

The Man-Made Global Warming Hoax



Introduction

You are being lied to. Over and over, a doomsday picture of imminent disaster is being conveyed via every medium possible with the explicit purpose of controlling one thing: energy. If you can control the production and distribution of energy, you control everything.

Today numerous entities are seeking to “control everything”. Several events have led to this, with the first being the real threat we experienced on 9/11. That event and the justifiable fear it created resulted in the Patriot Act—a measure by which spying on our own citizenry became an accepted reality. We still suffer from this today.

The second blast in the face on the march towards others gaining total control was the COVID Pandemic. During COVID, measures to monitor and control your movements and activities were justified as necessary to keep us all “safe.”

Then came the sustained effort by the left to assume control of all your comings and goings by screaming as loud as possible that the world is coming to an end because of **man-made climate change**. Everything you do must stop and you must surrender completely to the Great Reset if we are to stop the world from coming to an end in just a few short years. Don't worry about it—Klaus Schwab and the boys are the masterminds who will ensure the world is saved...from *you*.

Despite the propaganda behind this movement, it is important to realize that, **no**, the science isn't “settled,” there is no “scientific consensus,” storms are not/not getting worse, CO2 is not ‘destroying life,’ and apocalyptic predictions about the pending end of the world have, as usual, been notoriously wrong.


Like many things today, climate demagoguing is about **power, money, and control**. If there is one thing the world hates, it is the freedom of the American citizen. That is why the left and the **Demomarxists** seek to take away every right to pursue life, liberty, and happiness. If there isn't an emergency immediately present for them to use to seize power, they will create one. Viola! Man-Made Global Warming—caused specifically by you stinky Americans and your big cars. Bottom line: the notion of man-made global warming is a scam, and a profitable, powerful one at that.

“The whole aim of practical politics is to keep the populace alarmed—and hence clamorous to be led to safety—by menacing it with an endless series of hobgoblins, all of them imaginary.” – L. Mencken

The Hobgoblin Nonsense Surrounding CO2

You need to hold your breath because if you keep exhaling carbon dioxide we are all going to die. Well...perhaps not.

- Past and modern climate change is driven by solar cycle variations and their affect on ocean circulation and heat transport.¹
- Throughout the last hundreds of thousands of years, temperature changes *precede* the lagging changes in CO₂.²
- The United Nations (UN) Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) position that atmospheric CO₂ is the cause of the warming since the onset of the Industrial Revolution is only an assumption and is “not consistent with studies involving changes in temperature in rural areas of the northern hemisphere.”³
- In fact, to get more funding, the IPCC uses models that exaggerate warming, on average, *two and a half times* the actual temperature. (The red line in the chart shows the average of 102 climate model runs completed by a team at the University of Alabama at Huntsville using the models on which the IPCC itself relies. The other lines show the actual, observed temperatures.)⁴




¹ Stuart Harris, MDPI Journal *Atmosphere*, 2 October 2023

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ J.R. Christy, R.T. McNider, *Satellite Bulk Tropospheric Temperatures as a Metric for Climate Sensitivity*, *Asia-Pacific J Atmos Sci* 53, 511-518 (2017), <https://doi.org/10.1007>

- CO₂ is essential for life on earth, and a reduction in CO₂ would be harmful to the biosphere. There “seems to be no connection between carbon dioxide and the temperature of the earth.”⁵
- There is a marked difference between the warming of cities by the *heat island* effect and the rural areas of the northern hemisphere, which have not shown marked warming during the last 10 years.⁶
- The famous ‘hockey stick’ graph pushed by obscure researchers such as Michael Mann and subsequently used by Al Gore (a climate change baron now worth more than 300 million dollars who buys carbon offsets so he can continue to live in luxury) and the IPCC has been reputed by Professor Easterbrook who has stated, “Global warming ended in 1998. There has been no global warming in 15 years.” He goes on to state, “The Antarctic ice sheet is not melting, the main ice sheet is in fact growing,” and “CO₂ cannot possibly cause global warming;” and “We’re in for about 25 - 30 years of global cooling.”⁷
- Our current geologic period has the lowest average CO₂ levels in the last 600 million years.⁸




⁵ Stuart Harris, MDPI Journal *Atmosphere*, 2 October 2023

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ Don Easterbrook, Professor Emeritus of Glacial Geology and Environmental and Engineering Geology, Western Washington University.

⁸ Gregory Wrightstone, Bachelor of Science Waynesburg College and MS West Virginia University.

- There are three elements that make up our atmosphere: Nitrogen - 78%, Oxygen - 21%, and Argon - .9%. These make up 99%, so all the other gasses like CO₂, water vapor, and methane constitute the remaining **.1%**! As four-hundredths of one percent, CO₂ is insignificant (except for plant life). Of this tiny amount of CO₂, **96.8%** occurs in our atmosphere *naturally*. **Human caused CO₂ is only 1.28/1000th of one percent of the earth's atmosphere!** Water vapor is 70 times more effective as a 'greenhouse gas' than CO₂, but there's nobody to *tax* for emitting steam into the air; thus there is no commentary. Are we supposed to destroy our way of life, economies, and live in 15 minute city-prisons for 1.28/1000th of our contribution to 'man-made global warming'?⁹ Those seeking power and political gain say yes.
- While temperatures have gone up and down over hundreds of thousands of years, CO₂ has had nothing to do with it. Melting glaciers and rising sea levels result from warming, but the evidence shows that this warming and the retreat of the glaciers began long before any significant man-made CO₂ increase could have influenced either. Both are directly the result of natural warming that began in the late 17th Century.¹⁰



⁹ Chet Nagle, Canada Free Press, *Climate Change Lies*, 3 October 2023

¹⁰ J. Oerlemans, *Extracting a Climate Signal from 169 Glacier Records*, Science 29 April 2005: Vol. 308, Issue 5722, pp. 675-677 DOI: 10.1126/science.1107046

-
- The CO2 climate change hoax has a strong money motivation. There are two ways to put a price on CO2 emissions. The first is to **tax** companies for the amount of CO2 they emit. The second way is to **establish a CO2 emission-trading system**; a market in which a CO2-emitting company can buy carbon credits to offset their emissions and then continue to emit.¹¹ Didn't someone once say, "Follow the money"?

Bottom line: The extremely small, almost trace amounts of CO2 in the air are not/not causing global warming. Secondly, of that trace amount, very little is caused by man and an even smaller amount is caused by the United States—by **you**. It should strike you as odd that the Paris Accords hammer the modern western governments while leaving India and China out altogether. This is not a problem in search of a solution; this is a crippling handicap looking for a victim upon which to land. And that victim is **you**.

The Planet is Melting Like Never Before and We're All Going to Die


It is well known that the UN's IPCC exists to extract as much money from the industrialized nations as possible (along with passing resolutions condemning Israel). Fear is an essential ingredient of that process. If certain groups are not given extreme and dictatorial powers—as well as access to treasuries and your bank account—we are all going to broil like lobsters in a pot. And make sure we scare the beJesus out of your kids in school, too, for they can all become little UN man-made global warming Nazis and turn you in for having a gas stove or for barbequing perhaps one too many times this summer.

Well, the planet is not melting. Likewise, we as humans have always adjusted to changes quite successfully. Turns out we're not that easy to kill. One thing is certain; stick around, the weather is going to change.


- Temperature has changed dramatically on the earth over the last 10,000 years, which includes those periods long before you had a diesel truck, a barbeque grill, or a gas stove. We are in fact now in one of the cooler periods.¹²

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² Alley, R.B. (2004) *GISP2 Ice Core Temperature and Accumulation Data*, IGBP PAGES/World Data Center for Paleoclimatology Data Contribution Series #2004-013. NOAA/NGDC Paleoclimatology Program, Boulder Colorado. Box J.E., Yang L, Brownwich DH, Bai L (2009) *Greenland Ice Sheet Surface Air Temperature Variability: 1840-2007*. American Meteorological Society, Journal of Climate Vol 22, pp 4029 - 4049.




- Research shows that in Greenland during the Eemian interglacial warm period between 130,000 and 115,000 years ago, the conditions there were much, much warmer than previously thought. In fact, it was 8-degrees Celsius (14.4 degrees



Fahrenheit) warmer than today. Even though the temperatures there were 2.5 degrees Celsius higher than even the most aggressive (and as shown above, wildly inaccurate) IPCC predictions, the Greenland ice sheet lost only a quarter of its mass.

Polar bears evolved about 150,000 years ago and survived the Eemian warm period even though there was seldom any polar ice.¹³

- Promoters of man-made climate alarmism-for-power schemes state that our current temperature is “unprecedented” on a scale of thousands of years. That is a lie. The chart below by Moberg is a multi-proxy paleo temperature reconstruction of the last 2000 years using both high and low resolution data. The **Medieval Warm Period** was the most recent warming period and had warmer temperatures than today. This warming was driven by natural forces and **occurred in a period of very low carbon dioxide concentrations**.¹⁴




- The figure below shows that the Earth is now in one of the coldest periods in its history. No geological period has been as cold as our current geologic period for the last 250 million years. Temperature variations of more than 10 degrees C (18 degrees F) have been common. Viewed in the context of millions of years, our recent increase of .8 degrees C (1.4F) appears miniscule—barely a pin prick or

¹³ Dahl-Jensen, Niels Bohr Institute,

<http://www.nbi.ku.dk/english/news/news13/greenland-ice-cores-reveals-warm-climate-of-the-past>

¹⁴ Moberg A, Sonechkin DM, Holmgren K, Datsenko NM, Karlen W, Lauritzen SE (2005) *Highly Variable Northern Hemisphere Temperatures Reconstructed From Low and High-resolution Proxy Data*. *Nature*, 433(7026): 613-617.

rounding error on the overall chart.¹⁵



Bottom Line: On hot days, it gets hot. Sometimes there's drought. Sometimes, in the winter, it gets really, really cold. None of this is new. Propagandists screaming the sky is melting are showing you data from a very narrowly defined time period, and they do so to drive you towards an action (and expenditure) they favor.

Notice how the discussion always centers on **how bad** things may soon be. **Are there benefits to a warming period?** Perhaps we may have longer growing seasons; perhaps we may have more lands we can use. Perhaps an increase in CO₂ will fuel greater plant growth—something that has already happened with regard to forestation. There is no discussion of potential benefits; only discussions on how much of *your* freedom must be surrendered to the masterminds to avoid impending doom, and any scientist that dares question the negative narrative or whether man really has anything to do with this is shouted down, may lose a grant, and may be shunned by his colleagues. For the left, climate change is only bad—end of story. Even discussing it outside the already decided narrative could cost you your job. For some scientists, it already has.

¹⁵ Scotese C.R. (2002), *Analysis of the Temperature Oscillations in Geological Eras*, Poleo-Map Project.

The Lies Surrounding the Myth of a “Scientific Consensus”

It is easy for the scientific community to bamboozle the common citizen when it comes to throwing scientific terms around. Less so for those of us who are science majors with advanced degrees. Let us first start with the idea of a ‘scientific consensus’.

A political consensus, a general consensus, or a consensus amongst friends are all radically different from a **‘scientific consensus’**. Most non-scientific types apply the first three types of consensus to the fourth, and that is wrong. However, those with a preconceived agenda use the confusion to their advantage.

For the first three, our vote and our opinions matter in determining the consensus. If we agree by a certain majority, we state we have reached a consensus. We, or at least most of us, think a certain way, and often that political or casual consensus decides the way forward.

That is **not/not** a scientific consensus.

In science, if I put forth a theorem or axiom on how a body moves in space, for example, and all my equations not only describe that movement but allow me to make repeatable, accurate predictions, and none of those of my scientific buddies comes even close to describing the phenomena as well as mine, then everyone will start using my theory. Why? Because mine **best** describes the observed phenomena. A **scientific consensus** has formed because my theory is best; my axioms are best, but once a different scientist comes up with a better theory or axiom that does all of what mine does but even better and perhaps makes better predictions, the **scientific consensus** changes. It doesn’t matter one whit how many votes I get to preserve mine or how many people support me because they like me. That’s **not** how a scientific consensus works. Popularity means nothing. **The only thing that counts is the model that best describes what is being observed.** And, of course, all theories must/must be subjected to much skepticism, peer review, testing, modeling, and must achieve a series of successful predictions.

What we have in the climate world is a stack of lies regarding consensus; the application of the political to the scientific world. It is the use of the language of the uniformed to push an agenda. This has been borne out by research into what the Climate Nazis are claiming is

an all-powerful consensus around their version of man-made global warming. They are lying.

The primary paper asserting the **97% consensus** (and there's no 'consensus' without the 'con' when it comes to man-made global warming) was written by John Cook who claimed that "human activity is very likely causing most of the current GW [global warming] or anthropogenic global working [AGW]."¹⁶ His crew looked at 11,944 peer-reviewed papers published over 21 years. He concluded the 97% number from that review.

- As Gregory Wrightstone of Waynesburg College pointed out, Cook's paper **falsely** asserts that 97% of the papers the reviewers examined **had explicitly endorsed the opinion that humans are causing the majority of global warming.**¹⁷
- When looking at the data, we find that 7,930 of the papers (out of 11,944) **took no position at all** on the subject and were arbitrarily **excluded from the count** on this ground. Adding these back into the total papers reviewed in the 97% count, the actual claim falls to **32.6%**!¹⁸
 - I find this to be not an error, but a **willful reprehensible action** by someone who should know better. One finds, however, that this is standard operating procedure amongst the man-made-global-warming-for-power schemers.
- S. Fred Singer, a leading scientific skeptic of AGW is an atmospheric physicist and founder of the Science and Environmental Policy Project (SEPP). SEPP established the Leipzig Declaration, a statement of dissent from the 1997 Kyoto Protocol, that has been *signed by over one hundred scientists and meteorologists.*¹⁹
 - Singer established the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change, which "in 2009 published *Climate Change Reconsidered*, an 880-page report on scientific research that contradicts the models of man-made global warming."²⁰

¹⁶ Nichols, *Failure of Climate Change*,
https://kstatelibraries.pressbooks.pub/unmanned5/chapter/failure-of-climate-change/#_edn7

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ "Estimated 40 Percent of Scientists Doubt Manmade Global Warming," *National Association of Scholars, Press Release*, January 3, 2022,
https://www.nas.org/articles/Estimated_40_Percent_of_Scientists_Doubt_Manmade_Global_Warming
(March 17, 2019).

²⁰ *Ibid.*

-
- Patrick Michaels, formerly professor at the University of Virginia and currently director of the Center for the Study of Science at the Cato Institute, explains “that climate models have done remarkably *poorly* in replicating the evolution of global temperature during the past several decades, and that high-end climate horror stories emanating from these lousy models are largely unsupported by observations.”²¹
 - Richard S. Lindzen is a distinguished senior fellow at Cato’s Center for the Study of Science, emeritus professor of meteorology at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), and previously professor of dynamic meteorology at Harvard University. He received the Jule G. Charne Award for “highly significant research” in atmospheric sciences. His atmospheric dynamics research led to his conclusion that the sensitivity of surface temperature to increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide is considerably below that necessary to generate disastrous climate change²².
 - Patrick Moore was a **co-founder of Greenpeace** and is a Canadian ecologist. He testified before the United States Senate that “there is ‘little correlation’ to support a ‘direct causal relationship’ between CO2 emissions and rising global temperatures. There is no scientific proof that human emissions of carbon dioxide are the dominant cause of the minor warming of the Earth’s atmosphere over the past 100 years.” He also criticized the UN’s IPCC for claiming ‘it is extremely likely’ that human activity is the ‘dominant cause’ for global warming, noting that ‘extremely likely’ is not a scientific term. He warned that the statistics presented by the IPCC are not the result of mathematical calculations or statistical analysis, and may have been ‘invented’ to support the IPCC’s ‘expert judgment’.”²³
 - On 1 October 2019, a group of 500 prominent scientists and professionals sent a registered letter to the UN Secretary-General stating that there is no climate emergency and climate policies should be designed to benefit the lives of people. They stated, “...it is cruel as well as imprudent to advocate the squandering of

²¹ Michaels P. *Global Warming Scientists Scrap Real Science, Bow Before President Obama Instead*,” Forbes, 27 March 2014, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/patrickmichaels/2014/03/27/global-warming-scientists-scrap-real-science-bow-before-president-obama-instead/#59cf119f6d0e> (17 March 2019)

²² Lindzen R, biography, Cato Institute, <https://www.cato.org/people/richard-lindzen> (17 March 2019)

²³ Tadeo M. *Greenpeace Co-founder Patrick Moore Tells U.S. Senate There Is ‘No Proof’ Humans Cause Climate Change*, Independent, 28 February 2014, <https://www.independent.co.uk/environment/climate-change/greenpeace-co-founder-patrick-moore-tells-us-senate-there-is-no-proof-humans-cause-climate-change-9159627.html> (17 March 2019)

trillions of dollars on the basis of results from such immature models [referencing general-circulation models they deem ‘unfit for their purpose’.]” The list of scientists is available from their press release.²⁴

I could go on and on and on and on with the names of many reputable scientists that simply do not believe there is any kind of respectable *scientific consensus* on man-made climate change. Most of them will not get media attention or press, and many have been cowed into silence. The reality today is that even the scientific community cannot have a balanced discussion on the topic lest someone in disagreement be labeled a heretic. The powers that be have decided it will be their way or the highway.

Climate and Earth Worship as a New Religion

When you stand up confidently to the hoax of man-made global warming, do not expect to be greeted cheerfully. ‘Climate Change’ has become its own *religion*, and it has particularly affected the young who are desperately searching for meaning and are not anxious to find it in traditional Judeau-Christian spiritualism. Tell them to first master themselves and their relationship with God and they turn away. Tell them they’re on a mission to “save the planet by all means necessary,” and suddenly you have a fanatic on your hands. Gathering their torches and pitchforks, they’re ready to hunt down and destroy the heretics, and that’s anyone who dares oppose what they’ve been told is an existential threat to mankind. Through these means, climate advocacy has become a *cult* and a very dangerous one at that. In the coming years, all sorts of tyrannical measures will be justified in the name of ‘saving the planet’, and they will all be carved out of your liberty, your freedom, and your wallet.

Somewhere in my archives I have a paper written by a scientist at the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). He had put together research that showed sun activity mated to the Pacific Decadal Oscillation (PDO) *better* described observations of climate variation over many centuries. He wasn’t trying to force his views on the EPA, but rather was suggesting, as a scientist is supposed to, that perhaps the agency should expand its research and explore other possibilities when researching climate deviations. After all, his model *better*

²⁴ Perry M.J. *There is No Climate Emergency, Say 500 Experts in Letter to the United Nations*, <https://www.aei.org/carpe-diem/there-is-no-climate-emergency-say-500-experts-in-letter-to-the-unit-ed-nations/> (1 October 2019)

described what their data was showing and was thus a prime example of what a real **scientific consensus** is supposed to be. If others have a better one, then their's would constitute the consensus. But they didn't. Instead the EPA had long ago decided that it was CO2 and fossil fuels that were to blame, and that was that. For his troubles in suggesting that perhaps they should examine other models for accuracy, he was **fired**.

This is the kind of fanaticism we are up against, and you see it at work every day in the news all over the Western world. The hoax of man-made global warming will be used to put you in a box where you will be monitored 24 hours a day. Don't give in to it. Don't take it lying down. Don't smile back at an enemy that is seeking to imprison you. Instead, stand tall and refute their ridiculous claims and assertions. Remember always that it is their side that is seeking to radically alter *your* life based on a concept around which there is absolutely no consensus—scientific or otherwise. Instead there is an ongoing fight that quit being a sensible debate because their side has decided they've won by *decree*.

Well screw that.

We haven't even had a serious discussion as to whether the warming they errantly say is going to occur is an automatic disaster. They don't want to have that discussion because *what if it isn't?* That would wreck their whole plan...which it wouldn't if their motives were pure. But they aren't. If their motives were pure they'd wrap their loving arms around nuclear power—the absolute greatest and cleanest source of abundant energy for all. We have over half-a-century of experience successfully operating nuclear reactors, but the 'man-made global warming' crowd isn't clamoring for more clean nuclear power are they? No. They want that shut down as well. Does that make any sense? The premature and thoughtless shutdown of nuclear reactors in Germany has forced them to start reopening and using their coal-fired plants!²⁵

The lack of interest in the wise use of nuclear power to protect the environment was a significant factor in leading Michael Shellenberger, author of *"Apocalypse Never: Why Environmental Alarmism Hurts Us All"* away from following the leaders of the cult of man-made global warming. Alarmism coupled with the lack of any real effort to look at

²⁵ Schmitz R. "Amid an Energy Crisis, Germany Turns to the World's Dirtiest Fossil Fuel," All Things Considered, <https://www.npr.org/2022/09/27/1124448463/germany-coal-energy-crisis> (27 September 2022)

obvious solutions that would make everyone's lives better added to what he already knew to be true; that carbon emissions peaked and have been declining in most developed nations for over a decade; that deaths from extreme weather, even in poor nations, **declined 80%** over the last four decades; that the risk of Earth warming to very high temperatures is increasingly unlikely due to slowing population growth and abundant natural gas. The Earth is actually getting better—not catastrophically worse, and the rich and industrialized nations are leading the way.

This realization, of course, has put a big target on his back. Heretic.

Summation

The weather changes over thousands of years. Man and life on planet Earth adjust accordingly. Inventions we can't even imagine will take place between now and the end of this century. We won't be sitting still waiting to sweat to death due to global warming or freeze due global cooling. Come what may, we will adjust.

What is important now is to continue to stand up for what our forefathers created; a country whose government's *primary duty* is to protect the life, liberty, and **individual freedom** of each soul who justly constitutes the citizenry of these United States. We cannot allow our freedoms to be tossed away willy-nilly because of fear mongering by climate hoaxers and alarmists promising you "safety" if only you do not oppose their agenda. After all, they will say, they're only doing it for your own good—for your "safety".

Stand tall; fight back; and don't apologize for being strong willed in this matter. If they really had a decent argument, they wouldn't work so hard to win by decree.