

Editorial

Global warming: a hot potato

A week after the "Blizzard of '96," residents on the East Coast of the United States were still digging out from the massive snowfall. But they got even more of a shock when they read an article in the Jan. 14 *New York Times*, entitled "Blame Global Warming for the Blizzard." A bit of warm weather would not have been unwelcome!

We can expect next, that the *Times* will be trying to sell us the Brooklyn Bridge. The author of this ludicrous article was obviously a bit embarrassed himself, because he began his Greenie propaganda piece: "It seems a paradox at first glance: How could a record snowstorm have covered much of the northeastern United States last week when the climate of the earth is warming?" There was also a similarly anomalous snowstorm in Bosnia, as the author admitted.

The answer given is that "a warming atmosphere causes more evaporation of water from the ocean, which means more rain, snow or sleet." This denies the actual genesis of the recent storm pattern, which had to do with the placement of the jet stream, causing an unusual circulation pattern of high- and low-pressure air masses. This brought frigid air masses unusually far south at the same time that warm and moist air masses were travelling in a northerly direction.

The article in the *Times* is merely an example of the continuing barrage of propaganda put out to justify the myth that extreme measures must be taken to curtail the emission of pollutants into the atmosphere. Supposedly we run the risk, sometime in the future, of a runaway greenhouse effect, in which the Sun's warmth is trapped in the environs of the earth.

The *Times* has published a number of articles recently which have attempted to keep the "global warming" hoax alive, including one on a recent weather study to the effect that there was an increase in the world's temperature globally last year. What the articles do not mention, is that there were actually three such studies conducted. Two of them, using satellite data, showed that there was a cooling in 1995; the third, chosen by the *Times* to make its case, eliminated data from December

1995 from its analysis.

The data cited in the third study are not only inconclusive, because they covered only 11 months of the year, but the amount of warming which was predicted for a 10-year period was *less than one-tenth of a degree* centigrade. This is well within bounds of error to be expected in such a model.

This contention is especially absurd when we consider that the scenario for an alleged greenhouse effect, calls for an increase in temperature over *50 to 100 years*, of somewhere around 5°C (9° Fahrenheit).

In truth, we do run a risk: the risk of encumbering economies, worldwide, which are already staggering from the ongoing depression, with the burden of investing in unproductive measures for what is marketed as "environmental protection." The environmentalist movement is promoting superstition in the place of science.

The myth of global warming, the so-called growth of the ozone hole, the purported dangers of nuclear energy—these are not merely mass delusions. Nor are they simply the product of ignorance. They are deliberate attempts to brainwash the populations of nations everywhere, into allowing the destruction of national economies, which, in turn, is a necessary prerequisite to destroying the very existence of nation-states.

As we have documented, this assault on the nation-state is the deliberate policy of Britain's House of Windsor. By publishing such a ridiculous article, which tries to make the case that the recent blizzard was caused by *global warming*, the *New York Times* has once again shown its subservience to the British crown.

The greenhouse warming phenomenon is a chime-ra, concocted for political purposes. And the scientists who support the hypothesis, and the journalists who write about it, have the dismal task of trying to foist off a seemingly credible rationale for the dishonest claim that mankind is destroying the biosphere. It is just one instance of the use of pseudoscience to brainwash the gullible.