



HOW THE LEFT'S GLOBAL WARMING IDEOLOGY WRECKED SCIENCE—AND HOW TO STOP IT

We don't have a "climate crisis," we have a crisis of lying about climate. It's time for a sensible energy policy that rejects junk science and promotes prosperity.

JEFF REYNOLDS, SENIOR INVESTIGATIVE RESEARCHER | JR@RESTORATIONPAC.COM

"The biggest lie in American climate journalism is that reporters cover climate science as a science."

Holman W. Jenkins, Jr.,
Wall Street Journal Editorial Board

A culture of lying has metastasized around the theory of man-made global warming since its emergence as a prominent political movement in the 1990s. That it has become more *politics* than *science* is quite telling.

The lies are everywhere: Unreliable computer modeling has replaced empirical observation; observed temperature values are manipulated when they don't conform to the narrative; the baseless assumptions and false premises at the root of the theory; the fake consensus of "experts" and scientists; the fundamental problems with "green energy"; false claims that storms and wildfires have gotten more common and severe; and the ever more inaccurate predictions of climate doom.

The pronouncements by adherents of net-zero and decarbonization policies have grown progressively more hysterical, in direct proportion to the lack of available evidence of

the efficacy of those policies. All the while, if the media reports on the scientific debate at all it does so using straw man arguments and ad hominem attacks to minimize those who question the science behind the theory. More often, the corporate media simply goes more radical in the language used to assume the crisis and inject it into every story, regardless of subject.

The lies create a storm of misinformation founded on junk science, which hides a plain truth: No scientific analysis of the effects of atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO₂) can prove a causal effect on global temperatures, at least to the extent claimed by the alarmists. This is because the central assumption fundamental to the entire theory—the correlation of increased atmospheric CO₂ since the Industrial Revolution began in the late 19th century—has never been proven as the cause of temperature fluctuations.

That's right. The entire movement mixes up the fundamental rule every freshman college math student learns in statistics: Correlation is NOT causation.

This report will show that the

Left's Cult of Scientism has never proven its claims about CO₂ causing global warming. Moreover, we offer a powerful alternative to the Left's grim future of poverty, authoritarianism, and depopulation. Our goal is to equip Americans with a keen understanding of the true goals of the radicals using the environment to deny human advancement. This will play a vital role in 2024 and beyond, as they have told us they will never stop.

The Greatest Lie Ever Told

The theory of anthropogenic, or man-made, global warming (AGW) has led to a massive accrual of political power among globalists, radical "progressives," leftist nonprofits, and authoritarians over the past 30-plus years. Exposing that is critical to understanding the ulterior motives of those pushing junk climate science. If the theory held water, wouldn't every human jump on board to save the planet? Why do the solutions have to be mandatory?

Across that period, proponents' "solutions" have failed to affect the Earth's climate. Yet what *has* been affected is the size and scope of the governments which have adopted these radical goals.

Whether it's the United Nations, the European Union and its member states, the World Economic Forum, the United States of America, nations across the rest of the free world, or billionaire jet-setters who feel guilty about their massive wealth, societies and thought leaders that once based their economic activity on some level of free-market capitalism have allowed themselves to be subsumed by an endless desire for top-down regulations and non sequitur wealth redistribution in the name of "saving" the environment—eroding liberty and installing a command economy in its place.

The longer the Earth goes without proving the theory, the more wild-eyed the predictions of doom get, and the more its adherents resemble members of a cult—call it the Cult of Scientism—instead of actual scientists. Indeed, the more the facts get in the way, the bigger the lies get.

As American voters have shown in poll after poll, global warming—or climate change, or global boiling, or whichever new phrase is trotted out—continues to dwell at the bottom of the list of problems they want government to fix. That becomes especially apparent when voters consider the proposed solutions: Massive redistribution of wealth, equity schemes, big government intrusion into our private lives, unreliable and expensive "green" energy, and all of the unreasonable demands to curtail human progress.

In fact, the "solutions" go beyond mere inconveniences that require every human to do with a little less, as the cult members often claim. We are to be shamed or worse for our "overconsumption" of nutritious food, desire to travel freely and explore the world and its many cultures, innate right to own and work our own land, and wish to pay less for the convenient energy that powers human progress. Any challenge to the solutions will often meet with responses ranging from ad hominem attacks, to accusations of greed, to public protests that interrupt daily life, to destruction of property (not to mention priceless works of art), to personal threats.

Challenges to the AGW theory have led its proponents to go on the offensive. Instead of engaging in debate and winning on scientific arguments, zealots have waged war in a near-complete takeover of the corporate media by activist organizations, collaborations with Big Tech to censor opposing viewpoints, and "flooding the zone" with false assumptions and junk science.

The Green New Deal is Here

In the chaos of the 2020 Democratic presidential primary, the fractures between The Squad / Bernie Bros and establishment Democrats felt insurmountable, severely threatening their challenge to the reelection of Donald Trump. The candidates who filed to run for the Democratic nomination were a rogues' gallery of unelectable radical leftists, and the Democrat establishment knew it. Party elites also knew they couldn't win without bringing the Bernie Sanders supporters and the radical "progressives" back into the fold. So they marketed Joe Biden as the "moderate" alternative to voters, while promising the Left that Biden would implement the Green New Deal.

The Green New Deal, first introduced at a press conference in 2019 by Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (D-NY) and Sen. Ed Markey (D-MA), originally took the form of a congressional resolution. It harkened back to the 1930s New Deal, a series of laws and executive orders signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt designed to create federal government intervention into the free market with the (unsuccessful) goal of ending the Great Depression.

The Green New Deal proposed a set of similarly massive federal programs to artificially create jobs in the prophesized "green economy," set the United States on a path to "net-zero" CO₂ emissions, and subsidize alternative forms of energy to end our use of "fossil fuels."

As a result of this compromise, when Joe Biden was declared president in 2021 he set about undoing every policy enacted by the Trump administration, no matter how successful or well-received by the American public.



That included stealth-implementing the Green New Deal via executive order, beginning with his first day in the Oval Office. This action put the U.S. back into the Obama-era Paris Accords on climate change, revoked the permit for the Keystone XL pipeline expansion, and stopped new oil and gas leases in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Despite its claims to the contrary, the Biden administration has placed expensive and onerous restrictions on the domestic extraction of “fossil fuels,” while simultaneously begging global adversaries like Venezuela to sell us more oil to bring prices down.

Biden then doubled down in 2022 with the passage of his signature legislation, the Inflation Reduction Act, a name he later said he regretted. The IRA really amounts to a giveaway of trillions in federal funding to every green boondoggle imaginable, adding to our runaway national debt while subsidizing green energy that could not otherwise compete in a truly free market. The effects of this sweeping legislation are still being discovered.

The U.S. government, the UN, the WEF, the EU, Klaus Schwab, Bill Gates—none of them could have made so many moves to undermine human progress without a quasi-religious reliance on junk science, bad public policy, and a refusal to properly observe the world around them. A sensible national energy policy would reject the extremist rhetoric of pseudoscience and refuse to line the pockets of the political elite, instead building upon proven strategies that would enhance human progress, allow for more personal liberty, and create

conditions where the environment would thrive alongside the inevitable growth in personal wealth and prosperity for all.

Understanding the Greatest Hoax of All Time

The theory of anthropogenic global warming rests on some basic principles that people intuitively understand. Almost everyone has seen a greenhouse, and even with the sorry state of modern science education most folks can understand how they work when explained in layman’s terms.

The greenhouse concept scales up to atmospheric conditions, in which heat from the sun only partially dissipates into space after reflecting off Earth’s surface. We know the atmosphere forms a protective layer against asteroids, cosmic rays, and excess sunlight. Just compare Earth to our moon or other planets in the solar system, and it’s obvious how fortunate we are to live on a planet uniquely suited to human life.

Every human has conscience and self-awareness, which makes us question our effects on the world around us—other humans, animals, plants, the entire universe of actions we take can have consequences we often ponder. Throughout history, humans have often created environmental messes requiring significant clean-up and we’ve vowed never to make those same mistakes again. So it seems natural to wonder if we’re creating pollution every time people extract the raw materials necessary for modern life and human achievement and consume, burn, or otherwise dispose of them.

When we’re told by some scientists that the Earth is catastrophically warming, and human activity might have had irreversible effects on the entire global climate, most people sit up and take notice. Very few are sadistic enough to want to destroy our home; most honestly want to help if there is a problem. We ask questions like, “What is the proof that carbon dioxide is the cause of global warming?” and “How do we know the Earth has warmed catastrophically?” We want to understand the problem, so we can fix it. “Will the solutions you propose solve the problem?” We want to be able to trust the folks who tell us we’ve doomed our planet to destruction. We want to know whether the proposed solutions, like so-called green energy, reducing carbon emissions to pre-industrial levels, and halting human progress are even possible, and will have the reparatory effects claimed.

When so many lies are offered in response to the basic questions, public trust naturally erodes. When that becomes the knee-jerk reaction to any question on the topic, this is where cult-like behavior reveals itself.




Taking a Baseball Bat to the Hockey Stick

Professor Michael E. Mann, now at the University of Pennsylvania, has gained international prominence writing about and speaking about the average global temperature graphs he published in peer-reviewed literature in 1998 and 1999. Those graphs resemble a hockey stick laying on its side, for the sudden sharp upward turn they take in modern times. The famous Hockey Stick graph claims to show unequivocal proof that the earth has experienced a spike in warming since the Industrial Revolution and humanity's growing reliance on "fossil fuels."

Mann is one of the godfathers of the climate catastrophist movement. He was one of eight lead authors on a chapter in the 2001 Third Climate Assessment Report by the International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), convened by the UN. That chapter, "Observed Climate Variability and Change," featured Mann's Hockey Stick graphs in several sections.

This point is vital, and bears repeating. The groundbreaking research claims to show a spike in average global temperature unprecedented in the last two thousand years. This sits at the foundation of all global warming science.



Mann's first version of the 'Hockey Stick' curve, 1999.

Mann and his co-authors mathematically reconstructed historic temperature records for two thousand years, based on "climate proxy records," and created a new statistical analysis method to interpret these data. Those proxy records included tree ring data from higher latitudes in Russia and North America, based on the



Michael E. Mann

familiar notion that narrow tree rings indicate slow growth due to a cold year, and wider tree rings indicate faster growth during warm years.

These papers and the underlying data have faced withering criticism over the years, especially after they gained prominence in the 2001 IPCC report, and Al Gore's 2006 documentary *An Inconvenient Truth*. Mann *et. al.* chose to interpret tree ring growth as solely dependent on average air temperature, discounting other variables like availability of moisture, sunshine, or nutrients on tree rings.

Many climatologists, physicists, economists, mathematicians, and other academics and pundits have since picked apart every aspect of Mann's reconstruction, from the sample of trees used in the reconstruction, to his refusal to release his "proprietary" statistical methods so others could repeat his analysis, to his aggressive pursuit of critics via lawsuit. Mann even created an ad hoc group colloquially called "The Hockey Team" to refute his growing number of critics. Generally, their counterattacks often fail to address the scientific criticisms head-on, boiling down to accusing Mann's critics of shilling for Big Oil.

Mann has also been dogged by allegations that his data is manipulated at best and manufactured at worst. Mann took center stage in the 2009 "Climategate" email scandal, which centered on emails between climate scientists. A whistleblower leaked private emails between Mann and his collaborators at the Climate Research Unit (CRU) at the University of East Anglia in the UK.

A group of researchers met in Tanzania in 1999 to work on the International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)'s Third Assessment Report that would have


reported the science behind the latest understanding of anthropogenic global warming and what governments around the globe should do about it.

One big problem: the director of CRU at East Anglia, Dr. Keith Briffa, had run his own temperature reconstruction, and it showed a *decline* in average temperatures in the late 20th century. **It clearly and inconveniently *did not* match the other models.**

The Briffa reconstruction (or “Briffa decline”) took on new urgency for the Third Assessment authors. According to the leaked emails, “everyone in the room at IPCC” thought it was a problem. Pressure mounted on Briffa to show “unprecedented warming.” The pressure was so great, Briffa emailed his graph to Mann.

In the leaked emails, Mann consciously reveals his awareness that the temperature discrepancies cause the message to become “water[ed] down” and says, “the skeptics [would] have a field day casting doubt on our ability to understand the factors that influence these estimates.” So he came up with a trick which became known to the IPCC lead authors as “Mike’s Nature Trick.” Put simply, Mann deleted the problematic tree ring reconstruction data after 1960 that failed to conform to the temperature spike theory and replaced it with data from temperature stations. Thus the *decline* became a *spike*, when combined with the models produced by other authors. Since then, critics have pointed out that those two types of data are completely incompatible.


Briffa later went on to serve as lead author of a chapter in the IPCC’s Fourth Assessment report in 2007.



Dr. Tim Ball


When Dr. Tim Ball, a retired geography and climatology professor in British Columbia, said Mann deserved to spend time in the “state pen” instead of Penn. State (his employer at the time) for his “trick,” Mann sued him. The expensive and time-consuming lawsuit stretched on for 9 years before the Canadian Supreme Court dismissed it, awarding court costs and legal fees to Dr. Ball. Ball died before he could collect—meanwhile, Mann continues to publicly claim the court didn’t dismiss the suit based on its merits and called the 83-year-old Dr. Ball’s honesty into question until Ball’s death in 2022.

Mann also sued conservative commentator and radio host Mark Steyn after he said Penn. State handled the controversy over the hockey stick graph similarly to how they handled former football coach Jerry Sandusky, who was convicted of multiple counts of child rape. Steyn’s case is still pending, 11 years later.



In both suits, the defendants rebutted libel allegations by arguing that they had the truth on their side. In both trials' discovery phase, Mann steadfastly refused to reveal the r^2 regression analysis he used to reconstruct the historical temperature data, a standard statistics tool used to validate the mathematical analysis. Mann claimed the data were "proprietary" and lost several motions (and the entire Ball case) due to his refusal to submit them for discovery.

During his trial, Ball submitted his own historical temperature reconstruction graph in his defense. Relying on his decades of experience and scientific study, along with his academic training, Ball concluded that not only could nobody prove significant warming in the late 20th century, but that Mann had minimized the "Little Ice Age" of the 17th and 18th centuries and several very warm centuries before that. The significance goes to demonstrate Mann minimized much wider historical variations in average temperature than what he claims for the 20th century.



Mann vs. Ball Graphs

According to Ball's chart, not only does the 20th century spike not exist to the extent claimed by Mann, but much wider swings occurred within the past millennium, debunking the myth that any temperature anomalies today are out of the historic norm. Despite propaganda to the contrary, many climatologists today agree with Ball's reconstruction over that done by Mann.

The High Priests of Scientism

One would think this would spell the end of the hockey stick's prominence. But between Mann's public and aggressive attacks on his critics and the centrality of it to the argument that humans and governments need to do something, it miraculously lives on.

So does the criticism. In fact, just in November 2023 Dr. Judith Curry, the former chair of the School of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences at Georgia Tech and author of several books on climate, tweeted this:



Dr. Judith Curry



After the Climategate scandal broke in 2009, Curry began criticizing the IPCC and many of the scientists involved for not sufficiently addressing concerns about the science. At one point, *Scientific American* called her a "heretic" for taking her criticisms public instead of "trying to work differences out at conferences." They lament the respected climatologist "taking the side of skeptics," in an attempt to "figure[e] out how to shape the public debate." But she really began reconsidering her position after she published a peer-reviewed paper in 2005 linking more powerful hurricanes to climate change. When she received criticism that she took as constructive, she realized she'd failed to take natural variability seriously enough in her analysis.

For her open-mindedness, Dr. Curry was pilloried by the protectors of the climate narrative for “doing damage to the consensus,” according to *Scientific American*, which has only driven her further away.

Curry has long embraced scientific debate, unlike those who push the “climate consensus.” The article she highlighted points out another statistical trick pulled by Mann in his 1998 and 1999 papers that has long eluded critics, precisely because he refused to reveal his statistical methods. In that article, Steve McIntyre, a Canadian statistician who has criticized Mann almost as long as the hockey stick has existed, wrote:

“ Mann et al (1998) reported that the reconstruction consisted of 11 steps and, in the original SI (current link), reported the number of proxies (some of which were principal component series) for each step – 112 in the AD1820 network and 22 in the AD1400 network. As we later observed, the table of verification statistics did not include Mann’s verification r^2 results. Verification r^2 is one of the most commonly used statistics and is particularly valuable as a check against overfitting in the calibration period. ”

Recall that Mann has never released his verification r^2 , even when required under the rules of discovery when he sued Ball and Steyn in separate lawsuits. McIntyre continues:

“ Although Mann claimed statistical “skill” for each of the eleven steps, he did not archive results of the 11 individual step reconstructions. In 2003, we sought these results, ultimately filing a formal complaint with [peer-reviewed journal] *Nature*. But, to its continuing discredit, *Nature* supported Mann’s withholding of these results. Despite multiple investigations and litigations, Mann has managed to withhold these results for over 25 years. ”

It gets long and complicated, but boils down to this point: Many who have attempted to recreate Mann’s reconstructions in the 25 years since the publication of his papers have failed to do so, because the list of proxies he used to recreate temperatures in the time period 1400–1500 AD (as well as 1650 AD) included data from sources *other* than those he reported in his published articles.

It took this long for internet and statistical sleuths to suss out how he did this because of his decades-long refusal to release the real data sets. In other words, the principle components Mann claimed to use in his historical temperature recreations were not the ones he actually used. This could very well explain the discrepancy between his hockey stick graph and the graph created by Dr. Tim Ball in his own defense.

Falsifiability and repeatability are hallmarks of the scientific method. If others cannot verify your experimental results using the same methods you used, your theory cannot be considered scientifically rigorous. As of December 2023, Mann had yet to address the latest criticism on social media, preferring to post links to various interviews he’s done about his new book, or glowing reviews of the work he’s done and rewards he’s had conferred throughout his career.

Despite his silence, this new development, on top of decades of other important work attempting—and failing—to recreate Mann’s analysis goes to show the entire façade of the hockey stick has crumbled. **This point cannot be overstated**, as the hockey stick has served to underpin the worst of the climate alarmism, cultism, and junk science used to push governments to “Do Something NOW!” for decades.

Manipulating the Data


Mann has gotten away with his tricks for so long, it’s seemingly emboldened others to engage in similar chicanery.

Data manipulation is a feature of climate science—not a bug. The more the general public ignores the alarm bells coming from the climate cultists, the more these cultists seem to think they need to prove beyond a shadow of a doubt their theory holds water. Let’s review a few representative examples of blatant data manipulation here in the U.S.

Many folks have documented the data manipulations over the years. Few have been as prolific as Tony Heller, a self-proclaimed environmentalist and computer and electrical engineer who used to write climate modeling software for the federal government. Heller’s blog (RealClimateScience.com) exposes the many ways in which the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) has manipulated surface temperature station readings—manipulations so brazen it strains credulity that they’d have the gall to do it.



Tony Heller



RealClimateScience.com


NOAA has maintained temperature records at over 1,200 traditional surface weather stations for over a century. A large proportion of those have been observed by volunteers over the years. Heller has demonstrated, in painstaking detail, that NOAA has replaced over 40 percent of those observation stations since 1990 with *estimated data*, instead of replacing the aging equipment or retired staffers who used to collect the data manually. NOAA has also changed the time of day many of the stations record their readings, which further massages the data to produce the results desired to demonstrate warming.

In other words, **40 percent of the data NOAA publishes from weather stations around the country is simply made up.**

The data manipulations may result from pressure due to observations not matching the hypothesis. According to the EPA's own data, only 19 percent of all domestic climate stations show *any* warming since before 1950.

Sen. Ted Cruz (R-TX) convened a congressional hearing in 2015 to invite testimony from various witnesses to discuss this issue. Dr. Judith Curry agreed to testify. Aaron Mair, the president of the Sierra Club, did not.

The graph Cruz displayed in his hearing came from Heller's blog. That graph shows the difference between measured temperatures and "adjusted" temperatures—the adjusted temperatures showing a very clear warming trend that doesn't exist in the mere measured data:



Measured vs. Adjusted Temperatures. Source: RealClimateScience.com

In July 2023, the CO₂ Coalition noted that the EPA's own website reported a full 81 percent of weather reporting stations across the United States reported either a *decrease* in average temperatures or *no change at all* since 1948. Perhaps this explains why so many government agencies (EPA, NOAA, NASA) feel the need to manipulate the data to show an increase—because without that manipulation, no increase would show up.

Shortly after the Climategate scandal broke, Professor Phil Jones, director of the University of East Anglia's Climatic Research Unit, admitted he didn't believe current warming trends really counted as historically "unprecedented." In fact, he further admitted there had been no statistically significant warming between 1995 and 2010. This was remarkable because Jones was one of the key figures at the center of the email scheme to manipulate data to "hide the decline."

In 2023, a new report completely debunked the doom predicted by the climate cult, backed by junk science, that coral reefs would die off due to bleaching caused

by ocean acidification, driven by CO₂ increases in the Earth's atmosphere. The theory holds little credibility on its surface, as salt water creates a buffer system that can absorb a lot of carbon dioxide without acidifying. Real-world observations bear that out: Australia has seen a record level of new coral growth after a bleaching event that the media touted as the beginning of the end for the Great Barrier Reef.

The mainstream media has failed to follow up with a correction to its original doomsaying, much like it failed to follow up on the ozone layer (which has stubbornly refused to disappear). It turns out coral bleaching might very well be an adaptation by the corals, not a result of atmospheric conditions at all, and certainly no harbinger of doom. While this isn't an example of data manipulation *per se*, it is an example of hyperbolic conclusions drawn by cult members—who got their research published in a peer-reviewed journal—with cherry-picked data designed to come to the worst conclusion imaginable.

Computer Models Aren't Data

The data manipulation we've documented would not be possible if this entire branch of science didn't rely so heavily on computer models, both for recreating past temperature records, and for forecasting future average temperatures. Simple temperature observations over the last century have failed to yield any evidence of warming, but computer models often do.

A British scientist who was included on the leaked Climategate emails has spent a couple of decades demonstrating this point. Despite his experience, the rigor of his work, and his history of prior publications, peer-reviewed journals have used the most specious excuses to repeatedly avoid publishing his discussion paper on the flaws in computer climate modeling.

Richard Courtney served as the senior material scientist of the UK's National Coal Board, as well as the Science and Technology spokesman for the British Association of Colliery Management. He circulated a draft of his paper in 2003 calling for scientists worldwide to revise their use and definition of mean global temperature (MGT) data sets. As he demonstrates, if scientists cannot agree on how to measure MGT—or, alternatively, an average

daily temperature, or any other standard measure of temperatures—it follows that anomalies cannot be defined.

Put simply, if we cannot define a *normal* temperature, we cannot define *abnormal* either. Courtney wrote of the several teams that compiled separate calculations of MGT:

“One important use of data sets of MGT anomalies is in “attribution” studies of climate change. Attribution studies model the effects that can alter climate, (e.g. changes to solar radiance, atmospheric injection of volcanic aerosols, etc.). Differences between the model results and the observed changes to MGT are usually attributed to anthropogenic climate change (AGW). Any errors in the MGT data sets will clearly affect the results of attribution studies which use those data sets.


There are significant variations between the results of MGT calculated by the different teams that compile them. The teams each provide 95% confidence limits for their results. However, the results of the teams differ by more than double those limits in several years, and the data sets provided by the teams have different trends. Since all three data sets are compiled from the same available source data (i.e. the measurements mostly made at weather stations using thermometers), and purport to be the same metric (i.e. MGT anomaly), this is surprising.”

In his discussion, Courtney demonstrates that computer models are hopelessly simplistic in their modeling of the Earth's climate, for several fundamentally flawed reasons.

Several other climatologists have argued that computer models, and the scientists who created them, have failed to account for other significant variables. For instance, it's well understood that solar radiation fluctuations correlate more strongly with temperature variations over historical time periods than with CO₂ concentrations. Yet computer models fail to adequately account for the effects of solar radiation. Same for atmospheric water vapor, ozone, and other trace gases. Water vapor, in particular, seems to have a much greater effect than the computer models calculate.

Observed temperature data often doesn't match the computer-modeled historical temperature reproductions, like those favored by Michael Mann and

others. As just one example, the CO₂ Coalition published a graph showing an observed temperature decline in the 20th Century as atmospheric CO₂ levels rose:



CO₂ vs. Global Temperatures. Source: CO₂ Coalition

Another peer-reviewed paper this year by former NASA scientist Dr. Roy Spencer shows definitively that almost a quarter of all observed warming from satellite measurements can be attributed to the Urban Heat Island (UHI) effect, and climate models have completely failed to account for this major effect on temperature trends. The Urban Heat Island effect is a known phenomenon, in which the modern materials of construction—concrete, steel, asphalt, etc.—absorb more heat than natural landscapes. That heat then radiates back out, causing temperatures in dense cities to rise above natural averages.

Fundamentally, computer models are predictions, not observations. Too many climatologists have abandoned empirical data—crucial to genuine science—in favor of models which represent the bias of the programmer. The old programming rule comes to mind: Garbage in, garbage out.

Where Does CO₂ Come From? Not Just Fossil Fuels

Little dispute exists over atmospheric CO₂ concentrations having increased from around 270 parts per million (ppm) in the late 19th century to around 421 ppm (and rising) today. The assumption is that it correlates with the Industrial Revolution and humanity's reliance on burning fossil fuels. But this argument leaves out important details that call that correlation into serious question.

Natural sources of CO₂ include so many different variables it's virtually impossible to ascribe human causes as the main culprit. CO₂ makes up about 0.04 percent of the atmosphere. Of that, human emissions of all types—combustion, agriculture, and so on—make up about 3.4 percent of annual CO₂ emissions.

In other words, **humans account for 0.00136 percent of the observed increase in atmospheric CO₂ concentrations.**

Remember, the Cult of Scientism has *never* proven its claim that CO₂ causes global warming. Its adherents have never proven a causal link between CO₂ concentrations and rising near-Earth temperatures. They make claims about the absorption of certain types of radiation, but that absorption cannot account for the entirety of the greenhouse effects they claim.

All they really have is a *correlation* between supposedly rising temperatures and rising atmospheric CO₂ levels. Actually, they don't even have that.

CO₂ Increases Follow Warming, Not the Other Way Around

The AGW adherents have no answer to the following observation: Several climate scientists have shown that a rise in CO₂ concentration *follows* warming—it does not precede it. If a rise in CO₂ concentrations doesn't precede temperature rise, it simply cannot cause it.

This is not speculation. This geological observation completely destroys any argument in favor of carbon causing global warming. This has been published in peer-reviewed literature multiple times by credentialed scientists. These papers are summarized on the website of theoretical physicist Dr. Ed Berry, who asserts that **human CO₂ emissions do not control the overall CO₂ level.**

So, even the weak claim by the cultists that increased human CO₂ emissions correlate with increased temperature change can't be true.

Consensus Is Not Science

It doesn't matter how many scientists say they believe in the AGW theory if the theory is wrong. Never mind the supposed consensus of scientists and supposedly overwhelming number of peer-reviewed papers the adherents claim show support for the theory. That consensus has been debunked innumerable times over

the years. One new paper, peer-reviewed and published in November 2023, demonstrates that two-thirds of all scientific papers can be said to reject the theory of AGW. And, after all, consensus is not science. Appeal to a consensus is the equivalent to appealing to authority, never mind *argumentum ad populum*: “It must be true because many believe it to be true.”

Albert Einstein famously noted, in retort to the book, *One Hundred Authors Against Einstein*, to defeat his theory of relativity, “one did not need the word of 100 scientists, just one fact.”

Judith Curry recently sat down for an interview with John Stossel, who asked her about the supposed consensus among climate scientists. She said the “climate change industry” rewards alarmism and discourages alternate views. “The origins go back to the UN environmental program,” Curry said. “Some U.N. officials were motivated by anti-capitalism.” She added (emphasis mine):

“**They hated the oil companies and seized on the climate change issue to move their policies along. The IPCC wasn’t supposed to focus on any benefits of warming. The IPCC’s mandate was to look for dangerous human-caused climate change. Then, the national funding agencies directed all the funding . . . assuming there are dangerous impacts. The researchers quickly figured out that the way to get funded was to make alarmist claims about man-made climate change.**”

So, even if a consensus existed, it would only be due to financial motivations and professional survival.

Worse for the warmers, the authorities to which the alarmists appeal have increasingly been saying there is no global warming. For instance, Norway’s government issued a scathing report in September 2023 in which their top scientists state it definitively: “Using theoretical arguments and statistical tests we find that the effect of man-made CO₂ emissions does not appear to be strong enough to cause systematic changes in the temperature fluctuations during the last 200 years.”

They further state, “Even if recent recorded temperature variations should turn out to deviate from previous variation patterns in a systematic way it is still a difficult challenge to establish how much of this change is due to increasing man-made emissions of carbon dioxide (CO₂) and other greenhouse gases.”

One final point. The ability of CO₂ to cause warming logarithmically decreases as concentrations increase. That’s because infrared radiation reaches an absorption saturation level around 400 ppm. Bottom line: even if CO₂ caused warming, it is not at all clear that increased CO₂ saturation would lead to increased warming of any consequence.

For those with eyes to see and ears to hear, the theory of AGW is on life-support.

Carbon Dioxide Is Not A Pollutant

The Cult of Climate Change has decided the only way to convince the public of the urgency of the problem is to reclassify CO₂ as a pollutant. This flies in the face of the basic science even the worst of students learn in elementary school. Humans are carbon-based life forms. Carbon is the basis of all life on Planet Earth. It exists all around us, naturally, in every ecosystem and every geological formation. This biology unit from the Khan Academy teaches students how important carbon is for life on Earth:

“**As a brief overview, carbon exists in the air largely as carbon dioxide—CO₂—gas, which dissolves in water and reacts with water molecules to produce bicarbonate—HCO₃. Photosynthesis by land plants, bacteria, and algae converts carbon dioxide or bicarbonate into organic molecules. Organic molecules made by photosynthesizers are passed through food chains, and cellular respiration converts the organic carbon back into carbon dioxide gas.**”

CO₂ is plant food. Many scientists note that a warming climate, with more atmospheric CO₂, would produce a world in which fewer organisms (including humans) died of cold, and would lead to more productive agriculture to produce more food for more humans.

This should really go without saying, but climate cultists have forced us to state the obvious.

“Green Energy” Cannot Replace Traditional Energy Sources

The Biden administration has jumped into the deep end of so-called green energy, declaring its full dedication to abandoning “dirty” fossil fuels altogether in favor of throwing hundreds of billions of dollars into wind, solar, hydrogen, and lithium battery technology. They don’t even want to contemplate expanding nuclear energy, and have taken an active role in removing hydroelectric dams in western states that have relied on them for cheap energy over the past century.

The problem with wind and solar should be obvious even to the cultists: the wind isn’t always blowing and the sun isn’t always shining.

Every alternative form of energy either requires batteries of sufficient storage to power the grid when power can’t be generated, or it requires a traditional power source as backup. Unfortunately, we’ve decided not to rely on natural gas, coal, and oil as a backstop when the grid needs more power. America could meet its electrical demand with nuclear power, but because of the anti-nuke protests of the 1970s the people and their governments have irrationally shied away from that source of (carbon-free) power.

With current technology, we simply cannot create a reliable electrical grid with renewables. Any reliance on wind and solar would require us to go backwards as a species, reversing over a hundred years of technological and economic progress that has lifted billions of humans out of poverty across the globe.

It should also be obvious that electric vehicles (EVs) cannot outcompete the ever-more efficient and clean internal combustion engine, run either by gasoline or by diesel fuel. Electric vehicles have been around longer than horseless carriages. The first were invented in the early 1800s, and commercially available electric cars started appearing in the 1890s. They simply couldn’t compete with vehicles powered by hydrocarbons in terms of range, speed, and reliability. More than a century later, they still can’t.

EVs run on batteries. It takes an electrical connection to charge those batteries. A recent study showed that “fueling up” an EV costs at least four times as much

as an internal combustion vehicle—the equivalent of \$17.33 per gallon!

The batteries for these EVs also weigh hundreds of pounds, up to 1,100 pounds for an SUV model. Building just the batteries emits 74 percent more CO₂ than building a whole internal combustion engine car. The batteries also require rare-earth materials. Those markets are dominated by countries like China and the Democratic Republic of Congo which have poor environmental protection laws and rely on slave labor—in the Congo’s case, child slave labor.

The Biden administration has thrown billions of dollars into “clean hydrogen hubs” to develop hydrogen as an energy source. As Restoration News has previously reported, “the technology to efficiently store and cleanly burn hydrogen gas doesn’t currently exist, while attempts to harness hydrogen as a zero-emission fuel have failed for decades.” Another green energy pipe dream.

Given the hoax of carbon dioxide as a pollutant, the myth of global warming, the lies told by governments about their policies, the failure of green energy technology, and the benefits of a warmer world with more carbon, a “whole of government” approach to decarbonization makes no sense and will likely lead to much more harm than good done in the misguided pursuit of green policies.

The Media Atmosphere That Allows Climate Hysteria To Thrive

Such climate hysteria and junk science shouldn’t thrive. Voters and consumers of the news should see such obvious manipulations and know they don’t add up. And yet these terrible ideas dominate our public policy and our body politic. In fact, they’ve grown out of control, increasing in frequency and intensity in recent years. They need another element to propagate and grow to the extent they have.

That element is Big Journalism.

The corporate media complex has jumped all in on “centering” climate in everything it reports. It doesn’t matter which subject—immigration, business, sports, economics, local politics, or anything else—increasingly they have a mandate to manufacture a climate connection. These efforts are more and more driven and funded by radical nonprofits. Those nonprofits are

themselves often funded by politicized foundations and corporations whose boards have been commandeered by activist directors more dedicated to DEI and ESG than sound economic decisions.

Many nonprofits, like ProPublica, produce partisan investigative reports and peddle it as “news” to local outlets, most of which have cut way back on investigative journalism in recent decades. Many others have made donations to for-profit news companies to fund environmental reporters in newsrooms across the country. Several run seminars, training programs, and even college degree tracks on how to report on the environment and connect every story to climate change.

In such a radicalized atmosphere, presenting dissent or debate about climate science has completely vanished. It used to be that an occasional climate skeptic could get on TV or into the local paper’s op-ed pages. That simply won’t do in an environment in which dissent can no longer even be acknowledged. Rather than skeptics merely being labeled as “climate deniers,” increasingly they get no access at all. Honest debate has disappeared.

What a Sensible Environmental and Energy Policy *Actually* Looks Like

The more governments try to shift free markets toward a command economy to force their green energy revolution, the more money and natural resources they waste on concepts destined for failure. A sensible approach to energy and the environment would lead with lower costs for all consumers, which would lift more humans across the globe out of poverty. Study after study has proven that as more humans are able to build more wealth and lift themselves above the poverty line, the more they care for their land and environment.

Whether or not carbon emission reduction remains a viable and desirable goal, we can and must do significantly better in our public policies. A sensible energy policy would incorporate the following goals:

1. Despite the warnings of doomsayers and peak oil acolytes, we have enough petroleum and natural gas in the U.S. to become completely energy-independent, even before considering the use of nuclear-generated electricity. Even under the Biden administration, the

country produced a record amount of oil in 2023 and is exporting it all over the world. New technologies have further minimized the environmental impact of resource extraction.

2. Expand our already extensive network of pipelines. Regardless of energy goals, our present economy requires the transportation of oil and gas across the country and overseas via ports. Pipelines have a far safer and cleaner record than train or truck transportation and are much more energy-efficient.
3. Follow the example of France by expanding our use of nuclear power. France has successfully employed nuclear for approximately 70 percent of all the power it produces, without a major accident in decades. This would obviously lead to serious reductions in carbon emissions while reliably powering the next phase of human advancement. We should invest in technologies to recycle spent fuel, reusing it instead of disposing of it wherever possible.
4. Onshore manufacturing to shorten supply chains, reduce our carbon footprint, and reduce our reliance on countries who don’t have our best interests in mind, while diversifying our ability to make things in the U.S. again. Domestic manufacturing would significantly reduce environmental harms over relying on regimes that don’t have similar ecological goals as us. We do our economy and the world no favors by sending our “dirty” industries to other countries like China, thereby pretending we’ve cut pollution by sending it overseas.



Nuclear power plant, Saint Laurent des Eaux, France

5. Stop listening to the population reductionists. Paul Ehrlich wrote *The Population Bomb* more than 50 years ago, yet news programs still trot him out from time to time to talk about the perils of overpopulation. He based his work on the debunked work of the 18th century scholar Thomas Malthus, whose own predicted doomsday never came true. 95 percent of the world's population lives on just ten percent of the land. The entire human population could fit in the city of Los Angeles with about a meter and a half between us. The Earth is NOT overcrowded. We have no environmental or limited resource need to stop using the land to produce our food and our resources.
6. Producing high quality, nutritious meat and produce with America's agricultural might will increase our ability to feed the world's people. The notion that livestock produce an unnatural amount of CO₂ and methane flies in the face of known natural emissions from megafauna throughout geological history. The notion that we should not fertilize our crops and maximize agricultural yields, because it produces "nitrogen pollution," has no basis in fact or science. The land owners, farmers, ranchers, and producers care for the land they work, and produce a cleaner environment than what previously existed. We should support and encourage free markets in which they can thrive, with a minimum of government intervention.

A sensible energy and environment policy would really be quite simple, if we simply stopped listening to the lies that make up the Cult of Climate Change and did the things that make basic sense for all humanity, instead of enriching the elites and ceding ever more power to totalitarian governments.

Jeff Reynolds
Senior Investigative Researcher
jr@restorationpac.com

Restoration of America
restorationofamerica.com

