesting data could only be gathered by looking “sideways”, which satellites are very bad in. Even then, water is a very homogeneous surface type, which renders global observation obsolete, while on the other side we have a solid theoretic approach. As far as empirical testing is concerned, 10 years ago “science of doom” made a nice summary of research on the subject.[10]

If you google “emissivity of water” you will get all kinds of results. Given the complexity of the subject (including the political aspect) it is quite understandable. Regrettably this means you will have to figure it out yourself, which is mainly a mathematical challenge. The Fresnel equation tells us how water emits at a certain angle, but to get the hemispheric emissivity (we live in a 3 dimensional world) you will need to weight every gradient accordingly and also include Lambert’s cosine law. If I do all that, the result is 0.944.

Is this the final answer? I am not so certain! Anyone good in physics, or mathematics is invited to assist. One of the causes of doubt is, that German wikipedia [11], with reference to a noble German text book[12], has it at 0.91. Maybe I made a mistake after all. Then, just recently, I stumbled over an article stating “the emissivity of far-IR by the oceans is only about 89% of the 100% “efficiency” of emission/absorption of a true blackbody” [13], thereby suggesting a relatively larger refractive index in the far-IR (15-100 μ m). So I started again and with the help from a very useful site[14] calculated the average refractive index for the whole LWIR spectrum, which turned out to be $N = 1.33$, exactly the same as with SW radiation. With $N = 1.33$ my result for hemispheric emissivity drops to 0.934. By the way, I get 0.9 or 90% for the 15-100 μ m of far IR range, still relatively consistent with the 89% quoted above.

Kiehl/Trenberth fake science


All this may sound rather complicated and in the end, there is still this sour taste of uncertainty. We know for sure however, that surface emissivity, especially with regard to water, is significantly lower than 1. With an emissivity of 0.94 a surface at 288°K emits 367W/m², not 390. This alone shoves off 23W/m² from the GHE at least and exposes the infamous “Kiehl, Trenberth diagram”, where they claim 390W/m² of surface emission (396W/m² in later editions), as fake science. That’s it!

Did I forget something?

Oh yes, the big revelation. At this point we achieved more than we ever imagined, we just have not realized it yet. If we wind

back to our Fresnel charts, there is an opportunity we missed. I did show reflectivity of water with regard to solar radiation and if we invert the chart, we get the result for absorptivity.

In the logical next step, we can directly compare absorptivity with emissivity and, as we can see, they are almost identical. That is if we assume $N = 1.27$ for LWIR, which is in line with experimental observations which exclude far-IR. As named before, including far-IR would move N likely up to 1.33, with absorptivity and emissivity then being perfectly identical.



What is the temperature of a body when absorptivity and emissivity are equal at given solar radiation?

$$(342 * (x / x) / 5.67e-8)^{0.25} = 278.7^{\circ}\text{K}$$

GHE only 10°K

In other words, if there was no atmosphere, just the surface as it is (excluding any dynamic changes, ceteris paribus), the surface

of Earth would take on the temperature of 278.7K. If we allow for $N = 1.27$, thus the little asymmetry between the curves, the temperature would drop straight by 0.7°K to 278°K . Without an atmosphere, Earth would be 10°K colder.

Or, alternatively spoken, the GHE is 10°K in size!

It is a revelation you may want to let sink, or protest respectively, but it is true. Just like with the initial example of the moon, the surface of Earth absorptivity and emissivity largely cancel each other out. This is not a law of physics, as Kirchhoff's law only applies to identical wave lengths. But as much as there is variation in both absorptivity and emissivity with different wave lengths, the general tendency is for both of them to be more or less equal, especially with regard to wide spectra.[15]

Plenty of flaws - huge GHE hoax

The 33°K GHE narrative by comparison is build on a few "imprecisions", so it seems. There is the surface emissivity = 1 mistake, there is the formal impossibility of counting cloud albedo to the "surface", while at the same time denying the sheer existence of clouds in terms of emissivity. And then there are also plenty of flaws in the quantification of radiative effects, especially with regard to the CRE, that I have dealt with deeply in the previous article. All these "imprecisions" point in the same direction, certainly not accidentally so, and all together they accumulate to a huge GHE hoax.

It is a hoax as far as the apologetic side of "global warming" is concerned, but for the "critical" side it is an appalling failure. I have absolutely no understanding for how you can deal with the fiddliest questions of the science, polar bear populations, or Greta Thunberg's pigtails, but totally miss out on the core blunder.

Difference between GHGE and GHE

To be accurate, the GHGE (greenhouse gas effect) needs to be distinguished from the GHE itself. The 278°K are true for the surface alone, and the 10°K GHE is what the atmosphere does as

a whole. Of course it is perfectly thinkable there are components within the atmosphere which reduce the temperature of Earth, and then you can attribute more than just 10°K of GHE to GHGs.

If for instance clouds would cool the planet by 5°K, then we would arguably need 15°K of GHGE to get us back up to 288°K in the end. The global warming narrative thus interestingly takes relatively little harm, and can still prevail. The only precondition it needs is a significant net negative CRE. That of course is another story.

See [previous article here](#).

Footnotes

[1] https://lunarpedia.org/w/Lunar_Temperature

[2] https://www.nasa.gov/pdf/203096main_TEC%20Splinter-Thermal%20control.pdf

[3] <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0019103516304869>

[4] Actual maximum temperatures can reach over 400K, which is due to some craters serving as a kind of parabolic reflectors

[5] <https://www.mdpi.com/2072-4292/10/7/1027/htm>

[6] <https://pixabay.com/de/photos/hamilton-island-australia-sunset-585659/>

[7] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_refractive_indices

[8] [https://refractiveindex.info/?](https://refractiveindex.info/?shelf=main&book=H2O&page=Hale)

[shelf=main&book=H2O&page=Hale](https://refractiveindex.info/?shelf=main&book=H2O&page=Hale)

[9] $N=1.27$ is consistent with measurements on the subject.

These measurements yet exclude the far long wave range. A total weighted spectral average according to the data here

([https://refractiveindex.info/?](https://refractiveindex.info/?shelf=main&book=H2O&page=Hale)

[shelf=main&book=H2O&page=Hale](https://refractiveindex.info/?shelf=main&book=H2O&page=Hale)), would rather elevate N to 1.33, meaning identical N s for LW and SW radiation.

[10] <https://scienceofdoom.com/2010/12/27/emissivity-of-the-ocean/>

[11] <https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emissionsgrad>

[12] H. D. Baehr, K. Stephan: *Wärme- und Stoffübertragung*. 4. Auflage. Springer-Verlag, Berlin 2004, ISBN 3-540-40130-X (Kap. 5: Wärmestrahlung)

[13] <http://hockeyschtick.blogspot.com/2014/11/new-paper-finds-huge-false-physical.html>

[14] <https://refractiveindex.info/?shelf=main&book=H2O&page=Hale>

[15] Ironically NASA fully acknowledges this. NASA does not really measure the surface temperature of the moon, rather they measure radiation emitted with a satellite. To determine the actual temperature, they need to assume a certain emissivity. Essentially, they simply reverse the formula I used above. The only way they can get to 394°K is by assuming absorptivity = emissivity. And they need to do this in order to get reasonable scientific results. When it comes to “climate science” however, they forget about science and stick rather to the emissivity = 1 myth.

Why an e-Book ?

Climate science has reached a tipping point, where it has become a requirement to be rational again. One cannot stay idle, twiddling his thumbs when our most fundamental freedoms are going to be threatened by an unfounded climate urgency. Check this website regularly for updates and latest version available.



Patrice POYET

I graduated in Geophysics, Geochemistry and Remote Sensing with a DEA from Ecole des Mines de Paris / CTAMN (1982) - First in my class ("Mention Très Bien", i.e. grade point average > 18/20). I defended a D.Sc. in Geochemistry, Geo-Mathematics and Geo-Informatics (1986) at Nice University and INRIA (National Research Institute in Computer Science and Automation) - "Mention très honorable et félicitations du jury". I have an interest in various domains like Earth and Planetary Sciences, Astronomy, Finance and Trading, Integration in Manufacturing and Design, Simulation and Defense Systems, etc. I published 38 articles mostly in peer-reviewed scientific journals, 6 books jointly-reviewed with colleagues, 6 peer-reviewed chapters in books, 64 papers in peer-reviewed conferences, one D.Sc. thesis (1986), and 32 scientific and technical reports for demanding public and private clients and acted as an expert reviewer for several EC R&D projects. I am now using my initial training and my passion for Earth and Space sciences to completely revisit the subject of climate and paleo-climates. The result is this free 465 pages e-Book that addresses all aspects of the subject.


CLIMATE POLICIES

Climate Urgency will be an efficient manner to return into the cave. There is no climate crisis and no climate urgency. Let's be rational, repel myths and the dreadful policies that might emerge. Carbon and warmth support life and this has always been so over geological

times. Scientific evidences, from all disciplines involved in the analysis presented in the book, do not support the view that there would be any sort of climate urgency.

“Climate science has been targeted by a major political movement, environmentalism, as the focus of their efforts, wherein the natural disasters of the earth system, have come to be identified with man's activities - engendering fear as well as an agenda for societal reform and control...” Richard Lindzen





SCARE MONGERS HAVE FAILED FOR 50 YEARS

The worse predictions have been made for 50 years and none of them has ever happened to become true. Time to revisit and analyse the scare mongers strategies. For example, despite the unsupported claims that the Maldivé islands will be submerged by 2050, 97% of them have grown so far, for various reasons having nothing to do with "climate change".

Do not forget that in 1970, quite exactly 50 years ago, the first Earth Day promoted ice age fears, and environmentalist Nigel Calder warned "The threat of a new ice age must now stand alongside nuclear war as a likely source of wholesale death and misery for mankind" and C. C. Wallen of the World Meteorological Organization said "The cooling since 1940 has been large enough and consistent enough that it will not soon be reversed".

Suggested citation: Poyet, P., 2021. The Rational Climate e-Book: Cooler is Riskier. The Sorry State of Climate Science and Policies. March 3rd, 124 Figures, 181 Equations, 465 pp., e-ISBN 978-99957-1-929-6

- [Download free E-book](#)



4.4. Climate Activists, Environmentalists and Malthusians

Climate activists, even though they have not even been to school as they are too busy teenagers testifying before the U.S. Congress or attending the UN Climate Action Summit, know better than scientists who have studied earth and planetary sciences, computer sciences and much more for their entire life and who dissent the «consensus».

As unbelievable as it is, one must listen to Thunberg (2019) chastise world leaders and decide that science has been settled for more than 30 years. What does she know about science? Can someone tell me!

Invited by the United Nations, Thunberg, born in 2003, has the gall when she has benefited of the best conditions of living that mankind has ever had these last 2 million years thanks to the hard work and intelligence of so many previous generations, she has the gall to declare to the world:

«How dare you? You have stolen my dreams and my childhood with your empty words and yet I'm one of the lucky one, people are suffering, people are dying, dying ecosystems are collapsing, we are at the beginning of a mass extinction and all you can talk about is money, the fairy tales of economic growth, how dare you continue to look away? ... For more than 30

years the Science has been crystal clear, how dare you continue to look away, etc. »
(Thunberg, 2019).

Of course, she understands science better than Einstein (1919) who knew «***the truth of a theory can never be proven***» and Thunberg has decided that the matter is crystal clear and settled! Who else would dare to oppose such a savvy analysis.

What a difference one century can make! It is simply bewildering that so many public organizations, e.g. Swedish Parliament, United Nations, U.S. Congress, etc., demonstrate such a lack of discernment and have extended invitations to a clueless teenager that is to become the world fortune teller and reveal the new gospel as she does in Pearl Jam's song "Retrograde" with a startling vision for an Earth ravaged by climate change (Cohen, 2020).

It is simply inappropriate and morally indefensible to make use of a dysfunctional youngster suffering from Asperger syndrome, obsessive–compulsive disorder (OCD), and selective mutism, a teenager who struggled with depression for three or four years before beginning a school strike, to promote the worst and totally baseless climate activist vision and this should be obvious to our leaders and to the media who have organized this saddening circus. This is too much like a set-up to create any public trust in man-made climate change and will probably soon lead to a severe backlash as can be sensed from the comments left by the readers of the papers describing Thunberg achievements. Hopefully, the common sense of the people should not be underestimated.

Page 308

Cognitive Dissonances

“The global warming mantra changes the whole nature of the Scientific Method, which hitherto, has been driven by evidence, evidence backed by data. The whole global warming thing does not even rate as an hypothesis because there is no data, and certainly no evidence that 420 ppm CO₂ (or whatever, pick any number below 6000) drives climate change. It may cause mild warming, which is good, also because it greens the planet. Climate change as presented by the alarmists is a thought bubble, a dogma, which the Scientific Method cannot deal with because there is no data, no evidence.

Science will only progress when the veracity of data and evidence can be argued. Instead, the alarmists base their whole case on flawed and incomplete computer models around so-called '*climate sensitivity*'." Aert Driessen, Australia, Bureau of Mineral Resources, Geology and Geophysics. “

I suspect most of the 97% of scientists privately have grave doubts about how this has panned out, but all of us suffer more from being rejected by our peers than we suffer from being wrong. Strong advocates of the CO2 dominance of climate change, at an emotional level, fear being proven wrong by the skeptics far more than they fear the impending apocalypse. This is not climate science, it's the irrationality of humans”

320. Boxer (remaining anonymous).

The Cognitive Dissonance Theory (CDT) was established by Leon Festinger (1957) and acknowledges the fact that when observations do not match the theory, some people will inevitably resolve the dissonance by blindly believing whatever they wanted to believe.

Perfect examples of such situations will be provided later, such as what is illustrated by Figure 116, and AGW believers stating that blizzards killing and freezing populations is exactly what could be expected of Global Warming! As they intimately perceive the nonsense of having explained for years that CO2 was an IR GHG that would lead to an uncontrolled elevation of the temperatures and of having to stick desperately to their position as confronted to nonconforming observations, they thwart the words in a futile attempt to restore their internal comfort and to reassure themselves that all is fine in the world of ideology and belief by calling their failed AGW theory a climate crisis.

Not only does the climate not experience any crisis, but the only crisis visible in plain sight is their distress and the internal stress they feel whenever confronted to observations that do not match their failed theory.

Page 293

In today's world, «If the Chinese are such high performers and so innovative, it is because, like the Indians and the Russians, they have faith in science: they have

faith in the ability of science to embellish their future and to create a better world. In Europe, there was a time when we, too, had faith in science; and faith in an evolution of our societies that would rest on science. Today we have not only turned our backs on science, we are choked and infantilized by bureaucrats who suck the living forces of the old continent» (Markó, 2017) interviewed by (Watts, 2017).

One should remind that climate is, in fact, the consequence of an incredibly complex interaction of massive and diverse forces, from variations in solar radiation intensity, to eccentricities of Earth's orbit, axis precession, and rotation, atmospheric absorption and reflection, convection and advection, to ocean heat absorption, mixing currents, and thermohaline circulation, volcanism and even plate tectonics creating mountain belts influencing the location of monsoons and the global atmospheric circulation and many other massive forces interacting.

The agenda by climate alarmists to claim that this entire spectrum of massive forces is somehow insignificant next to a change of a mere 0.007% over 250 years in the concentration of a trace gas in Earth's atmosphere that in total represents just 0.04% of the atmosphere, is *prima facie* absurd.

This gas is essential for life, and has at other stages in Earth's history been as much as ten times more in concentration without any ill effect. In fact, times of higher concentration are times of incredibly lush, vibrant, and diverse plant and animal life whose fossilized carbon remains actually created the vast oil and gas reserves we today depend on to fuel human civilization. Page 305

<https://patricepoyet.org/>

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/347150306_The_Rational_Climate_e-Book

www.energyissuestoday.com

ENERGY POVERTY ADVOCACY MOVEMENT

HELPING ALLEVIATE HAZARDOUS HEALTH EFFECTS FROM HOUSEHOLD SMOKE
BY BUILDING RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADVOCACY MOVEMENTS IN
DEVELOPING NATIONS.



AIR POLLUTION FROM COOKING
IS A MAJOR PROBLEM

EMPOWERING WOMEN REDUCES EXPOSURE TO INDOOR AIR POLLUTION

Solid fuel use causes more deaths each year than HIV, malaria and tuberculosis combined.

Recent study says "pollutants from the use of solid fuels as a silent killer that is largely forgotten by aid groups and policymakers.

Rural electrification by Utilities must be extended not fake renewables..

energyissuestoday.com

Top NZ Scientist Describes “Global Warming” as Pseudo- Science

Barbara McKenzie Uncategorized January 26, 2019

The widespread obsession with Global-Warming-Climate-Change, in opposition to all factual evidence, is quite incredible. (Dr David Kear)

Dr David Kear is a former Director General of New Zealand’s Department of Scientific and Industrial Research (DSIR) – as such he would have been considered one of New Zealand’s top scientists. He has been publishing on sea levels since the 1950s.

In 2013 Dr Kear prepared a booklet in which he set out his views on the globalist climate project. In the booklet, Dr Kear describes:

- his experience with the UN’s International Panel on Climate Change
- the corrupted science behind the Global Warming narrative
- the corrupted science behind the claims of rising sea-levels
- the demonisation by “Global Warmers” of the “essential and innocent gas, carbon dioxide”.
- how councils are making zoning & other decisions purely to satisfy a false narrative, with total disregard for the facts

Think globally, act locally (UN catchcry) Dr Kear describes how local councils are ignoring scientific fact in order to satisfy an agenda imposed on them from above. No matter if scientists, engineers and local observers all indicate that the

sea is not rising, even retreating – once a council has decided on a policy that assumes that the sea IS rising, the council is immovable, and makes decisions on zoning and building codes on that basis.

Such policies will be being applied in coastal and non-coastal areas alike, thereby contributing to fulfillment of Agenda 21 goals of eventually eliminating small towns and villages and moving people to “sustainable” megacities.

Dr Kear’s text is reproduced here in its entirety with minimal changes to format.

GLOBAL WARMING alias CLIMATE CHANGE

[the NON-EXISTENT, incredibly expensive, THREAT TO US ALL, including to our GRANDCHILDREN]

by David Kear, 34 West End, Ohope, Whakatane, NZ

(former Director-General, NZ DSIR; United Nations consultant; & South Pacific geoscientist)

INTRODUCTION

“Climate Change” has become an important international topic – one might almost say religion. It began life as “Global Warming”.

So very many people, including politicians and “news people”, appear to have been overwhelmed by it, and have led others to believe, and follow the doctrine.

It has sponsored a good deal of international co-operation, which can only have been good.

However, the cost of “Combating Carbon” has been extremely high, and the debt and economic consequences are being passed on to present citizens, and, worse still, to future generations, including all our grandchildren.

This booklet attempts to raise, in citizens’ minds, questions regarding the enormous sums of money and effort being wasted on this topic.

Is it soundly based? Will it “do good” or “do bad” for ordinary citizens? Do those promoting it deserve our attention?

This booklet suggests that Global-Warming-alias-Climate-Change, as proposed by “Global Warmers” makes no sense. You, as the reader, must judge that for yourself – not to help the writer of this booklet, but to help you and your family.

Do you think after reading all this that the proponents are absolutely reliable?

Should you add your voice to those against it, or at least talk to your councillors and members of parliament and see how they feel?

THE ANCIENT ACCEPTABLE VIEW

Our Earth’s climate is highly variable, and records show clearly that it always has been so. Animals and plants have had no option but *to accept what comes*, and to adapt life *in ways that suit best*. Evolution gave some help by introducing “*the Survival of the Fittest*”

Humans found early that their discussion and understanding were helped by a belief in some extraneous source being the cause of recorded changes of climate – perhaps with divine

power. This booklet uses “Mother Nature” in that role to avoid wordy explanations.

Humans discovered that they could ameliorate climatic effects with buildings, clothing and the rest, and even create “microclimates” through windbreaks, forest clearing, artificial lakes, fossil fuel burning, and the rest. However, no-one originally thought seriously that man could change the basic influences to our climate - our Sun, our Earth’s rotation, the total quantity of our Planet’s water, and the rest. Mother Nature is able to change all such things (and has been doing so for some 3,000,000,000 years), *but we are not*.

THE NEW BELIEF – THE NEW PROBLEM

Introduction

That ancient and acceptable view was amended in the minds of some people whom I call the “Global Warmers”. I’ve heard nothing convincing about their so-called “Science”; but what they publish convinces me that it’s close to nonsense. The most convincing evidence against it comes mostly from the Global Warmers themselves.

In this booklet, the beliefs of “Global Warming”, and “Climate Change” have initial capital letters. That contrasts with natural warming, or natural changing of climate - indicated by lower case initial letters. The idea of a human cause is much less than 300 years old.

My interest in our changing climate and sea level

During fieldwork for a PhD thesis I found a coastal exposure of soft sandstone at Ohuka Creek, south of Port Waikato. There were Pliocene fossils of marine shellfish below an extensive horizontal bedding plane. Above that plane were more fossils, but of cool-loving plants. A finger could show the exact location of the abrupt change to the cooler climate at the onset of the first of the world-wide Pleistocene glaciations [Ice Ages]. Ice formed widely at the ultimate expense of sea water, so sea level fell. At Ohuka, sea bed had become land. Such changes

are rarely seen in a continuous sequence, so I recorded it in a 1957 scientific paper. That resulted in my joining an informal world-wide Group researching changing sea levels.

Most interest then was about the rate of sea level rise as the Earth warmed following the “Little Ice Age”. That cool period, from about 1500 to 1700 AD, halted winemaking in England and taro cropping in New Zealand. Our Group determined the rate of sea level rise in many different World regions, from widely-available readings of tide gauges (less variable than those of thermometers). The average for us all was 125 mm/century (“125” here). Hence it would take 8 centuries for sea level to rise 1m – no serious threat to us.

Global Warming Dawns Subsequently, I attended many international science conferences representing DSIR, NZ or Pacific Nations. I noted the words “Global Warming” appearing increasingly in paper titles, and sensed a growing number of adherents. Those latter arranged a first-ever “Conference on Global Warming” in Vienna in 1985. Unlike most such meetings, where a communiqué summarising achievements was released on the final day, the full results of this one were delayed for over 2 years.

When they did appear (front page *NZ Herald*, two days before Christmas 1987) a *World Declaration* included “Overseas scientists have estimated that the seas around New Zealand will rise by up to 1.4 m in the next 40 years”. That article concentrated on the massive consequent problems, caused by our carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions, but gave no adequate supporting science. That rate of rise was equivalent to **3,500** mm/century, 28 times faster than our **125**. Hence we stupidly ignored it, thinking no one could possibly believe it. But the World did believe, and the Global Warming mirage was born. Had **3,500** been true, sea level should have risen by almost 1 m by today – it hasn’t, not even closely.

This showed unambiguously that those “Overseas Scientists” were not true scientists. They ignored a most important basic

rule of true science *“Thou shall not publish Science without first checking it. A check against local tide gauges would have shown how wrong 1.4 m in 40 yrs was; they simply hadn’t bothered to check.* That was a **First Grave Error**.

Australian government scientists were concerned about the effects on Pacific Island nations by any sea level rise of around **3,500** mm/century, and launched a project to determine the correct figure at that time. They announced the result at the 1992 meeting of SOPAC – a geoscientific organisation of South Pacific nations. Their figure was **122** mm/century, confirming the order of magnitude of our group’s **125** average value.

Fooling the World The Global Warmers persisted with their use of pseudo-science and made further predictions. Understandably they too all proved wrong. At conferences I began to hear, regardless of the science involved, when a speaker wished to “rubbish” some scientific idea or research, he/she stated that conclusion firmly, and followed it by *“Just like Global Warming”*. Clearly the Global Warmers heard that too. They didn’t change their pseudo-science, but cleverly changed the name to ‘Climate Change’. [*One can disprove warming, but the words change of climate can’t be proved wrong*].

The United Nations became interested – major sea level rise could cause havoc in low-lying areas or island groups. They established an *Intergovernmental Panel for Climate Change (IPCC)* and invited nations to send delegates. Not surprisingly those chosen were almost entirely Global Warmers, because they *clearly knew something about it*. But to do them credit the Panel members acted a little more like true scientists than those earlier.

They accepted that *“1.4 m in 40 yrs”* was wrong and re-evaluated it as *“0.49 m by 2100”*, [roundly a century ahead]. Thus they dropped **3,500** down to **500** mm/century – to 14% of

the original. The cause remained unchanged – our CO2 emissions to the atmosphere. In no other human activity would those involved retain a belief when the most crucial item involved was found to be 86% wrong **by themselves**. That was a **Second Grave Error**.

In spite of that, the World was taken in. Politicians were able to promise to save us from the consequences, and the Media had an unending “Field Day”. It wasn’t that people necessarily believed, but they lacked the courage to risk that it might come true, and that they might have to bear the terrible consequences that had been so forcibly promised.

The New Errors The new value of “0.49 m by 2100” became widely accepted. In New Zealand, District Councils were instructed by Government Departments, like Conservation and Environment, and by Regional Councils, that they must take full account of the risk that “0.49” implied for a sea level rise by 2100. Councils had to consider that in the same way as earthquake and volcanic risk. Yet that “0.49” value doesn’t stand up to the most simple scientific scrutiny.

First, the rate is four times faster than the current sea level rise, as indicated by regional, widely-available tide gauges; *second*, no reason was given for quadrupling the value, and *third*, good science interprets “0.49” in this sense as being deliberately different from 0.48 and 0.50. Thus that effectively claims that those who determined that value know, for sure, where sea level will be a century ahead to ± 5 mm. That was, and is, patently absurd

These were the **Third, Fourth & Fifth Grave Errors**.

Further Damning Disclosures The United Nations appointed me personally to their UNCSTD Committee which assists small countries with their ability regarding Science and Technology Development. Three or so of us would go to a central city to talk and discuss their options with delegates from regional countries. On one occasion we met in Prague, to assist

countries on both sides of the “Iron Curtain”. While there, we were invited to visit the World’s only “Institute for Global Warming”. It was founded and funded incredibly by the USA and Soviet Union jointly, at the height of their “Cold War”, in an attempt to fund something “for the good of Mankind”, rather than “for armaments”. Some of its staff could have attended the 1985 Conference, and helped create the 1987 *World Declaration*.

I took the opportunity of asking to see copies of the documents that had been brought to that 1985 Meeting in neutral Austria. Several attendees brought their estimates for sea level rise due to Global Warming. The values, converted to mm/century, ranged from **500** minimum to **3,500** maximum. There can be no doubt that, to ensure that their 1987 *World Declaration* made the greatest impact, they published the maximum value – contravening the most sacred rule of acceptable science *Thou shall not publish items for monetary, political, or personal gain that are not clear un-biased un-inflated truths*.

The fact that “up to” was used, might be allowed in non-scientific areas, but not in Science. If World Media had distorted the message, the Warmers should immediately have denied what was wrongly claimed, and ensured that the proper statement got equal publicity. Using a maximum value for greatest effect was the Sixth (and Worst) Grave Error.

OLD SCIENTIFIC CONCLUSIONS ON CLIMATE IGNORED

19th Century science posed a important question. Why is our Earth’s average temperature significantly higher than that calculated from the then-recent determinations of our Sun’s distance and its radiation? Knowing my interests in climate,

DSIR librarians found me a publication in German that answered that puzzle early. It had Scandinavian author(s), if I remember correctly. Its answer was that the CO₂ in our atmosphere acts like glass in a glasshouse. Both change the optical physical nature of the Sun's infra-red rays [that carry the warmth to us] such that they may enter, but cannot then leave. So we are warmed by the heat trapped below our CO₂; like the glasshouse below its glass.

I surmise that the Global Warmers, along with Al Gore, noted correctly that CO₂ keeps us warm, but thought wrongly that more would make us warmer. The analogy with glass is important. Horticultural experiments long ago found that more (thicker) glass does not cause more warming, so more CO₂ probably doesn't either. The effect is like that of polarising spectacles, where the change takes place as light begins passing through the lenses. Thickness makes no difference. Polarisation is either 100%, or not at all. A coincidence timed the Little Ice Age's end with the Industrial Revolution's start. The Warmers blamed the undoubted warming on the latter - ignoring the glasshouse evidence.

THE NEW CLIMATE REGIME

NIWA The National Institute of Water & Atmospheric Research (NIWA) retains New Zealand climate records. It has a history of persuading successive governments that Global Warming and Climate Change are both real. It often encouraged media headlines like "*We are Getting Warmer*", when any news item suggested any higher temperature. Science progresses by new concepts and ideas being aired freely for scientific scrutiny. That has sometimes taken centuries to be completed. Although I don't agree with some of NIWA's views, it is proper that they should be aired for discussion, as in this booklet.

One announcement (that surely originated from NIWA) was very important to me and all citizens, and was a credit to NIWA itself. At the close of 2007, it stated that the decade just

finishing was the warmest since New Zealand records began. The announcement added that, of those 10 years, 1998 was the warmest ever since records began. I was grateful to NIWA, and concluded that 2007 was no warmer than 1998, and probably cooler. I could assume therefore that warming at our **125** rate finished in 1998. In the roundest of figures, the Little Ice Age lasted for some 200 years. There would be no conflict with accepting that the following warming should similarly last for some 200 years.

As always in Science one seeks confirmation whenever possible. I have seen many items that lead to that same view of “no warming since 1998”. The best was a written debate in the *Imperial Engineer* of autumn 2008. [*That scientific journal is produced for engineering graduates of Imperial College, London - arguably UK's top university in engineering.*] The debate was on whether Humans were to blame for current changes of climate. Prof Joanna Haigh blamed Humans, Lord Monckton blamed Mother Nature. The only point on which they both agreed was that there had been no warming since 1998. That confirmed NIWA's statement perfectly, along with several comparable pronouncements.

My conclusion is that warming since the Little Ice Age's end is now almost certainly finished. That was supported further by NIWA's release at the end of 2012, concerning the Eastern Bay of Plenty. Their report was that 2012 had been *drier and colder* than 2011. Citizens also notice that warming seems to be over. Skiing seasons are extended, winter fires are needed earlier, and some of us travelling overseas have been asked by those from Queensland, even Hawaii, whether we in New Zealand feel colder generally - *as they do*. I conclude that the New Zealand climate has not been warming since 1998.

THE AFFECTS ON CITIZENS

Astronomical Cost of Major Measures to Combat a Non-Existent Threat: Politicians and the Media have listened to

the proponents of Global-Warming-Climate-Change, but don't seem to have made any critical assessment of it all. Perhaps they were bemused by the Global Warmers constantly naming themselves and associates as "Scientists". As has been shown, those people disregarded the basic rules of true Science. Their political and media audiences innocently believed the statements - ***which contained grave errors.***

Innocents in politics and the media were badly mis-led. They gladly supported projects to combat the non-existent threat of Global-Warming-Climate-Change. The projects were ***unnecessary*** because there was no threat; ***extremely costly*** in money time and effort; ***full of praise where ridicule was deserved misleading*** about benefits & options; and above all ***diversionary*** away from today's real problems.

A huge international bureaucratic industry was born - with Cabinet Ministers, government departments, company sections, travel, conferences, treaties, carbon credits, and carbon trading, and very much more. The challenge was often heard that we must curb our carbon emissions or sacrifice our grandchildren's well-being. In truth, those children were being saddled with a gigantic debt to pay for everything encompassed by the Warmers' "carbon footprints", including the salaries and expenses of the loudest proponents.

Perhaps the saddest part has been that the essential and innocent gas, carbon dioxide, has been demonised and criminalised. It is essential in creating plant growth using chlorophyll and photo-synthesis. It is thus ***essential for our very existence.*** Crops grow better in a CO₂-enriched and warmer atmosphere, when heated by an old-fashioned vertical kerosene heater. It gives off "carbon emissions" that are valuable to us all.

Costs and Dangers of Local Measures to combat the Non-Existent Threat: Local authorities were compelled to adopt measures designed to combat the nonexistent threat.

Typically, maps were drawn showing the coastline's position now, and in the year 2100 with intermediate zone(s), assuming that sea level would rise 0.49 m in the next 100 years. Onerous restrictions have been emplaced within the zones that were thus defined.

Many regions have vast quantities of sand transported by rivers to their coast, released by the erosion of hills and mountains, continuously raised by Mother Nature. Their coastline extends seawards steadily. Citizens in such regions have long noted (with surveys and photos) that the coastline has a net **seawards** movement. It contrasts with many Councils' imposed belief in "0.49" which demands **landwards** movement ("inundation").

Councils seem unable to accept their citizens' constant and loud protests about all this. They seem to feel that higher authorities insist that they must ignore such views. It is not just (a) the absurdity of restrictions about where houses may be erected (only inland of certain lines), etc.; or (b) the increasing costs to those building their first home. At the other end of the scale there are enforced dangers; a requirement for higher floor levels, leading to more steps, with unnecessary risks to elderly folk falling, when using them.

The fact that sea level is no longer rising is a new extra factor for councils to ignore. In the example of Ohope Beach, a Commission of enquiry, set up by Council, backed the Council's view of **landwards** inundation. That rejected all citizens' factual evidence of **seawards** net movement for periods ranging from 50 to 5,000 years. Council also rejected the advice, supporting the Citizens, by one who was highly qualified in engineering and science and had had long and successful experience in coastal work.

Much worse, the Council's own appointed consultants provided an additional report based on every coastal survey for

which a record was available. **It showed a “retreat of the sea” [seaward shoreline movement, or accretion] at the only three Ohope sites, of 0.30-0.94 m/yr over 130 years that was still ongoing in 2008. Clearly neither Council nor Commission had bothered to read that critical report, written by highly regarded consultants, who had been appointed for this project by the Council itself.**

The widespread obsession with Global-Warming-Climate-Change, in opposition to all factual evidence, is quite incredible. It leads to unfair treatment of some citizens, and a massive bill for all, for nothing useful. When will citizens revolt effectively against such callous disregard for their observations and wishes, by those who are essentially their elected employees? When will the perpetrators examine the basis of their ideology, and realise that it's based on unfounded unscientific beliefs, not on confirmed, widely-available investigations by real scientists who abide by the moral standards of their profession?

References to Kaawa- Ohuka

- a) Couper RA & McQueen DR 1954: Pliocene and Pleistocene plant fossils of NZ and their climatic interpretation. *Trans Roy Soc NZ* 77(3): 398-420
- b) Kear D 1957: Stratigraphy of the Kaawa-Ohuka coastal area, West Auckland. *NZ J Sci Tech B* 38 (8): 826-42
- c) Kear D 1963: Geology of Te Akau, West Auckland & regional implications. PhD thesis, London University. 2 vols, 599 pp (copies at libraries of GNS, and of London, Auckland & Waikato Universities).

ISBN 978--0--473--25154--3

July 2013

Biographical Note: [Dr David Kear](#) has a background in geology and engineering, becoming the Director General of the DSIR (New Zealand’s Department of Scientific and Industrial Research) in 1980. He is a Fellow and Past Vice-President of the Royal Society of New Zealand, and Past President of the New Zealand Geological Society. Dr Kear has over 100 publications on New Zealand and Pacific geology, vulcanology and mineral resources. He has been publishing on sea-levels since the 1950s.

See also:

[CLIMATISM : 2019 State Of The Climate Report](#) Jamie Spry compares truth and fable with regard to “areas of concern” such as the polar icecaps, sea levels, snow, heatwaves, and the Great Barrier Reef.

[More Than 1000 International Scientists Dissent Over Man-Made Global Warming Claims \(pdf\)](#): Marc Morano details petitions and submissions from the years 2007-2010 addressed to the likes of Ban-Ki Moon, Barack Obama, Angela Merkel and the public, signed by top scientists around the world, including many from New Zealand.


Climate Depot, [Another Dissenter](#): “Dr. Kear joins many other scientists who recently publicly dissented from man-made climate fears”.

[Global Warming Petition Project](#): 31,000 American scientists have signed a petition asking the US government to reject the Kyoto global warming agreement. A summary of peer-reviewed research is included.

Petition

We urge the United States government to reject the global warming agreement that was written in Kyoto, Japan in December, 1997, and any other similar proposals. The proposed limits on greenhouse gases would harm the environment, hinder the advance of science and technology, and damage the health and welfare of mankind.

There is no convincing scientific evidence that human release of carbon dioxide, methane, or other greenhouse gases is causing or will, in the foreseeable future, cause catastrophic heating of the Earth's atmosphere and disruption of the Earth's climate. Moreover, there is substantial scientific evidence that increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide produce many beneficial effects upon the natural plant and animal environments of the Earth.



Please sign here

Please send more petition cards for me to distribute.

My academic degree is B.S. M.S. Ph.D. in the field of PHYSICS

https://stovouno.org/2019/01/26/top-nz-scientist-describes-global-warming-as-pseudo-science/?fbclid=IwAR0ay5mJhIAMImC-ifRZcy3uqzC3fNSk4cUasaZn43F6u_kFU8bnNsBptP0



New Paper: Risk Of Poverty, Lower Incomes, Increased Energy Costs ‘Directly Linked With Renewable Energies’

By *Kenneth Richard* on 8. April 2019

An empirical analysis using 2005-2015 data from 15 EU countries indicates that as more renewable energies (i.e., solar PV) are deployed, energy costs increase, household poverty risks rise, and incomes decline. Image Source: Pereira et al., 2019 In contrast to the negative consequences of switching from fossil fuels to renewables, Dr. Tadesse Weldu Teklu [...]

Share this...

Michael Moore Film May Splinter Green Movement, Calls Green Energies “A Delusion”, Billionaire Bonanza

By *P Gosselin* on 22. April 2020

Share this...

In short, everything we’ve been told about green energies is a lie. And a select few swindlers out there are making a financial killing while the environment gets devoured by “green” technologies. The newly released Planet of the Humans film is as damning documentary as you’ll ever see – produced by leftist Michael [...]

Share this...

‘the almost zero impact’ of carbon taxes misses some major costs.

Opinion: Higher carbon taxes will cost Canadian governments \$24 billion a year by 2030

Deficit will increase after already hitting historic highs during COVID

Author of the article:

Elmira Aliakbari and Jason Clemens, Special to Financial Post

Publishing date:

Mar 16, 2021 • 9 hours ago • 3 minute read •  [45 Comments](#)



Ottawa will raise the federal carbon tax, from a previous maximum of \$50 per tonne of carbon emissions to \$170 per tonne by 2030. PHOTO BY PAUL CROCK/AFP/GETTY IMAGES

By Elmira Aliakbari and Jason Clemens

Late last year, the Trudeau government unveiled its new climate plan, which calls for the federal carbon tax to reach \$170 per tonne by 2030, with revenues rebated to households or spent by Ottawa. This plan will, among other things, increase government budget deficits, which have already hit historic highs during the COVID-recession, resulting in rapidly rising government debt across Canada. According to a new [study](#) co-authored by one of us (Aliakbari) and Ross McKittrick of the University of Guelph, once the carbon tax is fully implemented, combined federal and provincial deficits will increase by another \$24 billion annually.



At the moment, the federal government expects to borrow more than \$380 billion in 2020-21 and more than \$650 billion between now and 2025-26 — not including either the \$70 billion to \$100 billion it has already said it plans to spend to stimulate the economy post-COVID or any new spending beyond that — which is likely to be financed by borrowing — that it may announce in this spring’s federal budget.

As of the end of February, most provinces were reporting budget deficits for the current year and into the future. In total, the provinces expect to borrow \$91.6 billion in 2020-21, with Ontario (\$38.5 billion), Alberta (\$20.2 billion), British Columbia (\$13.6 billion) and Quebec (\$12.3 billion) leading the way.”

Worse is yet to come. These numbers do not account for increasing pressure on government finances due to Canada’s aging population. A 2020 study by our colleagues Jake Fuss and Steven Globerman, which was completed pre-COVID, found that, due largely to our population aging, Ottawa will not balance the federal budget before 2050, while federal debt levels will rise to levels not seen since the early 1990s when Canada came close to experiencing a debt and currency crisis.

It’s in this fiscally daunting context that Ottawa has raised the federal carbon tax, from a previous maximum of \$50 per tonne of carbon emissions to \$170 per tonne by 2030. Again, while it may sound counterintuitive, this higher carbon tax will cause *larger* government deficits, for two main reasons.

First, according to the Trudeau government’s plan, most of the revenue (90 per cent) collected from the carbon tax is scheduled to be returned to households via lump-sum rebates — and the government has not indicated this policy will change as the tax increases. The total estimated cost of the rebate in 2030, when the tax reaches \$170 per tonne, is \$27.3 billion.

Second, the government has repeatedly claimed the higher carbon tax will have “almost zero impact” on the economy but, tellingly, has not released any quantitative or modelling analysis. However, the new Aliakbari/McKitrick study, which employed an expansive quantitative model of Canada’s economy (referred to as a partial general equilibrium model), found the higher tax will cause economic activity to shrink by 2.1 per cent, which in 2019 would equal roughly \$44 billion. The study also finds that a \$170 carbon tax will reduce employment by

more than 200,000 jobs and cost the average Canadian worker \$1,800 in foregone income — even after accounting for the carbon tax rebate.

The induced contraction of the economy means other taxes (on personal income, for example, both federally and provincially) will raise less revenue than before because the underlying tax base is smaller. Again, this combination of a smaller tax base and the rebating and/or spending of all carbon tax revenue means combined federal and provincial deficits will increase by a total of \$24 billion annually once the carbon tax is fully implemented.

Clearly, with the current weak state of federal and provincial government finances, increasing pressures from an aging population and perhaps more new government spending on the horizon, governments across Canada will continue to face rising deficits and more debt. The higher carbon tax rate will only further strain government finances.

Elmira Aliakbari and Jason Clemens are economists at the Fraser Institute.

https://www.google.ca/search?q=**ACADEMY+OF+SCIENCE**+and+**Chinese+Academy+of+Meteorological+Sciences,+Beijing,+China**&sxsrf=ALeKk036ODnX-RHi9YRu9qfch9-W_x9P5Q:1616013249706&source=lnms&tbm=isch&biw=1600&bih=642#imgrc=XQqo_nDSqIkufM

2021 • Fraser Institute

Estimated Impacts of a \$170 Carbon Tax in Canada by Ross McKittrick and Elmira Aliakbari

4 Conclusions

The federal government's HEHE plan includes a proposed \$170-per-tonne carbon tax to be phased in over the next 9 years. In contrast to its analysis of the Kyoto Protocol 20 years ago, the government has released no economic assessment of the impacts of such a tax, except for

a brief claim that the policy will have no effect on national GDP. This is not consistent with previous studies, including those conducted by the federal government and others, of the costs for Canada of large-scale reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. The analysis in this publication suggests that the proposed carbon-tax plan, even with most of the revenues being refunded to households, will impose substantial costs on the Canadian economy. **Real GDP could decline by about 2.1% compared to the case without the tax, and the economy will lose approximately 200,000 jobs.** Also real household consumption will decline in every province even after taking account of the rebates, which highlights the challenge the federal government will face in achieving their goal that most Canadians will be made better off by the plan. The macroeconomic estimates herein are consistent with those of studies done for Kyoto compliance, when scaled to comparable emission reduction levels. Furthermore, the analysis shows that, if the government intends to refund the revenues as planned, it will go into deficit since there will be revenue losses elsewhere in the tax system. We estimate that the current rebate plan could lead to about \$24 billion in annual net losses for governments in Canada, which will ultimately require either spending reductions or new tax increases. This analysis does not imply that regulatory measures would be less costly for the economy. If we take as given the goal of reducing CO₂ emissions by, in this case, 26%, the carbon tax as implemented herein is among the more efficient options, although the reliance on lump-sum rebates and new spending to recycle the revenue inflates the costs over what they could have been if, for example, the carbon tax proceeds were used to reduce income taxes.

<https://carbontaximpacts.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/estimated-impacts-of-a-170-dollar-carbon-tax-in-canada.pdf>

By doing what exactly will the Paris Agreement help keep the temperature increase under 2°C?



[James Matkin](#), Most viewed writer in climatology
[Updated 12h ago](#)

Nothing can be done by governments to control the climate and the Paris Agreement spews nonsense predictions contradicting their own cautions. The Paris summit relied on unfounded hypothesis about the greenhouse effect by old Arrhenius work in the 19th century but repudiated in the 20th century until resurrected by alarmist on a political mission to destroy fossil fuels and their wonderful impact on market economies across the world.

The hypothesis is a *****fictitious mechanism.*****



Thomas Allmendinger

Assert CO2 Greenhouse Theory A 'Phantasm' To Be 'Neglected'

Ph.D. Physicist Uses Empirical Data To Assert CO2 Greenhouse Theory A 'Phantasm' To Be 'Neglected'

New Paper: Experiment Reveals No Detectable 'Greenhouse' Difference Between CO2 And Air Below is a very abridged quoted summary of a new scientific paper published by Dr. Thomas Allmendinger , a physicist (chemistry, quantum mechanics) who uses a real-world experiment to document a glaring lack of empirical support for the position that CO2 is a dominant agent of atmospheric warming. One-sentence summary: Shortwave radiation heats both CO2 and air only up to a limited temperature threshold, and there is no observed difference between the heat absorption/emission of air vs. CO2. Original Greenhouse Theory Not Backed By Experimental Data The starting point of the here referenced research was the generally accepted greenhouse thesis which assumes that the present climate change is mainly due to the observed growing amount of the so-called greenhouse

gases in the atmosphere, particularly of carbon-dioxide in spite of the fact that, unlike a greenhouse, the Earth atmosphere doesn't exhibit a transparent roof ... This [greenhouse effect] idea takes its source in Fourier's treatise made in 1827, exhibiting no empirical data or physical calculations and experimental data . The first results were delivered by Tyndall in the sixties of the 19th century, using artificial IR (= infrared) radiation. His photometric [light-measuring] apparatus consisted of metallic tubes as gas vessels and Leslie cubes as heat radiation sources, entailing comparatively low temperatures, namely 100°C and lower. In the [eighteen] nineties, Arrhenius continued such measurements. He established the greenhouse thesis claiming that, unlike air, carbon-dioxide considerably absorbs infrared-radiation . Thereby we distinguish between near IR ($\lambda = 0.8 - 3\mu\text{m}$), emitted at high temperatures ($> 1000 \text{ K}$), and medium IR ($\lambda = 3 - 50\mu\text{m}$) occurring at lower temperatures as usual thermal radiation, while IR-radiation with larger wavelengths ($\lambda = 50 - 1000\mu\text{m}$) is defined as far IR. [O]verall, the greenhouse thesis has been commonly settled even if [...] its empiric basis appears poor while several theoretical presumptions are speculative there is reason enough to examine the current climate theory, and in particular the greenhouse thesis, regarding fundamental scientific principles and possibly to question the usual assumptions. The analytic methods applied in climatology were exclusively photometric [light-measuring] ones. ... Thermal measurements have never been made, except those by pyranometers comprising the whole spectrum, so that direct coherences between light absorption and warming-up effects at matter have not been detected yet . The natural laws which were used for constructing the theory were confined to the temperature law of Stefan-Boltzmann (1), Planck's distribution law (2), both being solely valid for black bodies, and BeerLambert's absorption law (3), being unequivocally valid solely for visible light, and not compellingly for IR radiation (see below). These laws were often imperm

<https://notrickszone.com/2017/09/04/ph-d-physicist-uses-empirical-data-to-assert-co2-greenhouse-theory-a-phantasm-to-be-neglected/>

By [Kenneth Richard](#) on

4. September 2017

Share this...

New Paper: Experiment Reveals No Detectable 'Greenhouse' Difference Between CO2 And Air

Below is a very abridged quoted summary of a new scientific paper published by [Dr. Thomas Allmendinger](#), a physicist (chemistry, quantum mechanics) who uses a real-world experiment to document a glaring lack of empirical support for the position that CO2 is a dominant agent of atmospheric warming.

One-sentence summary: *Shortwave radiation heats both CO2 and air only up to a limited temperature threshold, and there is no observed difference between the heat absorption/emission of air vs. CO2.*



A Novel Investigation about the Thermal Behaviour of Gases under the Influence of IR-Radiation: A Further Argument against the Greenhouse Thesis

Thomas Allmendinger*

Independent Scholar, CH-8152 Glattbrugg/Zürich, Switzerland

Abstract

Besides a critical discussion of the greenhouse thesis referring to its basic assumptions, a condensed report of [1] is given here. In contrast to the usual spectroscopic methods, the temperature of a gas embedded in a tube was measured, and not the intensity loss of the radiation. The starting point was to compare air with carbon-dioxide. Moreover, not medium-wave heat radiation was used but, initially, incident solar radiation and, subsequently, artificial radiation from an IR-bulb. In order to minimize the interference by the tube, light-weight building materials were used, such as Styrofoam, transparent plastic foils and aluminium foils. Surprisingly, and in contrast to the expectations, a considerable temperature enhancement could be detected being similar in both cases. The measuring apparatus was improved, and further gases were studied, in particular noble gases. In each case, a temperature increase was detected up-to a limiting value. While the warming-up rate was independent of the gas type, the limiting temperature turned out to be gas-specific, being almost equal for air, pure carbon-dioxide and argon whereas the light gases neon, and in particular helium, exhibited significant lower limiting temperatures. Applying the kinetic gas theory, and assuming a direct correlation between limiting temperature and radiative emission power, a stringent dependency of the product on mean kinetic energy and collision frequency could be deduced. Moreover, the adsorption degree could be calculated, turning out to be very low. The absorption was assumed as a result of vibration of the atomic electron shell, induced by the electromagnetic waves. Comparing the results in sunlight to those obtained in artificial light, the effective wavelength could be assessed delivering the value of $1.9\mu\text{m}$. Since the results could be approved by numerous experiments, there is no doubt that a new effect has been discovered which allows questioning the greenhouse theory all the more.

<https://www.omicsonline.org/open-access/a-novel-investigation-about-the-thermal-behaviour-of-gases-under-theinfluence-of-irradiation-a-further-argument-against-the-greenh-2157-7617-1000393.pdf>

Original Greenhouse Theory Not Backed By Experimental Data

The starting point of the here referenced research was the generally accepted greenhouse thesis which assumes that the present climate change is mainly due to the observed growing amount of the so-called greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, particularly of carbon-dioxide in spite of the fact that, unlike a greenhouse, the Earth atmosphere doesn't exhibit a transparent roof ... **This [greenhouse effect] idea takes its source in**

Fourier's treatise made in 1827, exhibiting no empirical data or physical calculations and experimental data.

The first results were delivered by Tyndall in the sixties of the 19th century, using artificial IR (= infrared) radiation. His photometric [light-measuring] apparatus consisted of metallic tubes as gas vessels and Leslie cubes as heat radiation sources, entailing comparatively low temperatures, namely 100°C and lower. In the [eighteen] nineties, **Arrhenius** continued such measurements. He **established the greenhouse thesis claiming that, unlike air, carbon-dioxide considerably absorbs infrared-radiation**. Thereby we distinguish between near IR ($\lambda = 0.8 - 3\mu\text{m}$), emitted at high temperatures ($> 1000 \text{ K}$), and medium IR ($\lambda = 3 - 50\mu\text{m}$) occurring at lower temperatures as usual thermal radiation, while IR-radiation with larger wavelengths ($\lambda = 50 - 1000\mu\text{m}$) is defined as far IR.

[O]verall, the greenhouse thesis has been commonly settled even if [...] its empiric basis appears poor while several theoretical presumptions are speculative. ... there is reason enough to examine the current climate theory, and in particular the greenhouse thesis, regarding fundamental scientific principles and possibly to question the usual assumptions.

The analytic methods applied in climatology were exclusively photometric [light-measuring] ones. ... **Thermal measurements have never been made, except those by pyranometers comprising the whole spectrum, so that direct coherences between light absorption and warming-up effects at matter have not been detected yet.**

The natural laws which were used for constructing the theory were confined to the temperature law of Stefan-Boltzmann (1), Planck's distribution law (2), both being solely valid for black bodies, and BeerLambert's absorption law (3), being unequivocally valid solely for visible light, and not compellingly for IR radiation (see below). **These laws were often impermissibly generalized and used in an incorrect way leading to wrong conclusions.**

Questioning The CO₂-IR-Warms-The-Atmosphere Assumption

[A]ccording to this [greenhouse theory] model the assumption is made that any warming-up of the atmosphere is exclusively due to a partial absorption of medium-wave IR-radiation while any short-wave IR-absorption can be excluded since it has never been detected spectrometrically.

Against this, at least the following [5] arguments may be alleged [*just the 1st , 4th, and 5th arguments are included here in very condensed form*]:

1. As already found within a previous investigation [12], the greater part – namely **at least 60% - of the energy being emitted from a warmed plate to the surrounding atmosphere is transferred by heat conduction, and not by heat radiation** [i.e., via the greenhouse effect] obeying Stefan-Boltzmann's law which is only valid in the vacuum. That part is even enhanced when the air convection is enhanced.

Moreover, **near the ground the molar concentration of water vapour is much higher than that one of carbon dioxide** letting assume that its absorbance of heat radiation is much stronger. (e.g. at 20°C and 60% rel. humidity, the molar concentration of **water vapour is 36 times larger than that one of carbon-dioxide** being 0.038 volume%). Hence it can be assumed that **the major part of the heat transfer between Earth surface and atmosphere occurs near the ground while the greenhouse theory neglects that part solely regarding the radiative absorption by CO₂ passing the whole atmosphere.**

4. Between the energetic absorption of electromagnetic radiation by gases and their resulting warming-up no empirical – and also no theoretical – coherence is known which would be needed to carry spectroscopic results onto thermodynamic properties. **There is no good reason to assume that absorbed IR-radiation will be entirely transformed into heat. Rather it is conceivable**

that a part of it is re-emitted, to wit in all directions. But the link between the two phenomena is not known.

5. The question of radiation emission by hot gases is related with it since it is obvious that **any gas, also air, begins to radiate to such an extent as it is warmed-up**. This question arises when the so-called radiative energy transfer is studied. But instead of empiric measurements, complicated theories were developed [15-17] starting from the abstruse assumption that the atmosphere behaves like a black body obeying Stefan-Boltzmann's emission law, and disregarding the kinetic gas theory.

Overall it must be assessed that the atmospheric theory is on a shaky ground. widely missing empiric key methods to check the principles and their consequences.

Air Vs. CO2 Experiment: 'The Final Proof That The Climate Theory Cannot Be True'

Beyond, there is an aspect which hitherto has been overlooked, and which delivers **the final proof that the climate theory cannot be true**. It is the topic of the here reported author's work [[Allmendinger, 2016](#)] concerning thermal measurements instead of spectroscopic ones, and delivering the evidence that **any gas absorbs IR-radiation - but in the short wavelength range -, with the consequence that air is warmed up by direct solar insolation - as well as by artificial IR-light - up to a limiting temperature due to radiative emission, and leading to an equilibrium state.**

Preliminary tests for the present investigation were made with solar light using square twin-tubes from Styrofoam (3 cm thick, 1 m long, outer diameter 25 cm), each equipped with three thermometers at different positions, and covered above and below by a thin transparent foil (preferably a 0.01 mm thick Saran-wrap). The tubes were pivoted on a frame in such a way that they could be oriented in the direction of the solar light (Figure 3). **One tube was filled with air, the other with carbon-dioxide**. Incipiently, the tubes were covered on the tops

with aluminium-foils being removed at the start of the experiment.

The primary experimental result was quite astonishing in many respects.

Firstly: **The content gases warmed within a few minutes by approximately 10°C up to a constant limiting temperature.**

This was surprising – at least in the case of air – for no warming-up was anticipated since sunlight is colourless and allegedly not able to absorb any IR-radiation. However, the existence of a limiting temperature is conceivable since a growing radiative emission has to be expected as far as the temperature rises.

Secondly: **The limiting temperatures were more or less equal at any measuring point. This means that the intensity of the sun beam was virtually not affected by the heat absorption in the gas tube** since the latter one was comparatively weak.

And thirdly: **Between the two tubes** [one filled with air, the other with CO₂] **no significant difference could be detected.** Therefore, thanks to this simple experiment **a special effect of carbon dioxide on the direct sunlight absorption could already be excluded.**

As evident from Figure 8, any gas absorbs IR-light - even the noble [non-greenhouse] **gases argon, neon and helium do so** – while there is no significant difference between argon and carbon dioxide, but **only a small difference between carbon-dioxide and air.**




Figure 8: Time-temperature curves of different gases (150 W, medium thermometer position).

Conclusion/Summary

Besides a critical discussion of the convenient atmosphere theory profoundly questioning the greenhouse thesis by disclosing several basic errors, the here reported investigation reveals the discovery of direct absorption of shortwave IR-radiation by air. It is part of the incident solar light, but also of artificial light which enables a more exact detection. It is caused by another effect than the one which is responsible for the longer-wave absorption being observed at carbon dioxide, and **it is not detectable by IR-spectroscopy** since its absorption coefficient is too low. However, it is clearly detectable by means of the here applied apparatus leading to a distinct temperature elevation up to a limiting temperature which depends on the radiative emission. **The limiting temperature depends on the gas kind, whereby practically no difference between air and carbon-dioxide could be found.**

Nevertheless, that direct absorption effect [shortwave] which was discovered thanks to this method probably contributes significantly to the warming

up of the atmosphere while the warming-up due to carbon-dioxide can be neglected.

But since the direct absorption cannot be influenced, the surface albedo must be focused as the governing factor providing the only [anthropogenic] opportunity to mitigate the climate, or at least the microclimate, by changing colour and structure of the surface, particularly in urban areas. However, a prediction seems not feasible since the global climate is too complex. But **the greenhouse theory turns out to be a phantasm delivering the wrong diagnosis for the climate change, and a wrong diagnosis cannot enable a healing.**


“The IPCC third report (2001) said,

“In climate research and modelling, we should recognize that we are dealing with a coupled non-linear chaotic system, and therefore that the long-term prediction of future climate states is not possible. (Chapter 14, Section 14.2.2.2.)”

This means no one knows what the future climate will be like just as no one can predict the weather as Texas proves more than a couple of weeks. Weather is indeed the only data for climate therefore if you cannot predict the weather you cannot predict the climate.

Also 2°C is an impossible narrow range for temperatures and is only with standard statistical variation. Also temperatures vary from day to night by on average of 7 degrees showing further the range cannot be around 2 degrees up or down.

The only tool offered to change the climate in the Paris Agreement is a bully pit campaign to reduce human contributions to greenhouse gases. Ponder what nonsense this is when you see that even accepting the unfounded theory of GGH human emissions are a trivial part of the whole near zero. Water vapor is the giant and we are the midget that is all. Impossible to even imagine how reducing our small contribution will change the world's climate.




“The relatively small decline in emissions this year makes one thing clear: We cannot get to zero emissions simply—or even mostly—by flying and driving less”. Gates (2020)

Weekly average CO₂ at Mauna Loa

Week beginning on May 24,	417.43
2020:	ppm
Weekly value from 1 year	414.40
ago:	ppm
Weekly value from 10 years	392.63
ago:	ppm

Last updated: June 5, 2020




Preliminary weekly (red line), monthly (blue line) and daily (black points) averages at Mauna Loa for the last year.

“No for sure, preventing us from driving and flying will not be enough, there will be a need for the dominants to senselessly destroy our economies and standards of living; what an outlandish idea! Why should we go to zero emissions? Shall we all stop also breathing?” Patrice Peyot

CO2 and Global Warming: I’m still not convinced.

Every time I get curious about how CO2 is impacting the Earth’s climate, it seems I always find articles that agree upon one thing: The amount of carbon dioxide in the air is 0.04%. Now, you have to understand just what that number means. If we were to add 0.96 percent to the 0.04 it would total just one percent of a hundred percent. The graph below represents the atmosphere. There are one-hundred squares, so each square represents 1% of the whole. That little black line in the bottom right square is the amount of CO2 in the air. And, that teeny-tiny amount of carbon dioxide is keeping the Earth’s excess heat from seeping out into space? Hey, I’m no climatologist, but this surely offends my common sense.

The Atmosphere 100%



This is 0.04% CO₂

Image for post

If we were to turn this graph into a grate that covers a heating duct, and then have experts claim that the little black line is causing your house to heat up more than usual (into dangerous levels), you'd call him crazy (wouldn't you?).

This article [CO₂ Makes Up Just 0.04% of Earth's Atmosphere. Here's Why Its Impact Is So Massive](#) states that "Scientists widely agree that Earth's average surface temperature has already increased by about 2 F (1 C) since the 1880s,..." Two degrees? In 140 years of the most industrial time of smoke stacks and cars

with zero emissions controls? Again, I'm no expert, but I find a 2 degree increase over that time period to be rather remarkable. It proves that our planet knows how to take care of itself quite well.

What I find most odd is the fact that it is well known that plant life NEEDS carbon dioxide in the air — it's the stuff that forests grow on. So, the question that we and our scientists should be asking is, What would happen to all of Earth's vegetation if we accidentally decreased the CO2 levels to zero, or close to zero? Would plant life diminish? Completely die off? Now, THAT'S a scary thought.

What's missing in this whole climate change debate is the answer to how massive amounts of ice has been melting for the last 2.6 million years without any human interference, and how that particular process is separate from what we're seeing now? How does a few hundred years of human industrialization get blamed for a process that started even before homo erectus evolved into homo sapiens?



The Pleistocene Epoch is typically defined as the time period that began about **2.6 million years** ago and lasted until **about 11,700 years** ago. The most recent Ice Age occurred then, as glaciers covered huge parts of the planet Earth. Aug 29, 2017

www.livescience.com > 40311-pleistocene-epoch

[Pleistocene Epoch: Facts About the Last Ice Age | Live Science](#)

Image for post

What would it take to convince me?

Build two rooms of the same size right next to each other. Clean the air of one room, and make sure the other room has 0.04% CO2. Place highly sensitive temperature monitors in both rooms.

If the one with the CO₂ heats up more than the clean room, I will be convinced that such a minuscule amount of CO₂ can make a difference.

I know I'm wrong, but after hearing the numbers involved, what I would expect the scientific community to be shouting is:



Jiggerj Uncategorized 1 Comment February 15, 2021 2 Minutes



The Globe's Total Greenhouse Effect Forcing Has Been On A Declining Trend For Decades

By Kenneth Richard on 8. February 2021 CO₂'s impact on the total net greenhouse effect (GHE) or longwave (LW) forcing trend has been offset by the dominant impact of cloud cover since the 1980s. It is now widely accepted that changes in clouds, naturally driven by changes in atmospheric circulation, “ may be the most important parameter controlling the radiation budget, and, hence, the Earth climate ” (Sfică et al., 2021). Indeed, in recent decades, the post-1980 +3 W/m² increase in absorbed solar radiation due to the reduction in cloud albedo (Delgado-Bonal et al, 2020) can explain the warming in recent decades . An overlooked 2020 observational study (Su et al., 2020) suggested that while top of the atmosphere (TOA) shortwave (SW) forcing has risen at a rate of +0.61 W/m² per decade since the early 2000s (because “decreasing cloud optical depth...causes an overall increase in TOA SW flux”), the total longwave (LW) or greenhouse effect (GHE) forcing – which includes the total net forcing impact of CO₂ – has declined at a rate of -0.17 W/m² per decade. These trends are consistent with Kato et al., 2018 . They found the total downwelling SW forcing (“downward shortwave irradiance”) rose +1.3 W/m² from 2005-2014 (and +2.2 W/m² per decade from 1986-2000). In contrast, the total LW (greenhouse effect) forcing from clouds, water vapor, and CO₂ combined to elicit a trend of -0.2 W/m² per decade from 2005-2014. Cess et al. (2003) also explained total greenhouse effect forcing declines as the absorbed solar radiation increases due to the “ major impact ” of clouds. Decadal-scale cloud cover changes are “ the

result of natural variability on decadal time scales ,” or “ internal unforced variability .” “ Not only is the negative trend in cloud fraction consistent with the positive trend in ASW [absorbed shortwave], it is also consistent with the negative trend in G [greenhouse effect anomaly]” that occurred from 1985-1999. If the net impact of greenhouse effect forcing has been negative since the 1980s while the trend in absorbed SW forcing has been positive, this explains the warming trends in the last decades and precludes an attribution for anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions. Donate - choose an amount 5 10 15 20 50 100 250 500 1000 Posted in Cloud Climate Influence , CO2 and GHG , Solar Sciences | 4 Responses


<https://notrickszone.com/2021/02/08/the-globes-total-greenhouse-effect-forcing-has-been-on-a-declining-trend-for-decades/>

By [Kenneth Richard](#) on

8. February 2021

CO2’s impact on the total net greenhouse effect (GHE) or longwave (LW) forcing trend has been offset by the dominant impact of cloud cover since the 1980s. It is now widely accepted that changes in clouds, naturally driven by changes in atmospheric circulation, “may be the most important parameter controlling the radiation budget, and, hence, [...]

Posted in [Cloud Climate Influence](#), [CO2 and GHG](#), [Solar Sciences](#) | [4 Responses](#)



Austrian Analyst: Things With Greenhouse Effect (GHE) Aren't Adding Up"Something Totally Wrong"

Something is rotten with the GHE By Erich Schaffer

Introduction The greenhouse effect (GHE) is a well established theory which most people consider a solid fact, even those who are otherwise "critical" over global warming. On the other side there are some voices who "deny" the GHE with flatearther-like arguments, which seemingly only adds to the credibility of the theory. This is a very odd situation, since there are huge issues with the GHE hidden in plain sight. "Without GHGs, the Earth would be a frozen planet with a temperature of only -18°C , or 255°K ". This definition is all too familiar to us all and the experts naming it are legion. The 255°K is the result of a (relatively) simple formula. $(342 \times ((1-0.3) / 1) / 5.67\text{e-}8)^{0.25} = 255$ 342W/m^2 is the amount of solar radiation (the exact number may vary), $5.67\text{e-}8$ is the Stefan-Boltzmann constant and $^{0.25}$ (or the 4th root) represents the Stefan-Boltzmann law according to which radiation is a function of temperature to the power of 4. Black body assumption trouble The interesting part however is $(1-0.3 / 1)$. 0.3 is the albedo of Earth and $1-0.3$ is thus the absorptivity, which is the share of solar radiation the Earth absorbs ($\sim 70\%$). The 1 below the comma, which is usually omitted, represents emissivity, which is the share of LWIR emitted by the Earth relative to a perfect black body of the same temperature. In other words, it is being assumed Earth would be emitting just like a perfect black body if it were not for GHGs. And that is where the trouble starts. The basic problem Quite obviously there are two factors that "violate" the assumption named above. The surface of the Earth, mainly consisting of water, is not a perfect emitter, pretty much like any real surface. Although it is not the scope of this article, it can be shown there is a significant deviation from 1 (in the 0.91 to 0.94 range). One needs to look up Fresnel equations, the refractive index of water and so on to sort out this subject. Clouds interfere massively with LWIR emissions. Actually this is common wisdom, as "clear nights are cold nights" and most people have made the according experience. Even the IPCC states clouds would block a 50W/m^2 of SW radiation, retain a 30W/m^2 of LWIR and thus have a net CRE (Cloud Radiative Effect) of -20W/m^2 [1].

Of course those -50W/m² of SW CRE are already included in the formula above (part of the 30% albedo), while the 30W/m² of LW CRE are not. For this reason we need to make some minor corrections to the GHE as presented above. Basically Earth receives some 240 W/m² of solar radiation (= 0.7 x 342) and is meant to emit some 390 W/m² at 288°K at the surface. Next to a temperature of 33°K, the GHE would thus amount to about 150W/m² respectively (=390-240). Since in reality the surface is not a perfect emitter, the 390W/m² are totally inaccurate. In fact it is easy to call it “fake science” whenever someone claims this number, or an even higher one. Rather we need to reduce this figure by at

<https://notrickszone.com/2020/09/11/austrian-analyst-things-with-greenhouse-effect-ghe-arent-adding-up-something-totally-wrong/>

By [P Gosselin](#) on

11. September 2020

Something is rotten with the GHE By Erich Schaffer Introduction
The greenhouse effect (GHE) is a well established theory which most people consider a solid fact, even those who are otherwise “critical” over global warming. On the other side there are some voices who “deny” the GHE with flatearther-like arguments, which seemingly only adds to [...]

Posted in [CO2 and GHG](#) | [38 Responses](#)



Study Recalculates New Greenhouse Effect Values And Sharply Minimizes CO2's Contribution And Climate Sensitivity

By Kenneth Richard on 27. January 2020 Another study finds CO2's greenhouse effect contribution and climate sensitivity are much smaller than claimed by the IPCC and proponents of anthropogenic global warming. Ollila (2019) reconfigures the "consensus"-derived greenhouse effect radiation values and finds (a) LW absorption only adds 45% to Earth's present atmospheric greenhouse effect, (b) water vapor dominates (76.4%) the total greenhouse effect whereas CO2's contribution is minimal (7.3%), and (c) CO2 climate sensitivity is just 0.6°C upon doubling. The reconfiguration eliminates the "physical contradiction" of having a 155.6 W/m² create an energy flux of 345.6 W/m² by rejecting the claim that the entire longwave energy flux is from greenhouse gases. Further, CO2's total temperature contribution to the greenhouse effect is reduced from 7.2°C to 2.4°C, which better aligns with the climate sensitivity (doubled CO2) estimate of 0.6°C. Posted in [Climate Sensitivity](#) , [CO2 and GHG](#) | 13 Responses

<https://notrickszone.com/2020/01/27/study-recalculates-new-greenhouse-effect-values-and-sharply-minimizes-co2s-contribution-and-climate-sensitivity/>

By [Kenneth Richard](#) on

27. January 2020

Another study finds CO2's greenhouse effect contribution and climate sensitivity are much smaller than claimed by the IPCC and proponents of anthropogenic global warming. Ollila (2019) reconfigures the "consensus"-derived greenhouse effect radiation values and finds (a) LW absorption only adds 45% to Earth's present atmospheric greenhouse effect, (b) water vapor dominates (76.4%) the total greenhouse [...]

Posted in [Climate Sensitivity](#), [CO2 and GHG](#) | [13 Responses](#)



Scientists Document A DECLINE In Overall Greenhouse Effect Forcing From 1985-2014

By Kenneth Richard on 30. December 2019 CO2 concentrations rose from 345 ppm to 398 ppm in the 29 years from 1985 to 2014. Mainstream scientists sympathetic to the anthropogenic global warming (AGW) paradigm have nonetheless reported the overall greenhouse effect forcing has been flat to declining throughout this period. 1. Cess and Udelhofen, 2003 Due to the downward trend in cloud cover, absorbed shortwave radiation increased and the overall greenhouse effect's forcing influence declined from 1985-1999. The authors consider these trends to be driven by natural variability. 2. Song et al., 2016 The overall greenhouse effect went on "hiatus" from 1992-2014, with the combined forcing effects of water vapor, cloud, and CO2 declining by -0.04 W/m^2 per year (-0.4 W/m^2 per decade) during this interval. Again, the main reason for the declining greenhouse effect trend was the downward trend in cloud cover. 3. Kato et al., 2018 Downward longwave radiation (DLR), or the overall greenhouse effect, responds to variability in water vapor and cloud. CO2 isn't mentioned in the paper as a factor influencing DLR. Total DLR was negative (-0.2 W/m^2) during this decade, insinuating rising CO2 had no net warming climate impact. In contrast, downward shortwave forcing increased by $+2.2 \text{ W/m}^2$ per decade from 1986-2000 and by $+1.3 \text{ W/m}^2$ from 2005-2014. These positive shortwave absorption trends explain the warming during this period. Posted in Climate Sensitivity , Cloud Climate Influence , CO2 and GHG | 2 Responses


<https://notrickszone.com/2019/12/30/scientists-document-a-decline-in-overall-greenhouse-effect-forcing-from-1985-2014/>

By [Kenneth Richard](#) on

30. December 2019

CO2 concentrations rose from 345 ppm to 398 ppm in the 29 years from 1985 to 2014. Mainstream scientists sympathetic to the anthropogenic global warming (AGW) paradigm have nonetheless reported the overall greenhouse effect forcing has been flat to declining throughout this period. 1. Cess and Udelhofen, 2003 Due to the downward trend in cloud [...]

Posted in [Climate Sensitivity](#), [Cloud Climate Influence](#), [CO2 and GHG](#) | [2 Responses](#)



Scientists: The CO2 Greenhouse Effect Was Cancelled Out By Clouds During 1992-2014

Facts? What facts? Why bother to even read the post? Gotta do that, you'll be in the dark if you don't. Question: How did water get here on earth? Hydrogen and oxygen, not too difficult to see two elements there, what the two become, water, is something that never could be imagined by some tiny, puny human brain bouncing around inside a cranium that is usually solid bone to the core. lol Nevertheless, water it is. One thing about water: There is a lot of it. When the sun's rays reach the earth, the earth's oceans are going to warm, there is just too much water at the surface covering too much surface area, when it all warms from the heat produced at the sun, the source of the heat, changes occur.

You're going to have evaporation, then condensation, then the atmosphere has these two elements, nitrogen and oxygen, trapped gases from gravity alone, which then can turn everything crazy, like the earth takes crazy pills, clouds then form. It is amazing stuff, call it the greenhouse effect. The air is going to warm, the sun will do it, guaranteed. Just too much water, makes it all happen like no other phenomena can. The earth is at water overshoot, happened a long time ago. lol If the earth did not have a molten core, it would a frozen globe from the Tropic of Capricorn to the South Pole and from the Tropic of Cancer to the North Pole. Maybe not that, but something like that. One trip to Jellystone Park will provide ample evidence that the earth has hotspots. There was plenty of CO2 in the air back in 1986 at Lake Nyos in Africa. The source of the CO2 was not anthropogenically sourced, however. The heat from the sun reaching the earth's surface with all of that water from pole to pole makes a world of difference. If it were all ice, you'll have places like Lake Missoula all over again. 4.5 billion years of heat from the earth's molten core is going to speak volumes for where some of the heat content, the budget, belongs.

<https://notrickszone.com/2019/03/28/scientists-the-co2-greenhouse-effect-was-cancelled-out-by-clouds-during-1992-2014/>

By [Kenneth Richard](#) on

28. March 2019

The Greenhouse Effect On Hiatus An unheralded but significant 2016 scientific paper - "A Hiatus in the Greenhouse Effect" - is now publicly available. It had previously been paywalled. Scientists have found the greenhouse effect's (GHE) influence on planetary temperatures went on "hiatus" during 1992-2014. The estimated GHE radiative influence for these 22 years was [...]

Posted in [Climate Sensitivity](#), [CO2 and GHG](#), [Natural Variability](#) | [29 Responses](#)

CO2 GREENHOUSE EFFECT

Shock Paper Cites Formula That Precisely Calculates Planetary Temps WITHOUT Greenhouse Effect, CO2

CO2 Climate Sensitivity So Low It's 'Impossible To Detect Or Measure In The Real Atmosphere' "In particular, formula 5 (and 6) as presented here, totally rules out any possibility that a 33°C greenhouse effect of the type proposed by the IPCC in their reports can exist in the real atmosphere ." - Holmes, 2017 In a new peer-reviewed scientific paper published in the journal Earth Sciences last December (2017), a Federation University (Australia) Science and Engineering student named Robert Holmes contends he may have found the key to unlocking our understanding of how planets with thick atmospheres (like Earth) remain "fixed" at 288 Kelvin (K), 740 K (Venus), 165 K (Jupiter)... without considering the need for a planetary greenhouse effect or changes in atmospheric CO2 concentrations. The Greenhouse Effect 'Thought Experiment' Perhaps the most fundamental conceptualization in climate science is the "thought experiment" that envisions what the temperature of the Earth might possibly be if there was no greenhouse effect, greenhouse gases, or atmosphere. "The size of the greenhouse effect is often estimated as being the difference between the actual global surface temperature and the temperature the planet would be without any atmospheric absorption, but with exactly the same planetary albedo, around 33°C. This is more of a 'thought experiment' than an observable state , but it is a useful baseline." Simplistically, the globally averaged surface temperature clocks in at 288 K. In the "thought experiment", an imaginary Earth that has no atmosphere (and thus no greenhouse gases to absorb and re-emit

the surface heat) would have a temperature of only 255 K. The difference between the real and imagined Earth with no atmosphere is 33 K, meaning that the Earth would be much colder (and uninhabitable) without the presence of greenhouse gases bridging the hypothetical “heat gap”. Of that 33 K greenhouse effect, 20.6 K is imagined to derive from water vapor droplets in the atmosphere (1,000 to 40,000 parts per million [ppm] by volume), whereas 7.2 K is thought to stem from the “natural” (or pre-industrial) 200-280 ppm atmospheric CO₂ concentration (Kramm et al., 2017). As a “thought experiment”, the critical heating role for water vapor droplets and CO₂ concentrations lacks real-world validation. For example, the Earth’s oceans account for 93% of the planet’s heat energy (Levitus et al., 2012), and yet no real-world physical measurements exist that demonstrate how much heating or cooling is derived from varying CO₂ concentrations up or down over a body of water in volume increments of parts per million (0.000001). Consequently, the CO₂ greenhouse effect is a hypothetical, model-based conceptualization . And in recent years, many scientific papers have been published that question the fundamentals of not only the Earth’s hypothetical greenhouse effect, but the role of greenhouse gases for other planets with thick atmospheres (like Venus) as well Hertzbe

<https://notrickszone.com/2018/02/05/shock-paper-cites-formula-that-precisely-calculates-planetary-temps-without-greenhouse-effect-co2/>

By [Kenneth Richard](#) on

5. February 2018

CO₂ Climate Sensitivity So Low It’s ‘Impossible To Detect Or Measure In The Real Atmosphere’ “In particular, formula 5 (and 6) as presented here, totally rules out any possibility that a 33°C greenhouse effect of the type proposed by the IPCC in their reports can exist in the real atmosphere.” – Holmes, 2017 In a new [...]

Posted in [Climate Sensitivity](#), [CO2 and GHG](#), [Scepticism](#) | [381 Responses](#)

Components of natural greenhouse effect (Schmitz)

formula	Share of natural increase of temperature	W
H_2O	20.6 K	
CO_2	7.2 K	
and O_3	2.4 K	
N_2O	1.4 K	
	0.8 K	
	ca. 0.6 K	
	33 K	

<https://notrickszone.com/2017/09/25/another-new-paper-dismantles-the-co2-greenhouse-effect-thought-experiment/>

By [Kenneth Richard](#) on


25. September 2017

3 Atmospheric Scientists: Greenhouse Effect Based On ‘Physically Irrelevant Assumptions’ Yet another new scientific paper has been published that questions the current understanding of the Earth’s globally averaged surface temperature and its relation to the theoretical greenhouse effect. Perhaps the most fundamental equation in climate science is the “thought experiment” that envisions what the temperature [...]

Posted in [CO2 and GHG](#), [Oceans](#), [Scepticism](#) | [209 Responses](#)

Greenhouse Effect

Global-Scale Pause in Greenhouse Effect Forcing on the Globe



17 New Scientific Papers Dispute CO2 Greenhouse Effect As Primary Explanation For Climate Change

“ [T]he absorption of incident solar-light by the atmosphere as well as its absorption capability of thermal radiation, cannot be influenced by human acts .” – Allmendinger, 2017 “ [G]lobal warming can be explained without recourse to the greenhouse theory . The varying solar irradiation constitutes the sole input driving the changes in the system’s energy transfers.” – Blaauw, 2017 “ The down-welling LW radiation is not a global driver of surface warming as hypothesized for over 100 years but a product of the near-surface air temperature controlled by solar heating and atmospheric pressure.” -Nikolov and Zeller, 2017

The Refutation of the Climate Greenhouse Theory “ The cardinal error in the usual greenhouse theory consists in the assumption that photometric or spectroscopic IR-measurements allow conclusions about the thermal behaviour of gases, i.e., of the atmosphere . They trace back to John Tyndall who developed such a photometric method already in the 19th century. However, direct thermal measurement methods have never been applied so far. Apart from this, at least twenty crucial errors are revealed which suggest abandoning the theory as a whole . In spite of its obvious deficiencies, this theory has so far been an obstacle to take promising precautions for mitigating the climate change. They would consist in a general brightening of the Earth surface, and in additional measures being related to this. However, the novel effects which were found by the author, particularly the absorption of incident solar-light by the atmosphere as well as its absorption capability of thermal radiation, cannot be influenced by human acts .” “This paper demonstrates that global warming can be explained without recourse to the greenhouse theory . This explanation is based on a simple model of the Earth’s climate system consisting of three layers: the surface, a lower and an upper atmospheric layer. The distinction between the atmospheric layers rests on the assumption that the latent heat from the surface is set free in the lower atmospheric layer only. The varying solar irradiation constitutes the sole input driving the changes in the system’s energy transfers. All variations in the energy exchanges can be expressed in terms of the temperature variations of the layers by means of an energy transfer matrix. It

turns out that the latent heat transfer as a function of the temperatures of the surface and the lower layer makes this matrix next to singular. The near singularity reveals a considerable negative feedback in the model which can be identified as the 'Klimaverstärker' presumed by Vahrenholt and Lüning. By a suitable, yet realistic choice of the parameters appearing in the energy transfer matrix and of the effective heat capacities of the layers, the model reproduces the global warming: the calculated trend in the surface temperature agrees well with the observational data from AD 1750 up to AD 2000 ." " Our analysis revealed that GMATs [global mean

<https://notrickszone.com/2017/06/08/17-new-scientific-papers-dispute-co2-greenhouse-effect-as-primary-explanation-for-climate-change/>

By [Kenneth Richard](#) on

8. June 2017

"[T]he absorption of incident solar-light by the atmosphere as well as its absorption capability of thermal radiation, cannot be influenced by human acts." – Allmendinger, 2017 "[G]lobal warming can be explained without recourse to the greenhouse theory. The varying solar irradiation constitutes the sole input driving the changes in the system's energy transfers." – Blaauw, [...]

Posted in [CO2 and GHG](#), [Scepticism](#), [Solar Sciences](#) | [81 Responses](#)

J. Journal of Modern Physics 8
3 (2008) 275-304
World Publishing Company



**IFICATION OF THE ATMOSPHERIC CO₂ GREENH
EFFECTS WITHIN THE FRAME OF PHYSICS**

GERHARD GERLICH
Instit für Kosmosphysik, Physik,
Technische Universität Carolo-Wilhelmine zu Braunschweig,
Munchevstrasse 2, D-38100 Braunschweig,
Federal Republic of Germany
g.gerlich@tu-bs.de

HALF D. TSCHESCHINSKI
Dr.-Ing./D. Technischer Dipl.-Phys. Fachhochschule
D-32077 Hildesheim, Federal Republic of Germany
m@hs-niederrhein.de

3 Chemists Conclude CO2 Greenhouse Effect Is 'Unreal', Violates Laws Of Physics, Thermodynamics


<https://notrickszone.com/2017/06/01/3-chemists-conclude-co2-greenhouse-effect-is-unreal-violates-laws-of-physics-thermodynamics/>

By [Kenneth Richard](#) on

1. June 2017

New Paper Uses Physics Laws To Disassemble Greenhouse Theory
Eight years ago, 2 physicists published a comprehensive 115-page scientific paper entitled "Falsification Of The Atmospheric CO2 Greenhouse Effects Within The Frame Of Physics" in the International Journal of Modern Physics. Gerlich and Tschuschner, 2009 Buttressed by a reference list of over 200 scientific publications, the authors [...]

Posted in [CO2 and GHG](#), [Scepticism](#) | [152 Responses](#)



New Paper Documents Imperceptible CO2 Influence On The Greenhouse Effect Since 1992

New Paper: From 1992-2014, There Was A Pause In CO2's Influence On Temperature "Monthly variations of the areal averaged atmospheric and surface greenhouse effect parameter anomalies (G_{aa} and G_{sa}) from 1979 to 2014 for the (a) globe" Between the years 1992 and 2014, anthropogenic CO2 emissions rates grew by 65%, or from a yearly average of 6.1 gigatons of carbon (GtC) in 1992 to a rate of 10.1 GtC by 2014 (Global Carbon

Budget, 2014). However, according to a new Nature paper entitled “ A Hiatus of the Greenhouse Effect ” by Song, Wang, & Tang (2016), there has been an overall hiatus to slight decline in the influence of the greenhouse warming effect on temperature beginning in 1992, which has coincided with the well-established pause in global warming since the early 2000s. The encapsulating graph from the paper is depicted above, illustrating that the global-scale atmospheric and surface greenhouse effect (G_{aa} and G_{sa}) has remained flat or slightly declined between 1992 and 2014, during the same period time that anthropogenic CO₂ emissions were rapidly rising. This strongly suggests that anthropogenic CO₂ emissions retain a very modest role in affecting variations in the overall greenhouse effect .

A Hiatus of the Greenhouse Effect [T]he primary goal of this study is to investigate the spatiotemporal evolution of the greenhouse effect to better evaluate its potential impact. Because of the shorter period of the CERES EBAF product, the areal averaged G_{sa} [surface greenhouse effect] is represented only between 2003 and 2014 in Fig. 2 but shows no notable trend over the globe, sea or land. Thus, the surface greenhouse effect has not been strengthened in the last decade . In the 1980s, a significant increasing G_{aa} [atmospheric greenhouse effect] tendency exists with a linear estimate of $0.19 \text{ W m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$. However, this uprising trend pauses starting in circa 1992, when G_{aa} [atmospheric greenhouse effect] begins to slightly decrease at a rate of $-0.01 \text{ W m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$. This statistically non-significant trend indicates that the enhancing global atmospheric greenhouse effect is slowed down. Moreover, the atmospheric greenhouse effect hiatus can be found over both sea and land . The oceanic G_{aa} [atmospheric greenhouse effect] exhibits a notable increasing trend with a rate of $0.21 \text{ W m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ in 1979-1991, whereas its rate of change ($-0.04 \text{ W m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) during 1992-2014 is not statistically significant . By contrast, although a sudden change in the G_{aa} tendency is observed overland, the breakpoint is approximately 5 years later than that of the oceanic G_{aa} . The terrestrial G_{aa} trends are $0.12 \text{ W m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ and $0.05 \text{ W m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ before and after 1997, respectively. In the last subperiod [2003-2014], the global averaged SULR [surface upwelling longwave radiation/greenhouse effect] anomaly

remains trendless ($0.02 \text{ W m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) because T_s [global temperatures] stop rising . Meanwhile, the long-term change of the global averaged OLR anomaly ($-0.01 \text{ W m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) is also

<https://notrickszone.com/2016/09/19/new-paper-documents-imperceptible-co2-influence-on-the-greenhouse-effect-since-1992/>

By [Kenneth Richard](#) on

19. September 2016

New Paper: From 1992-2014, There Was A Pause In CO₂'s Influence On Temperature “Monthly variations of the areal averaged atmospheric and surface greenhouse effect parameter anomalies (G_{aa} and G_{sa}) from 1979 to 2014 for the (a) globe”
Between the years 1992 and 2014, anthropogenic CO₂ emissions rates grew by 65%, or from a yearly average of 6.1 [...]



- [Home](#)
- [Contact](#)

The Globalism of Climate: How Faux Environmental Concern Hides Desire to Rule the World

Barbara McKenzie [Uncategorized](#) February 23, 2019

[Edit: **it was in 1988, not 1986, that** Hansen and Wirth sabotaged the air conditioning in a US Senate committee room in order to make their global warming point]

The primary function of ‘global warming’ alarmism, aka as the ‘climate crisis,’ is to facilitate a one-world government, administered by the United Nations bureaucracy.

Regardless of the science involved (or lack of it), there are a number of indisputable facts about the background to anthropogenic global warming alarmism:

- The [long-standing plan](#) for global government by an elite;
- The one-to-one equivalence between the globalists and the creators of climate alarmism, represented above all by David Rockefeller and his protégé Maurice Strong;
- The manifest intention of UN reports on ‘climate’ and the environment to give more power to the UN bureaucracy and to corporate-owned non-government organisations (NGOs).

David Rockefeller

It was David Rockefeller who, ably assisted by Maurice Strong, created and drove the wildly successful ‘Global Warming’ strategy.

[David Rockefeller](#) (1915-2017) was the youngest of John D. Rockefeller Jr.'s six children, and a grandson of John D. Rockefeller. He was well known as chairman and chief executive of Chase Manhattan Corporation and in the words of the obituary published by [Rockefeller University](#), 'one of the greatest philanthropists of our time'. He is viewed in a somewhat different light by his critics, e.g. [David Rockefeller: An Immoral Life of Evil and Treason](#).

David Rockefeller was heir to the Rockefeller ambition to create global governance by an elite. This almost certainly goes back to the confidential meeting between Alphonse de Rothschild and either John Rockefeller or his agents in 1892, and before that to Cecil Rhodes' founding of a secret society, the Round Table, of which Nathaniel Rothschild was a member. The purpose of the society was to 'bring the whole of the civilised world' under one rulership. To that end, i.e. of creating one-world government, David's father John D. Rockefeller, Jr, together with Rothschild agents, engineered the creation of first the League of Nations and then, after that project failed due to United States scepticism, of the United Nations. See [How Cecil Rhodes Fathered the Modern Globalist Movement: a Timeline](#).

David Rockefeller in his turn acted to strengthen, expand and control through generous funding the role of the United Nations.

David Rockefeller was the common denominator amongst the groups descended from Rhodes original secret society, the groups of the Round Table, whose function is to plan and achieve global governance by an elite, as intended by Cecil Rhodes.

- **1921** His father John D. Rockefeller, Jr, founded the [Council on Foreign Relations](#) and David Rockefeller was chairman of CFR from 1970 until 1985. At the same time,

- **1921** John D. Rockefeller, Jr founded the Royal Institute of International Affairs, aka Chatham House. Chatham House has continued to [receive funding](#) from the Rockefeller Foundation from inception, and is still [listed by the Foundation as a grantee](#) today.
- **1954** David Rockefeller was a founding member of [Bilderberg](#), whose primary function is to oversee the 'European project'. He served on the advisory board and was a regular attendee at its meetings, even [at the age of 98](#).
- **1968** He founded the [Club of Rome](#), the 'apex of the New World Order'.
- **1973** He founded the [Trilateral Commission](#) to bring together high ranking people politicians and business people from the US, Western Europe and Japan to plan one-world government.

The Club of Rome (CoR)

The [Club of Rome](#) is a global think tank on behalf of the elite environmental movement. It describes itself as 'an organisation of individuals who share a common concern for the future of humanity and strive to make a difference'.

The main purpose of the Club of Rome is to formulate crisis through which the world can be united under a world government.' [Compleat Patriot](#).

From inception, it is apparent that the Club of Rome was seeking a strategy to provide a catalyst for radical change in society, to create Hegelian dialect, or order out of chaos.

The Club of Rome specialises in 'crisis creation' using the [Hegelian Dialectic](#) to accomplish their goals ([Jeremiah Project](#), video)

The CoR first promoted the population scare of the 1970's, then, when the promised famine failed to eventuate,

environmentalism, and then finally in 1977, anthropogenic global warming alarmism, which has succeeded admirably, if only because of the huge sums of money thrown at it.

The Club of Rome was founded by David Rockefeller.

1965, June 12-19, the Conference on Conditions of World Order is held at the Rockefeller Foundation's Villa Serbelloni in Bellagio, Italy, with [papers](#) given by Henry A. Kissinger and others. Three years later,

1968, April The Club of Rome is founded in Bellagio by 'a think-tank of financiers, scientists, economists, politicians, heads of state, and industrialists from ten different countries'. Members of the Club of Rome have included Ted Turner, George Soros, Henry Kissinger, Bill Gates, Zbigniew Brzezinski, Bill Gates and Queen Beatrix of the Netherlands (a long list [here](#)).

Inventing a Common Adversary

The threat of environmental crisis will be the international disaster key that will unlock the New World Order (Mikhail Gorbachev, member of Club of Rome, Monetary and Economic Review, 1996, 5).

The Club of Rome has produced a large number of [reports](#) proposing population reduction and global government on the basis of environmental crisis.

1972 *The [Limits to Growth](#)* warns of overpopulation and the need for sustainable development.

The Club of Rome's Depopulation Agenda

- "The Earth has cancer and the cancer is Man." **Club of Rome**, *Mankind at the Turning Point*, 1974

- “... the resultant ideal sustainable population is hence more than 500 million but less than one billion.” **Club of Rome**, Goals for Mankind, 1976.
- ‘World population needs to be decreased by 50%’ **Henry Kissinger**, member of CoR.
- “the ecological crisis, in short, is the population crisis. Cut the population by 90% and there aren’t enough people left to do a great deal of ecological damage.” **Mikhail Gorbachev**, Former President of the Soviet Union, member of CoR.
- ‘A total population of 250-300 million people, a 95% decline from present levels, would be ideal.’ **Ted Turner**, founder of CNN, major UN donor, member of CoR.
- In order to stabilize world population, we must eliminate 350,000 people per day. It is a horrible thing to say, but it is just as bad not to say it. **Jacques Cousteau**, French naval officer and explorer, member of the CoR.
- “If I were reincarnated I would wish to be returned to earth as a killer virus to lower human population levels.’ **Prince Philip**, Duke of Edinburgh, according to Green Agenda a member of CoR, father of four. (The [Green Agenda](#))

In short:

Scratch a CoR member and there is a global depopulation misanthrope inside (Bill Elder, [here](#) in comments)

The current fad of referring to looming extinction, as in the corporate-owned protest group [Extinction Rebellion](#), has therefore a double entendre - the intended extinction is, of course, that of most of the human race.

Environmentalism is used to justify moving people from rural areas into the city, and increased control over people's lives and property by local and central government. Above all environmentalism, and especially the global warming scare, are being used by the Club of Rome and its members to create acceptance for increasing powers for the corporate-owned United Nations bureaucracy and the corporate-owned NGOs affiliated to the United Nations.

The real purpose of the establishment environmental movement is to build the structures (political, economic, ideological etc) of the ultimate monopoly: a corporate-communist world government. [David Richards](#)

1974 Club of Rome published *Mankind at the Turning Point*: 'This report develops further the concept on the World Problematique'. Mankind is faced by a multitude of crises: 'the population crisis, the environmental crisis, the world food crisis, the energy crisis, the raw material crisis, amongst others' [...]

*"The solution of these crises can be developed only in a global context with full and explicit recognition of the emerging world system and on a long-term basis. **This would necessitate, among other changes, a new world economic order and a global resources allocation system...**"*

Paul Ehrlich, author of *The Population Bomb*, 1968, and CoR member, [exemplifies](#) the alarmist tactics of the Club of Rome, warning of mass extinction from famine, global cooling, global warming, or pollution:

- "In the 1970s the world will undergo famines - **hundreds of millions of people are going to starve to death...**" - Paul Ehrlich, the *Population Bomb*, 1968
- **"The Population of the U.S. will shrink from 250 million to about 22.5 million before 1999 because**

of famine and global warming.” – Paul Ehrlich, 1968

- **“I would take even money that England will not exist in the year 2000.”** – Paul Ehrlich, 1969
- **“Smog disasters in 1973 might kill 200,000 people in New York and Los Angeles”** – Paul Ehrlich, 1969
- **“Falling temperatures will cause the ice caps to sink into the ocean, producing a global tidal wave that could wipe out a substantial portion of mankind, and the sea level could rise 60 to 100 feet.”** – Paul Ehrlich, 1970

A year after the founding of the Club of Rome:

1969 The Rockefeller Foundation (RF) approved [‘its first full-fledged environmental effort’](#), the Quality of the Environment (QE) program. (The program supported for some years the work of the CRU at the University of East Anglia in Norwich, England, which in 2009 achieved notoriety as the centre of the [‘climategate’](#) scandal.)

Maurice Strong

Biographies: [Official biography](#), now ‘crashed’; [Sourcewatch](#) (neutral/positive), [James Corbett](#), (highly critical); [Ronald Bailey](#) (highly critical)

In James Corbett’s words, Maurice Strong rose from being ‘a dirt poor high school dropout from Oak Lake, Manitoba, to become an international wheeler-dealer who is responsible for shaping our modern day globalist institutions’.

As a Rockefeller asset Maurice Strong (1929-2015) was a major force behind both the global warming narrative and the linking of that narrative with an argument for ever greater powers for the corporate-owned United Nations bureaucracy.

His crowning achievement was the 2nd Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro in 1992.

Strong met David Rockefeller at the age of 18, and under Rockefeller's patronage was given a minor, temporary position with the United Nations. Thereafter continuing sponsorship by Rockefeller led to a career in oil, and in parallel one as a mover and shaker in Canadian politics, including heading the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) - David Rockefeller was grooming Strong for great things.

Apparently impressed by his work at CIDA, UN Secretary General U Thant asked Strong to organize what became the first Earth Summit — the Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment in 1972.'

1972 Stockholm: The UN Conference on the Human Environment (the Earth Summit)

In preparation for the Conference Strong commissioned a report on the state of the planet, *Only One Earth: The Care and Maintenance of a Small Planet*. The authors were [Rene Dubos](#) a microbiologist employed by Rockefeller researching antibiotics, with no previous interest in environmentalism, and [Barbara Ward](#), who during the war had worked for the UK Ministry of Information before becoming the foreign editor of *The Economist*.

The Stockholm Conference signaled the [beginning of modern environmental diplomacy](#). As an outcome of the Summit Maurice Strong **founded and was first director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)**, to coordinate the UN's environmental activities and assist developing countries in implementing 'environmentally sound' policies and practices.

The Global Cooling Scare

As recently as the mid-1970s the threat of global cooling, rather than global warming, was a recurrent theme in the media. [‘The 140 Year Failed History of “Gorebull Warming” and “Ice Ages Doom”’](#) gives some examples:

- **1974** - “...the facts of the present climate change are such that the most optimistic experts would assign near certainty to major crop failure...mass deaths by starvation, and probably anarchy and violence” - **New York Times**
- **1975** - *Scientists Ponder Why World’s Climate is Changing; A Major Cooling Widely Considered to Be Inevitable* - [New York Times, May 21st, 1975](#)
- **1975** - “The threat of a new ice age must now stand alongside nuclear war as a likely source of wholesale death and misery for mankind” Nigel Calder, editor, **New Scientist** magazine, in an article in *International Wildlife Magazine*
- **1976** - “Even U.S. farms may be hit by cooling trend” - **U.S. News and World Report**

A 1974 CIA report, [A Study of Climatological Research As It Pertains to Intelligence Problems](#) referred to cold, floods and also drought, but overall assuming global cooling.

David Rockefeller and Maurice Strong Kick Off the Global Warming Scare

1977 [From this point](#), ‘Scientific opinion tends to converge on global warming, not cooling, as the chief climate risk in the next century’.

1977 One of the first significant reports on 'global warming' was the report [*Energy and Climate*](#), which warned that '**average temperatures may rise 6 degrees Celsius by 2050 due to the burning of coal**' - perhaps the first example of climate catastrophism.

***Energy and Climate* was a Rockefeller report, produced by a Rockefeller employee.** The report was prepared by the National Research Council (founded in 1916 [with the help of John D. Rockefeller](#)). At the time [the chairman of NRC, Philip Handler](#), was simultaneously on the [Board of Trustees of Rockefeller University](#), at a time when David Rockefeller [chaired the Board's Executive Committee](#).

1980 United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), founded by Maurice Strong, produces the [**World Conservation Strategy**](#). The strategy declares categorically:

The most acute climatic problem, however, is carbon dioxide accumulation as a result of the burning of fossil fuel, deforestation and changes in land use. At present rates of increase, the atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide may produce a significant warming of the lower atmosphere before the middle of the next century, particularly in the polar regions. This warming would probably change temperature patterns throughout most of the world, benefitting some regions and damaging others, possibly severely .

Thus from a position of warning about global cooling as late as 1976, by 1980, a mere four years later, the 'science was settled' by Rockefeller and Strong in favour of global warming, caused by human emissions of CO₂, as the most acute climatic problem.

1981 NASA scientist James Hansen [predicted](#) that burning fossil fuels would increase global temperatures by 4.5 degrees Fahrenheit (2.5 degrees Celsius) by the end of the century.

In **1988** Hansen and Senator Timothy Wirth [sabotaged the air conditioning](#) in a US Senate committee room, on the likely hottest day of a hot summer, in order to persuade the committee of global warming. This is considered a turning point in the US consciousness of the global warming 'crisis' - at least at a political level.

In his Book, *Science Under Siege*, Michael Fumento quoted Timothy Wirth as saying in 1988,

'We've got to ride this global warming issue. Even if the theory of global warming is wrong, we will be doing the right thing in terms of economic and environmental policy.'

The Global Warming-Climate Change Scam

The global warming project has been characterised by fake data, dirty tricks and relentless dishonesty, including a penchant for sensational and ludicrous claims of extreme weather events which foretell human extinction, climate meltdown. There is a shift of emphasis once claims are debunked - the prophecies of a six degree rise in global temperature have given way to warnings that even a two degree increase in temperature will result in catastrophic consequences for life on earth (see Tim Ball, [Seven Ways to Spot Climate Change Propaganda](#)).

The [many thousands](#) of scientists (see also [10,000 international scientists](#)) who have protested the corruption of science and the demonisation of CO₂, through articles, petitions and letters to world leaders, have had no impact in the face of the billions spent at every level of propaganda.

The change in emphasis from 'global warming to 'climate' was not just to duck the issue of the failure of nature to deliver the said warming. It simplifies the terminology, and provides a one word term to describe the cult, i.e.the cult of climate - anyone

who disagrees that an increase in CO2 will cause catastrophic global warming is now a climate denier. Suppression of dissent has become normalised, with calls for [criminalisation](#) of 'climate denial'.

In New Zealand, as elsewhere, criticism even of the claim of consensus is censored, for example, NZ's major source of mainstream news, Stuff.

Stuff accepts the overwhelming scientific consensus that climate change is real and caused by human activity. We welcome robust debate about the appropriate response to climate change, but do not intend to provide a venue for denialism or hoax advocacy. That applies equally to the stories we will publish in **Quick! Save the Planet** and to our moderation standards for reader comments.

The adoption of 'global warming' as a cause turned out to be a brilliant strategic move for the global government project, backed as it has been by huge sums, total commitment and inspired execution.

The United Nations Bureaucracy Administers the Global Warming Scare

'Global warming is a global problem, they insist, that national governments alone cannot resolve. [...] The only solution, we are told, a one world government' ([Tim Ball](#)).

For twenty years Maurice Strong was involved in the organisation of UN conferences and the commissioning of UN reports which tied in global warming with global government. The reports have certain things in common. They:

- Assume that the claim that CO2 causes global warming is unquestioned and unquestionable;

- Ensure that references to ‘climate change’ appear whenever any aspect of planning is considered;
- Recommend increased powers to the United Nations bureaucracy;
- Recommend increased participation for ‘civil society’, i.e. non-government organisations affiliated to the UN.

United Nations and ‘Civil Society’

Affiliated NGOs include such charities as the Rockefeller Foundation, George Soros’s Open Society Foundation, Carnegie Foundation and a large number of charities funded by the same, such as Greenpeace and Oxfam. The role of the major foundations in the UN is apparent if one looks, for, example at [UN Women](#), which lists as ‘some of our partners’: [Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation](#), [Elizabeth Arden](#), [Ford Foundation](#), [Open Society Foundation](#), [Procter & Gamble](#), [PROYA Cosmetics Co. Ltd](#), [Rockefeller Foundation](#), [The Coca-Cola Company](#), [Unilever](#), and [Zonta International Foundation](#).

Major UN conferences, which are financially supported by NGOs, are increasingly accompanied by a forum of NGO representatives, the NGO’s being selected by UN bureaucrats (like Maurice Strong). (The CGG has benefited substantially from the largesse of the MacArthur, Carnegie, and Ford Foundations.)

‘This kind of international gabfest is, of course, a sinister parody of democracy. Very few of even the larger international NGOs are operationally democratic, in the sense that members elect officers or direct policy on particular issues. Arguably it is more often money than membership that determines influence, and money more often represents the support of centralized elites, such as major foundations, than of the grass roots. (Hofstra University law professor Peter Spiro, quoted by [Ronald Bailey](#)).

1987 Our Common Future (the [Brundtland Report](#).)

The World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED), set up in 1983, was chaired by Gro Harlem Brundtland, former Prime Minister of Norway who has held several high posts in the UN; Maurice Strong was a member. In 1987 they published a report named '[Our Common Future](#)'.

The report:

- defines 'sustainable development' for the first time, as 'development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs'.
- refers to 'global warming' throughout, and specifically attributes it to CO₂, and also
- assumes an inevitable move to the cities, making no recommendations to counter this.

1987 The 4th World Wilderness Congress, Colorado

The Brundtland report was timed to appear just before the [4th World Wilderness Congress](#), organised by Maurice Strong, and involving 2,000 delegates from 64 countries (proceedings: *For the Conservation of Earth*). The whole affair appears to have been a hijack by David Rockefeller, in view of the appearance of himself with associates such as Strong and Brundtland, who had not attended [previous Congresses](#).

There were a number of significant speeches:

- **Gro Harlem Brundtland** spoke to the report 'Our Common Future' urging **a merging of economy and ecology**.

- Both **Maurice Strong and Michael Sweatman** presented papers calling for **global conservation finance mechanisms** (which eventually led to the \$1.1 billion Global Environment Facility, founded in 1992).
- **Irving Mintzer** (with no relevant qualifications and currently [chief strategist](#) with the [Potomac energy fund](#)) presented '**Global Climate Change and Its Effects on Wildlands**', claiming 'If current trends continue, the rate of global warming over the next 50 years will exceed that of the last 10,000 years'.
- **David Rockefeller** spoke on 'The Need for Partnership'. His purpose, however, was to reiterate important points made elsewhere: the role of carbon dioxide, the need for a World Conservation Bank and the importance of making environmental concerns integral to any economic discussion and vice-versa.

According to George Hunt, [Edmund de Rothschild](#) spent six days at the conference although his name does not appear in the proceedings - . Hunt recorded Rothschild speaking about the conservation banking programme ([video](#), from 2:00) -(de Rothschild was a [founder member](#) of the Wilderness Foundation and had been involved in previous Congresses).

Hunt discusses [here](#) the implications of the Conservation Banking Programme, later reincarnated as the Global Environment Facility.

- Interviewer: 'But what's really happened is that the Brazilians will have given up title to millions of acres of land and in exchange the Chase Manhattan will get its loan to Brazil paid off by the WCB.'
- Hunt: 'You got it'

See also [How Edmund de Rothschild Managed to Let 179 Governments Pay Him for Grasping Up to 30% of the Earth](#)

1991 CoR publishes the [First Global Revolution](#). According to the CoR website, it offers 'both a warning and an approach to a possible solution to world problems'. Topics include 'containment of global warming: the need to reduce global emissions of carbon dioxide, to encourage reforestation, to conserve traditional forms of energy and develop alternatives'. It also has the following revealing quote:

"In searching for a new enemy to unite us, we came up with the idea that pollution, the threat of global warming, water shortages, famine and the like would fit the bill. In their totality and in their interactions these phenomena do constitute a common threat which demands the solidarity of all peoples." (Alexander King & Bertrand Schneider, **The First Global Revolution** p. 115)

1991 April Prince Charles hosts a two day conference on board the Britannia, with in attendance Al Gore, Maurice Strong, senior officials from the World Bank, chief executives from companies such as Shell and British Petroleum, the key NGOs, and other officials. According to what Joan Veon learned from Maurice Strong, Charles's goal 'was to bring together key international figures in an attempt to achieve a degree of harmony between the various countries that would happen at the Rio Earth Summit to be held the next year' ([Sustainable Development, Agenda 21 and Prince Charles](#)).

The apex of Maurice Strong's career was the UNCED Conference at Rio. First, however, let us roll back to 1976, to Habitat 1

Habitat 1

1976 The First UN Conference on Human Settlements and Sustainable Urban Development ([Habitat I](#)) was held in Vancouver, Canada, 31 May to 11 June . The Conference organising body 'drew on the resources of' amongst others, United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP). A separate

'forum' for NGOs and 'ordinary citizens' was held in conjunction.

The Conference is notable in two ways. Firstly the emphasis in the two conference documents, the [report](#) and the [Vancouver Declaration on Human Settlements](#) (the latter available for signature), on such issues as urbanisation and how to facilitate it, the problem of population growth, and above all the undesirability of private ownership. The most quoted passage from Habitat 1 concerns private ownership of and public control of land.

*Land, because of its unique nature and the crucial role it plays in human settlements, cannot be treated as an ordinary asset, controlled by individuals and subject to the pressures and inefficiencies of the market. **Private land ownership is also a principal instrument of accumulation and concentration of wealth and therefore contributes to social injustice**; if unchecked, it may become a major obstacle in the planning and implementation of development schemes. [...] Public control of land use is therefore indispensable to its protection as an asset and the achievement of the long-term objectives of human settlement policies and strategies.*

This view is reflected in the Vancouver Declaration:

Land is one of the fundamental elements in human settlements. Every State has the right to take the necessary steps to maintain under public control the use, possession, disposal and reservation of land.

The conference is also memorable for the choice of poster, which gives an indication of what globalists have in mind for the masses.



HABITAT

United Nations Conference on Human Settlements
May 31-June 11, 1976
Vancouver, Canada



The Rockefeller foundation [funds](#) UN Habitat on an ongoing basis.

1992 UN Conference on Environment and Development (aka Earth Summit 2, UNCED, or simply 'Rio'), Rio de Janeiro

'The Earth Summit was a landmark in the career of Maurice Strong.' (UNEP, [Maurice Strong's 85th birthday](#))

*No previous UN conference had ever received such planning and promotion. **Maurice Strong** was named to head the conference, which was dubbed "Earth Summit II." He had chaired the first "Earth Summit" in 1972 and had participated in every environmental commission and conference since. (Strong became Chairman of the Board of WRI in 1994). [...]*

The NGO community, coordinated through the IUCN and the WRI publication Networking, used the [igc.apc.org](#) computer networks extensively to funnel information to and from the UNCED agenda planners, and to plan the NGO Forum. UNCED provided an opportunity for the NGOs to perfect the lobbying process. With the blessings of and assistance from the UNEP, the NGOs scheduled a "Forum" the week immediately preceding the official conference.

Nearly 8,000 NGOs were officially certified to participate in the UNCED Forum, and another 4,000 NGOs were observers, swelling the total attendance at UNCED to more than 40,000 people — the largest environmental gathering the world has ever known. UNCED may be recorded in history as the most significant event the world has ever known; it was the watershed event that began the final march to global governance.

(Henry Lamb, ['Global Governance: The Final March'](#))

To guide the agenda for the conference, UNEP and its NGO partners published two major documents, *Caring for the Earth*, and *Global Biodiversity Strategy* (Lamb). The Summit resulted in the following documents, [Rio Declaration on Environment and Development](#), *Agenda 21*, and *Forest Principles*, and opened for signature the following legally binding agreements ([Rio Convention](#)): [Convention on Biological Diversity](#), [Framework Convention on Climate Change](#) (UNFCCC). [United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification](#). (Wikipedia)

In order to ensure compliance to the agreements at Rio (particularly the [Rio Declaration on Environment and Development](#) and [Agenda 21](#)), delegates to the Earth Summit established the [Commission on Sustainable Development](#) (CSD). [...] [Green Cross International](#) was founded to build upon the work of the Summit. (Wikipedia)

Green Cross International was founded by Club of Rome stalwart and dedicated globalist [Mikhail Gorbachev](#).

Agenda 21

Agenda 21 is a comprehensive plan of action to be taken globally, nationally, and locally by organizations of the United Nations System, Governments, and Major Groups in every area in which human impacts on the environment ([Sustainable Development Goals](#))

Or to put it another way:

It's all happy, feely, smiling faces and rhetoric about "how we care", when the truth is that Agenda 21 is a vicious, brutal, heartless strategy to impose a global Orwellian state and forcibly depopulate humanity. ([Agenda 21: the Plan for a Global, Fascist Dictatorship](#)) .

Agenda 21 addresses every aspect of modern life:

1. Agriculture

2. Biodiversity and Ecosystem Management
3. Education
4. Energy and Housing
5. Population
6. Public Health
7. Resources and recycling
8. Transportation, Sustainable Economic Development

Like all similar UN documents, it is full of positive values that nobody seriously disagrees with in principle, such as care of the environment, or adequate housing for all. Implicit in the document, however, is an assumption of greater control over every aspect of life. For example, from [A Critical Analysis of Agenda 21 – United Nations Program of Action](#):

Human Settlements

*Any movement of population that takes place will be highly controlled, and directed, by government regulations. These so-called population policies, and programs, encouraged by the United Nations, will be used **“to bring about demographic transition”** (Ch. 5, Sec. 16), as it is referred to in Agenda 21, to reflect more of what the planners have envisioned.*

*The agenda plans to “expand areas under forest and tree cover,” (Ch. 11, Sec. 12-a) by forcing people out of their quiet rural homes, and into crowded cities: “As appropriate, **they should also concentrate on activities aimed at facilitating the transition from rural to urban lifestyles and settlement patterns”** (Ch. 7, Sec. 19)*

*This forced changed will be brought about by causing an increase in the cost of water, sanitation, and other essentials, to higher income neighborhoods, thus making it too expensive to live in these areas: **‘Reducing subsidies on, and recovering the full costs of, environmental and other***

services of high standard (e.g. water supply, sanitation, waste collection, roads, telecommunications) provided to higher income neighbourhoods;” (Ch. 7, Sec. 16-ci)

People will be forced into, what the Agenda refers to as, “human settlement” areas, which will help transition these populations to new living areas, where your “resource needs, waste production, and ecosystem health” will be controlled by government: **“In formulating human settlements policies, account should be taken of resource needs, waste production and ecosystem health.” (Ch. 5, Sec. 29)**

The eventual goal of this forced population movement into human settlement areas is to get rid of private property, and have all land accessible, and owned, collectively, by the community: **“ensure access to land to all households and, where appropriate, the encouragement of communally and collectively owned and managed land.” (Ch. 7, Sec. 28)**

How It Works

Agenda 21, the documents provided to the Summit, and the agreements that arise from the Summit, are dominated by two assumed, overriding and non-negotiable values, the two prongs of the environmentalist strategy – debate of the first never arises, and of the second is never permitted:

- The concept of biodiversity has to take precedence over other rights, even of human life;
- The non-negotiability of the Rockefeller catastrophic anthropogenic global warming narrative.

There are a number of recurring themes:

- Urbanisation
- States are constantly reminded of their right and duty to control all land

- No opportunity is lost to expand the numbers and powers of the UN bureaucracy and the role of non-government organisations.

The two prongs of climatism, the carbon scare and the biodiversity mandate, each facilitate the movement of people away from the countryside or the coast into high density cities, which is conducive to depopulation and to loss of private ownership.

Agenda 21 is referred to less and less, having acquired negative connotations – instead terms like sustainability, resilience, biodiversity, smart growth are prevalent, see Strzelczyk, Rothschild, [UN Agenda 21 - Coming to a Neighborhood near You](#).

‘Undoubtedly, residents of any town, county, or city in the United States that treasure their freedom, liberty, and property rights couldn’t care less whether it’s called Agenda 21 or smart growth. A recent example of this can be found in Carroll County, Maryland, where a smart growth plan called [Pathways](#) was drafted by the County Planning Department. The plan, if enacted, proposed a breathtaking reshuffling of land rights:

- *Rezoning of thousands of acres of beautiful, low-density agricultural farmland and protected residential conservation land into office parks*
- *Down-zoning of agriculture land to prevent future subdivision by farmers*
- *Up-zoning of low-density residential land around small towns into higher density zoning to permit construction of hundreds or possibly thousands of inclusive housing units, including apartments and condominiums*
- *Inclusive housing with placement of multi-family construction on in-fill lots within existing residential single family communities*

- *Endorsement of government-sponsored housing initiatives (subsidies) to ensure healthier, balanced neighbourhoods.’ (Strzelczyk, Rothschild)*

After Rio

Maurice Strong and David Rockefeller worked hard to ensure that the proposals of Rio would be put into practice. Strong was active on a very large number of global bodies concerned with environment or development (which is always about the environment).

‘Mr. Strong continued to take a leading role in implementing the results of Rio through the establishment of The Earth Council, the Earth Charter movement, his chairmanship of The World Resources Institute, his membership on the Board of the International Institute for Sustainable Development, The Stockholm Environment Institute, [etc, etc, etc ...] He has also served as Senior Advisor to the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio +20).’ ([UN Press Release](#))

Meanwhile David Rockefeller created and funded a myriad of NGOs, all dedicated to pushing pushing the same messages of sustainability, diversity, resilience, very many work to ensure compliance at a local level, such as ICLEI or the Rockefeller founded [100 Resilient Cities](#) – ‘think global, act local’ is the UN refrain. The Rockefeller foundations continue to fund UN institutions and conferences, [academic institutions](#). and of course [political movements](#). According to [Inside Philanthropy](#): ‘Rockefeller’s climate change grants tend to amount to \$10 million to \$30 million annually, on average’. All in all, the sums spent promoting the globalist narrative and agenda by the Rockefeller family alone must amount to billions, let alone the combined resources of the globalist elite – Rockefellers, Rothschilds, Turner, Gates, etc....

The megalomaniacs working towards a one-world government are contriving or relying on a number of factors:

- Moral blackmail: capitalising on the sense of responsibility humans feel towards the environment, other species, and their descendants, though whether we are supposed to be saving ourselves, or saving the planet from ourselves is unclear.
- Fear: the threats of rising seas and an earth turned into parched desert, though how effective this is is debatable.
- Ignorance about global warming: people avoid the global warming issue because they do not feel confident they will understand the science.
- Ignorance about the implications of signing up to Agenda 21, 'biodiversity', 'sustainability', 'resilience' and 'smart growth' for quality of life .
- Apathy: the effects of Agenda 21 are felt locally, and in New Zealand at least there is [considerable apathy](#) when it comes to local politics.
- Agenda 21 will affect rural, provincial and coastal dwellers first and foremost, impact on residents of high density cities will be much slower.
- The enormous sums available to globalists to spend on corruption of media, academic institutions, politicians and the UN bureaucracy, and on creating NGOs which work for their agenda.

The Cecil Rhodes vision of global governance is well on track.

See also:

Alex Newman, [New Report Exposes Rockefeller Dynasty's Role in "Climate" Scam](#): 'Basically, the Rockefeller clan is the head of the climate snake.'

[The Political Agenda Behind the Man-Made Global Warming Movement](#): Investigates inter alia the roles of Maurice Strong and the Rothschild family. Includes a bibliography of criticism of the global warming narrative.

Jamie Spry, [Draconian UN Climate Agenda Exposed](#): 'Global Warming Fears Are A Tool For Political and Economic Change...It Has Nothing To Do With The Actual Climate'. Spry points to Maurice Strong rather than David Rockefeller as originator of the global warming hoax.

Global Warming

[Anatomy of a Massive Con Job](#)

The Invisible Critic, 'Remember the Ice Age Scare', [video](#) 'The moral of the story is this: If the ice age scare of the 70s was bullshit then, then the global warming scare of today and the 40 subsequent years is bullshit now' (6:35).

Dr Eric T Karlstrom, [Is Man-made Climate Change a Hoax and a Scam?](#)

[Top NZ Scientist Describes "Global Warming" as Pseudo-Science](#) Since the IPCC report came out in 2007, many of New Zealand's top scientist have worked to expose the global warming narrative as junk science and a hoax (some 60 listed in [10,000 International Scientists](#)). David Kear, former Director-General of New Zealand's Department of Scientific and Industrial Research (DSIR), was one of them.

Zbigniew Jaworowski, M.D., Ph.D., D.Sc., CO2: [The Greatest Scientific Scandal of Our Time](#) , 2007 (pdf). Jawarowski tackles the claims of the IPCC Report of 2007 and explains the science relating to CO2

Piers Corbyn on latest IPCC report on climate change; also on dubious environmental initiatives such as the destruction of North American forests to make biomass wood pellets:

Agenda 21

[Agenda 21 - In one easy lesson](#)

[10 Part Course on Agenda 21](#)

[Windows on the World](#) has produced a number of broadcasts on how Agenda 21 is being implemented, especially at a local level (which is where most happens).

AGENDA 21 IS FULL-SPECTRUM DOMINATION BY THE 1%.

Nothing has been left out.

- *It guarantees both birth control and death control.*
- *It promises the basic essentials of life in return for submission.*
- *It exchanges critical thinking for re-education and brainwashing.*
- *It destroys the epicenter of the family, society, and culture, allowing only one way to live. It groups the population into small contained areas to be more easily controlled.*
- *It takes away from some to give to others who will be more easily managed by the promise of a full belly and a warm shelter.*

It's a parasitical representation of the 1%, feeding on the 99.

Agenda 21.

Divide.

Dumb down.

Conquer.

And it's only going to get worse. (Daisy Luther) [Daisy Luther](#)

<https://stovouno.org/2019/02/23/globalism-of-climate-how-faux-environmental-concern-hides-desire-to-rule-the-world/>

Do any of you feel climate change isn't real? Why?



[James Matkin](#), Most viewed writer in climatology

[Updated 7h ago](#)

Originally Answered: [If you deny climate change, why do you do so?](#)


[Remove Banner](#)

Evidence. No one denies climate change, but evidence from climate history does not support the alarmists denial of natural variability under the sun. Solar cycles correlate with changing temperatures carbon dioxide does not.

Most important is the simple fact temperatures have not increased for the past 150 years. NASA finds only 0.8 °C increase. Think about it how can we fear climate change if temperatures are not increasing. Remember we are in an ice age called the Quaternary where the previous climate change was the devastating Little Ice Age.

The Earth has been in an ice age most of the last 400,000 years. The earth's temperature in each of the last four interglacial periods was several degrees warmer than today. (chart reads left to right)

Reconstructed global temperature over the past 420,000 years based on the Vostok ice core from the Antarctica (Petit et al. 2002)





The above chart shows the oscillations of temperature of our ice age climate between the interglacials that are warm and the glaciations that are frigid. Evidence shows the earth is cooling. It is madness to fear global warming as this is necessary to human civilization.

This small increase over the last 100 years is not enough to qualify as climate change. The increase is easily explained by cyclical ocean currents and by solar activity and natural variability. Measuring global temperatures at this level of precision is not credible and it is certainly not cause for concern.

as climate always seesaws hot and cold everywhere so the range of statistical error must be very high.


NOAA GRAPHS SHOW TEMPERATURES ARE DECLINING EVERYWHERE LAST DECADE.

This evidence assures us that natural variation is out reality not global warming.




North America

January–December Temperature Anomalies



Caribbean Islands

January–December Temperature Anomalies





The Global Warming Policy Forum

Director: Dr Benny Peiser

- HOME
- WHO WE ARE
- LATEST POSTINGS
- PRESS RELEASES
- GWPF NEWSLETTER
- CONTACT
- RSS

You are here: [The Global Warming Policy Forum \(GWPF\)](#) > [Global Temperature Drops By 0.4°C In Three Years](#)


THE OBSERVATORY



GLOBAL TEMPERATURE DROPS BY 0.4°C IN THREE YEARS

Date: 30/11/18 | Dr David Whitehouse, GWPF Science Editor

It is said that a picture is worth a thousand words. In science communication however, a simple graph can be worth far more than pictures particularly when the main point is that the last four years have been the hottest on record.







Figure 1: The world's surface air temperature change ("anomaly"), relative to the world's mean temperature of 58° F or 14.5° C, averaged over land and oceans from 1975 to 20082. Inset are two periods of no warming or cooling within this overall warming trend.



Many more studies find humans have little if any effect on temperatures and the climate because the greenhouse theory is unproven and false.

Nobel Prize-Winning Scientist Who Endorsed Obama Now Says Prez. is 'Ridiculous' & 'Dead Wrong' on 'Global Warming'

Nobel Prize Winning Physicist 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.'

"I am worried very much about the [UN] conference in Paris in November...I think that the people who are alarmist are in a very strong position.'

'We have to stop wasting huge, I mean huge amounts of money on global warming.'

By: [Marc Morano](#) - [Climate Depot](#) July 6, 2015 8:34 PM with [1109 comments](#)

Climate Depot Exclusive

Dr. Ivar Giaever, a Nobel Prize-Winner [for physics in 1973](#), declared his dissent on man-made global warming claims at a Nobel forum on [July 1, 2015](#).

"I would say that basically global warming is a non-problem," Dr. Giaever [announced during his speech titled "Global Warming Revisited."](#)



Giaever, a former professor at the School of Engineering and School of Science Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, received the 1973 physics Nobel for his work on quantum tunneling. Giaever delivered his remarks at the 65th Nobel Laureate Conference in Lindau, Germany, which drew 65 recipients of the prize. Giaever is also featured in the [new documentary "Climate Hustle"](#), set for release in Fall 2015.

Giaever was one of President Obama's key scientific supporters in 2008 when he joined [over 70 Nobel Science Laureates in endorsing Obama](#) in an October 29, 2008 open letter. Giaever signed his name [to the letter](#) which read in part: "The country urgently needs a visionary leader...We are convinced that Senator

Barack Obama is such a leader, and we urge you to join us in supporting him.”

But seven years after [signing the letter](#), Giaever now mocks President Obama for warning that “no challenge poses a greater threat to future generations than climate change”. Giaever called it a “ridiculous statement.”

“That is what he said. That is a ridiculous statement,” Giaever explained.


“I say this to Obama: Excuse me, Mr. President, but you’re wrong. Dead wrong,” Giaever said. ([Watch Giaever’s full 30-minute July 1 speech here.](#))

“How can he say that? I think Obama is a clever person, but he gets bad advice. Global warming is all wet,” he added.

“Obama said last year that 2014 is hottest year ever. But [it’s not true. It’s not the hottest](#),” Giaever noted. [**Note:** *Other scientists have reversed themselves on climate change. See: [Politically Left Scientist Dissents - Calls President Obama ‘delusional’ on global warming](#)*]

The Nobel physicist questioned the basis for rising carbon dioxide fears.

“When you have a theory and the theory does not agree with the experiment then you have to cut out the theory. You were wrong with the theory,” Giaever explained.



Global Warming ‘a new religion’

Giaever said his climate research was eye opening. “I was horrified by what I found” after researching the issue in 2012, he noted.

“Global warming really has become a new religion. Because you cannot discuss it. It’s not proper. It is like the Catholic Church.”

Concern Over ‘Successful’ UN Climate Treaty

“I am worried very much about the [UN] conference in Paris in November. I really worry about that. Because the [2009 UN] conference was in Copenhagen and that almost became a disaster but nothing got decided. But now I think that the people who are alarmist are in a very strong position,” Giaever said.

“The facts are that in the last 100 years we have measured the temperatures it has gone up .8 degrees and everything in the world has gotten better. So how can they say it’s going to get worse when we have the evidence? We live longer, better health, and better everything. But if it goes up another .8 degrees we are going to die I guess,” he noted.

“I would say that the global warming is basically a non-problem. Just leave it alone and it will take care of itself. It is almost very hard for me to understand why almost every government in Europe — except for Polish government — is worried about global warming. It must be politics.”

“So far we have left the world in better shape than when we arrived, and this will continue with one exception — we have to stop wasting huge, I mean huge amounts of money on global warming. We have to do that or that may take us backwards. People think that is sustainable but it is not sustainable.

On Global Temperatures & CO2

Giaever noted that global temperatures have halted for the past 18 plus years. [**Editor’s Note:** *Climate Depot is honored that Giaever used an exclusive Climate Depot graph showing the RSS*

satellite data of an 18 year plus standstill in temperatures at [8:48 min. into video.](#)]

Giaever accused NASA and federal scientists of “fiddling” with temperatures.

“They can fiddle with the data. That is what NASA does.”

“You cannot believe the people — the alarmists — who say CO₂ is a terrible thing. Its not true, its absolutely not true,” Giaever continued while showing a slide asking: ‘Do you believe CO₂ is a major climate gas?’

“I think the temperature has been amazingly stable. What is the optimum temperature of the earth? Is that the temperature we have right now? That would be a miracle. No one has told me what the optimal temperature of the earth should be,” he said.

“How can you possibly measure the average temperature for the whole earth and come up with a fraction of a degree. I think the average temperature of earth is equal to the emperor’s new clothes. How can you think it can measure this to a fraction of a degree? It’s ridiculous,” he added.

Ivar Giaever and King Carl Gustaf at the Nobel Prize ceremony in Stockholm in December 1973

Silencing Debate

Giaever accused Nature Magazine of “wanting to cash in on the [climate] fad.”

“My friends said I should not make fun of Nature because then they won’t publish my papers,” he explained.

“No one mentions how important CO₂ is for plant growth. It’s a wonderful thing. Plants are really starving. They don’t talk about how good it is for agriculture that CO₂ is increasing,” he added.

Extreme Weather claims

“The other thing that amazes me is that when you talk about climate change it is always going to be the worst. It’s got to be better someplace for heaven’s sake. It can’t always be to the worse,” he said.

“Then comes the clincher. If climate change does not scare people we can scare people talking about the extreme weather,” Giaever said.

“For the last hundred years, the ocean has risen 20 cm — but for the previous hundred years the ocean also has risen 20 cm and for the last 300 years, the ocean has also risen 20 cm per 100 years. So there is no unusual rise in sea level. And to be sure you understand that I will repeat it. There is no unusual rise in sea level,” Giaever said.

“If anything we have entered period of low hurricanes. These are the facts,” he continued.

“You don’t have to even be a scientist to look at these figures and you understand what it says,” he added.

“Same thing is for tornadoes. We are in a low period on in U.S.”
(See: [Extreme weather failing to follow ‘global warming’ predictions: Hurricanes, Tornadoes, Droughts, Floods, Wildfires, all see no trend or declining trends](#))

Physicist Giaever in 1973

Media Hype

“What people say is not true. I spoke to a journalist with [German newspaper Die Welt yesterday...and I asked how many articles he published that says global warming is a good thing. He said I probably don’t publish them at all. Its always a negative. Always,” Giever said.

Energy Poverty

“They say refugees are trying to cross the Mediterranean. These people are not fleeing global warming, they are fleeing poverty,” he noted.

“If you want to help Africa, help them out of poverty, do not try to build solar cells and windmills,” he added.

“Are you wasting money on solar cells and windmills rather than helping people? These people have been misled. It costs money in the end to that. Windmills cost money.”

“Cheap energy is what made us so rich and now suddenly people don’t want it anymore.”

“People say oil companies are the big bad people. I don’t understand why they are worse than the windmill companies. General Electric makes windmills. They don’t tell you that they are not economical because they make money on it. But nobody protests GE, but they protest Exxon who makes oil,” he noted.

#

Ivar Giaever in 2008

Dr. Ivar Giaever resigned as a Fellow from the American Physical Society (APS) on September 13, 2011 in disgust over the group’s promotion of man-made global warming fears.

In addition to Giaever, other prominent scientists have resigned from APS over its stance on man-made global warming.

See: [Prominent Physicist Hal Lewis Resigns from APS: ‘Climategate was a fraud on a scale I have never seen...Effect on APS position: None. None at all. This is not science’](#)

Other prominent scientists are speaking up skeptically about man-made global warming claims. See: [Prominent Scientist Dissents: Renowned glaciologist declares global warming is ‘going](#)

[to be a big plus’ – Fears ‘Frightening’ Cooling – Warns scientists are ‘prostituting their science’](#)

Giaever has become a vocal dissenter from the alleged “consensus” regarding man-made climate fears. He was featured prominently in the [2009 U.S. Senate Report of \(then\) Over 700 Dissenting International Scientists](#) from Man-made global warming. Giaever, who is a member of the National Academy of Sciences and won the [1973 Nobel Prize](#) for Physics. (*Watch news coverage [here](#).*)

Giaever was also one of more than 100 co-signers in a March 30, 2009 letter to President Obama that was critical of his stance on global warming. See: [More than 100 scientists rebuke Obama as ‘simply incorrect’ on global warming: ‘We, the undersigned scientists, maintain that the case for alarm regarding climate change is grossly overstated’](#)

Giaever is featured on [page 89 of the 321 page of Climate Depot’s more than 1000 dissenting scientist](#) report (updated from U.S. Senate Report). Dr. Giaever was quoted declaring himself a man-made global warming dissenter. “I am a skeptic...Global warming has become a new religion,” Giaever declared. “I am Norwegian, should I really worry about a little bit of warming? I am unfortunately becoming an old man. We have heard many similar warnings about the acid rain 30 years ago and the ozone hole 10 years ago or deforestation but the humanity is still around,” Giaever explained. “Global warming has become a new religion. We frequently hear about the number of scientists who support it. But the number is not important: only whether they are correct is important. We don’t really know what the actual effect on the global temperature is. There are better ways to spend the money,” he concluded.

Giaever also [told the New York Times in 2010](#) that global warming “can’t be discussed — just like religion...there is NO unusual rise in the ocean level, so what where and what is the big problem?”

Related Links:

[On Friday, 3 July, over 30 Nobel laureates assembled on Mainau Island on Lake Constance signed a declaration](#) on climate change. Problem was, there were 65 attendees, and only

30

36 signed the declaration. As is typical of the suppression of the alternate views on climate, we never heard the opinion of the 35 who were in the [nearly equal] majority. Today, one of the Nobel laureates who was an attendee has spoken out.

[In Lindau Giaever speaks to young researchers and other Nobel laureates.](#) In the second row: Steven Chu, Secretary of Energy in Barack Obama's first Cabinet, where he drew a lot of money in research into renewable energies. The Nobel Laureate in Physics sinks deeper and deeper into his purple armchair, runs his fingers through his hair, scratching her on the forehead, shaking her head.

[Exclusive: Nobel Prize-Winning Physicist Who Endorsed Obama Dissents! Resigns from American Physical Society Over Group's Promotion of Man-Made Global Warming](#) - Nobel Laureate Dr. Ivar Giaever: 'The temperature (of the Earth) has been amazingly stable, and both human health and happiness have definitely improved in this 'warming' period.'



[2012: Nobel Prize Winning Physicist Ivar Giaever: 'Is climate change pseudoscience?...the answer is: absolutely' — Derides global warming as a 'religion'](#) - 'He derided the Nobel committees for awarding Al Gore and R.K. Pachauri a peace prize, and called agreement with the evidence of climate change a 'religion'... the measurement of the global average temperature rise of 0.8 degrees over 150 years remarkably unlikely to be accurate, because of the difficulties with precision for such measurements—and small enough not to matter in any case: "What does it mean

that the temperature has gone up 0.8 degrees? Probably nothing.”

[When Science IS Fiction: Nobel Physics laureate Ivar Giaever has called global warming \(aka. climate change\) a ‘new religion’ - When scientists emulate spiritual prophets, they overstep all ethical bounds. In doing so, they forfeit our confidence’](#)

[American Physical Society Statement on Climate Change: No Longer ‘Incontrovertible,’ But Still Unacceptable - Because of the following statement from the American Physical Society: “The evidence is incontrovertible: Global warming is occurring. If no mitigating actions are taken, significant disruptions in the Earth’s physical and ecological systems, social systems, security and human health are likely to occur. We must reduce emissions of greenhouse gases beginning now.”](#)

Giaever: “I resigned from the society in 2011. First: nothing in science is incontrovertible. Second: the “measured” average temperature increase in 100 years or so, is 0.8 Kelvin. Third: since the Physical Society claim it has become warmer, why is everything better than before? Forth: the maximum average temperature ever measured was in 1998, 17 years ago. When will we stop wasting money on alternative energy?”

[Skeptic win... American Physical Society removes ‘incontrovertible’ from climate change position](#)

[Politically Left Scientist Dissents - Calls President Obama ‘delusional’ on global warming](#)

[SPECIAL REPORT: More Than 1000 International Scientists Dissent Over Man-Made Global Warming Claims - Challenge UN IPCC & Gore - Climate Depot Exclusive: 321-page ‘Consensus Buster’ Report](#)

[Another Prominent Scientist Dissents! Fmr. NASA Scientist Dr. Les Woodcock ‘Laughs’ at Global Warming - ‘Global warming is nonsense’ Top Prof. Declares](#)

[Green Guru James Lovelock on Climate Change: 'I don't think anybody really knows what's happening. They just guess' - Lovelock Reverses Himself on Global Warming](#)

[Another Dissenter! Israeli Prof Giora Shaviv says 'Gore is an idiot who does not know what he is talking about' — Declares 'CO2 is not responsible for heating the earth' \(more here\) - Dr. Shaviv, Swartzmann-Medvedi chair in Space Sciences at The Technion in Haifa: 'The movement of sun affects temps, which influences levels of CO2, & that these levels have risen & fallen for centuries, even before mankind' — 'Temperature rise preceded the CO2 rise \(long before the industrial revolution\) so that the cause & effect Al Gore claims is completely wrong'](#)

[Prominent Scientist Dissents: Renowned glaciologist declares global warming is 'going to be a big plus' - Fears 'Frightening' Cooling - Warns scientists are 'prostituting their science' - 'Too many \(the majority\) of climate research scientists are quite willing to prostitute their science by giving these politicians what they want.' - 'I'm now retired, so I have no scientific career to protect by spreading lies.'](#) Glaciologist Dr. Terry Hughes is a professor emeritus of the [University of Maine's 'Climate Change Institute & School of Earth and Climate Sciences'](#). 'Dr. Hughes is an [internationally renowned glaciologist](#) who pioneered many of the modern ideas currently under study in the field.' Dr. Hughes has travelled to the Arctic ten times and the Antarctic thirteen times since 1968, mostly as the principal investigator of NSF-funded glaciological research.

[More Than 1000 International Scientists Dissent Over Man-Made Global Warming Claims - Challenge UN IPCC & Gore](#)

[Top Swedish Climate Scientist Says Warming Not Noticeable: 'The warming we have had last a 100 years is so small that if we didn't have climatologists to measure it we wouldn't have noticed it at all'](#) - Award-Winning Dr. Lennart Bengtsson, formerly of UN IPCC: 'We Are Creating Great Anxiety Without It Being Justified'

['High Priestess of Global Warming' No More! Former Warmist Climate Scientist Judith Curry Admits To Being 'Duped Into](#)

[Supporting IPCC' - 'If the IPCC is dogma, then count me in as a heretic'](#)

[German Meteorologist reverses belief in man-made global warming: Now calls idea that CO2 Can Regulate Climate 'Sheer Absurdity' — 'Ten years ago I simply parroted what the IPCC told us'](#)

[UN Scientists Who Have Turned on the UN IPCC & Man-Made Climate Fears — A Climate Depot Flashback Report](#) - Warming fears are the “worst scientific scandal in the history...When people come to know what the truth is, they will feel deceived by science and scientists.” - UN IPCC Japanese Scientist Dr. Kiminori Itoh, an award-winning PhD environmental physical chemist.

['Some of the most formidable opponents of climate hysteria include politically liberal physics Nobel laureate, Ivar Giaever; Freeman Dyson; father of the Gaia Hypothesis, James Lovelock — 'Left-center chemist, Fritz Vahrenholt, one of the fathers of the German environmental movement'](#)

[Flashback: Left-wing Env. Scientist Bails Out Of Global Warming Movement: Declares it a 'corrupt social phenomenon...strictly an imaginary problem of the 1st World middleclass'](#)

The UN claim that human industry Co2 emissions are causing runaway global warming that will end in catastrophe if not arrested with renewables and carbon taxes was only a thought experiment without any physical observation. Think about this - the UN said there was no historical precedent for the rapid rise in temperatures after industrialization therefore increased Co2 must be the culprit. This is both false logic and untrue. A raft of studies about temperature variability from ocean currents or changes in solar cycles evident in rising or falling sunspots easily explains the temperature rise.

Today with the benefit of hindsight there never was any fast rising temperatures needing explanation. In fact temperature's rise of less than 1 ' C over the past 140 years and now falling 0.4 ' C in the past three years means no global warming now or in the past.


Because the climate changes over a long period of time no one living or dead has actually looked out the window and observed climate change. You see weather and it may be a heat wave, snow storm or record rainfall, but one weather event is never a new pattern of changing weather because that must be a statistical analysis.

CLIMATE HISTORY FROM BILLIONS OF YEARS AGO

Earth's history blows hot and cold

©NewScientist

Global temperatures have risen far higher than today's in the geological past



We see the rain, the snow and wind blowing the trees, but this is just weather not climate change.

Climate change is any significant long-term change in the expected patterns of average [weather](#) of a region (or the whole Earth) over a significant period of time. W.

Watching hurricanes and other severe weather is REAL and is over a long time scale the evidence for climate change which is only an unreal statistical fiction. No one living or dead has ever seen climate change. Therefore climate change is an invisible macro phenomena and must be studied through proxies as an indirect science similar to the invisible world of molecules and atoms at the micro level.

“What does this mean? First climate science is perhaps the most complex science of all. In fact so far unlike all other physical sciences there is no theory of climate science. There is no climate formula or calculus like $E=MC^2$ discovered to explain the universe. Does this also mean climate science is so primitive that it is wrong to call it science? Maybe not but what is certain is without the structure of a climate theory scientists like the bunch leading the UN IPCC can make wild claims without falsifiable proof just like astrologists. Their claims cannot be falsified against some $E=MC^2$.”

This analysis is sourced from a powerful book, TAKEN BY STORM by Dr. Essex and McKittrick.

Predicting devastating sea level rise that would flood coastal cities was the pet of alarmists particularly the huckster politician Al Gore. But the predictions have all been false. There is no sea rise climate crisis.

[Eric Worrall's recent essay](#) on the Prime Minister of Tuvalu and his reticence to providing some evidence that his island nation is being inundated by rising sea level inspired me to devise a simple test to see if an island is sinking, vanishing or being washed away:

I planimetered the coast lines of each map and found no significant changes over the 51 years from 1962-2012...




Figure 3: 1962 vs. 2012. Roughly a 1% difference in area. The apparent slight increase is well within the margin of error of the planimetering tool.

I guess I'm going to have to deny climate change or at least doubt the climate, because I can't see any effect of sea level rise on this puny, flat, little island. (/sarc).

Posted in [Climate Science](#), [Junk Science and Enviromarxism](#), [Uncategorized](#) | [8 Comments](#) »

WRITTEN BY [JOHN NOLTE](#) ON

MAR 12, 2021

. POSTED IN [LATEST NEWS](#)

Flashback: NYTimes Claimed East Coast Beaches Would Be Gone By 2020



“[M]ost of the beaches on the East Coast of the United States would be gone in 25 years,” the fake *New York Times* [told](#) the world 25 years ago, all the way back in 1995.

Fact check: It’s 2021 and America’s East Coast beaches are doing just fine!

Here’s the [relevant portion](#) from the original *Times*’ article:

A continuing rise in average global sea level, which is likely to amount to more than a foot and a half by the year 2100. This, say the scientists, would inundate parts of many heavily populated river deltas and the cities on them, making them uninhabitable, and would destroy many beaches around the world. At the most likely rate of rise, some experts say, most of the beaches on the

East Coast of the United States would be gone in 25 years. They are already disappearing at an average of 2 to 3 feet a year.


The date of the article is September 18, 1995. The headline reads, "Scientists Say Earth's Warming Could Set Off Wide Disruptions."

So here we are 25 full years later, a whole quarter of a century later, and the first prediction from these unnamed "experts" has not even come close to occurring, so why should we believe the dire predictions about the year 2100?

We shouldn't.

[Flashback: NYTimes Claimed East Coast Beaches Would Be Gone By 2020](#)

We think in pictures not words and the most important pictures in our minds are metaphors. Sadly the climate debacle has suffered from the bad metaphor of a **GREENHOUSE** fooling the public and many scientists as well.



Why a greenhouse is not a true metaphor

There is a mountain of evidence that global warming from trace amounts of human emissions of plant food non-polluting carbon dioxide is not happening because at 0.1% of the atmosphere it is impossible. There is no cover of the earth to trap heat like the cover of a real greenhouse. The mislabeled 'greenhouse gas

effect' is bunk no more effective than this shattered real greenhouse.

[Now French Scientist Trashes Greenhouse Gas Theory | PSI Intl](#)



Like this smashed greenhouse from vandals in Scotland the greenhouse effect is literally and figuratively full of holes.

I will add peer reviewed climate research from around the world with my own choice of art metaphors that seem relevant and introductory.

NEW RESEARCH shows Co2 is not the driver of climate change.

- [Published: 25 September 2019](#)

Low CO2 levels of the entire Pleistocene epoch

- [Jiawei Da,](#)
- [Yi Ge Zhang,](#)
- [Gen Li,](#)
- [Xianqiang Meng](#) &
- [Junfeng Ji](#)

[Nature Communications](#) **volume 10**, Article number: 4342 (2019)
| [Download Citation](#)

Abstract

Quantifying ancient atmospheric $p\text{CO}_2$ provides valuable insights into the interplay between greenhouse gases and global climate. Beyond the 800-ky history uncovered by ice cores, discrepancies

in both the trend and magnitude of $p\text{CO}_2$ changes remain among different proxy-derived results. The traditional paleosol $p\text{CO}_2$ paleobarometer suffers from largely unconstrained soil-respired CO_2 concentration ($S(z)$). Using finely disseminated carbonates precipitated in paleosols from the Chinese Loess Plateau, here we identified that their $S(z)$ can be quantitatively constrained by soil magnetic susceptibility. Based on this approach, we reconstructed $p\text{CO}_2$ during 2.6–0.9 Ma, **which documents overall low $p\text{CO}_2$ levels (<300 ppm) comparable with ice core records, indicating that the Earth system has operated under late Pleistocene $p\text{CO}_2$ levels for an extended period.**

<https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-019-12357-5>

Identification of the driving forces of climate change using the longest instrumental temperature record

New research confirms the view of leading climate scientists and scholars that trace amounts of CO_2 emissions are not destabilizing the planet. CO_2 is essential plant food and therefore green energy. I will summarize leading science paper that do not support the deniers of natural variability from CHINA, FRANCE, CANADA, GERMANY AND THE UNITED STATES.

First China scientists with new research with the longest instrumental temperature record thus far.

Historical Chinese Painting.

The authors Geli Wang & Peicai Yang and Xiuji Zhou are scientists at the CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCE and **Chinese Academy of Meteorological Sciences, Beijing, China** 中国气象科学研究院

ANTHROPOGENIC (human activity). The driving forces are

“the El Niño-Southern Oscillation cycle and the Hale sunspot cycle, respectively.”

The title of the study published in the prestigious NATURE Journal is: **Identification of the driving forces of climate change using the longest instrumental temperature record**

<https://www.nature.com/articles/...>

Their study confirms **THE DRIVING FORCES OF GLOBAL WARMING AND CLIMATE CHANGE ARE NATURAL**


The “driving forces” of climate change are natural and not Co2 plant food emissions. A new Chinese study confirms climate change comes from natural cycles. This research is based on the longest actual temperature data of more than 400 years from 1659 to 2013, including the period of anthropogenic warming.

Abstract

*The identification of causal effects is a fundamental problem in climate change research. Here, a new perspective on climate change causality is presented using the central England temperature (CET) dataset, the longest instrumental temperature record, and a combination of slow feature analysis and wavelet analysis. The driving forces of climate change were investigated and **the results showed two independent degrees of freedom —a 3.36-year cycle and a 22.6-year cycle, which seem to be connected to the El Niño-Southern Oscillation cycle and the Hale sunspot cycle, respectively.** [Emphasis added]. Moreover, these driving forces were modulated in amplitude by signals with millennial timescales.*



James Matkin This research is very relevant and should make climate alarmists pause in their crusade against Co2 emissions from fossil fuels. Far too much focus on Co2 like a one trick pony in a big tent circus where solar radiation is a more compelling show. The thrust of recent research has demonstrated that climate changes continually and is determined by natural forces that humans have no significant control over. Many leading scientists have presented research of other "driving forces" and cautioned against the arrogance of many that "the science is settled." See Judith Curry of the Georgia Institute of Technology and blogger at Climate Etc. talks with EconTalk host Russ Roberts about climate change. Curry argues that climate change is a "wicked problem" with a great deal of uncertainty surrounding the expected damage as well as the political and technical challenges of dealing with the phenomenon. She emphasizes the complexity of the climate and how much of the basic science remains incomplete. The conversation closes with a discussion of how concerned citizens can improve their understanding of climate change and climate change policy.<http://www.econtalk.org/arc...>
<https://www.nature.com/articles/...>



JAMES MATKIN • 2017-08-23 10:03 PM

The great failure of the Paris accord is the failure to accept that the IPCC Al Gore hypothesis of anthropogenic warming is not settled science. Indeed, none of the predictions of doom have occurred. New research confirms the view of leading climate scientists and scholars that trace amounts of Co2 emissions are not destabilizing the planet. Co2 is essential plant food and therefore green energy. The “driving force” of climate change is natural and not Co2 plant food emissions. A new Chinese study confirms climate change comes from natural cycles. This research is based on the longest actual temperature data of more than 400 years from 1659 to 2013, including the period of anthropogenic warming. The authors Geli Wang & Peicai Yang and Xiuji Zhou are scientists at the CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCE and Chinese Academy of Meteorological Sciences, Beijing, China 中国气象科学研究院 Their study confirms THE DRIVING FORCES OF GLOBAL WARMING AND CLIMATE CHANGE ARE NOT ANTHROPOGENIC (human activity). The driving forces are “the El Niño–Southern Oscillation cycle and the Hale sunspot cycle, respectively.” The title of the study published in the prestigious NATURE Journal is:

Identification of the driving forces of climate change using the longest instrumental temperature record [Identification of the driving forces of climate change using the longest instrumental temperature record](#) This means that climate change cannot be stopped as Paris attendees believed. Co2 is very beneficial plant food and we need more not less. [Why climate change is good for the world | The Spectator](#) It is good news for civilization that the Paris targets are not being met around the world.

<https://www.nature.com/news/prov...>

<https://www.quora.com/Do-any-of-you-feel-climate-change-isnt-real-Why/answer/James-Matkin>