

Global warming hoax takes its last gasp

by Rogelio A. Maduro

Over the past few months, the public has been subjected to a barrage of propaganda promoting the global warming theory. In the first two weeks of 1996, stories proliferated about how 1995 was the warmest year on record, while in the last two weeks of January, the same news outlets reported that the record snowfall and cold temperatures in many parts of the world, were proof of global warming. In fact, the propaganda shoveled through the *New York Times*, *Newsweek*, and other establishment outlets is the dying gasp of the global warming theory, one of the greatest scientific frauds ever concocted.

The *New York Times*'s front-page story of Jan. 4 shows how these scientific frauds are committed. The story, by William K. Stevens, promoted a sensational claim by the British Meteorological Office and the University of East Anglia, that 1995 was the warmest year on record. This was meant to provide support for the global warming theory. It turns out that the British Meteorological Office's claim was based on only 11 months of data. The British "scientists" actually manufactured the December data out of thin air.

At the time that the *New York Times* story was published, the British report was contradicted by highly accurate satellite data that show an actual cooling. The satellite data, as well as ground-based data, show that December had the largest recorded temperature drop in 10 years, 1.3° Fahrenheit.

This revelation is in many respects a positive event, because the general public has, for the first time, a slightly open door through which to see how the global warming and other hoaxes have been concocted. Real atmospheric scientists are taking the opportunity to expose these hoaxes. Dr. S. Fred Singer of George Mason University, for example, wrote the following letter to the *New York Times*:

"What would motivate [the British researchers] to issue a premature, incomplete, and quite misleading report? Two possible explanations: 1) They knew in advance that December 1995 was going to be awfully cold and wanted to beat the clock with a hot news story. 2) They wanted to give a boost to the just completed report of the U.N.-sponsored Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), prepared under the direction of the director of the British Met

Office. It predicts a major warming trend—albeit much less than what IPCC predicted only three short years ago when statesmen, including George Bush, were induced to sign a Global Climate Treaty at the Rio 'Earth Summit.'

"And what about the 'global warming trend'; is it really there? Unfortunately for the climate models, the IPCC, the British Met Office, and the *New York Times* story—the answer seems to be: NO. The best global data we have, come from satellites [which give] the global trend as $-0.05^{\circ}\text{C}/\text{decade}$. That's a cooling, not a warming!"

Mysticism and Druids

The Western Fuels Association went a step beyond Singer's denunciation and called the environmentalists "Druids," who are engaged in committing "scientific fraud" to promote their global warming theory, in a press release dated Feb. 15. Western Fuels, a cooperative of several coal producers and electric utilities that burn coal fuel in the West, has been taking the lead in funding the publication of research by scientists opposing the global warming theory. They have come under intense attack for this, both from the news media and other electric power utilities.

The Western Fuels press release starts with an attack on the British Meteorological Office and the University of East Anglia for releasing data that figured prominently in William K. Stevens's *New York Times* article, "to the effect that 1995 was the hottest year on record, thus supporting the new vision of apocalypse." The press release notes that the data were completely wrong, and that "scientists who subsequently contacted East Anglia for the data on which the story relies have been rebuffed." The release warns that one can "expect the University of East Anglia, Steven Schneider, and the professional environmental community to continue to make unsupported scientific claims."

The reason for this, is that "today's environmental community is like the ancient Druids. Environmentalists, like their druidic predecessors, hold a worldview based on mysticism. . . ." The "environmental community, with support from many in the media, is perpetrating scientific fraud on the American people in the continuing push of their vision of apocalyptic global warming."

Western Fuels announced that they will publish a new *State of the Climate* report on April 22, to expose "this ongoing fraud, in an effort to inject rational science into the policy debates that swirl around energy and electricity utilization in the United States and the world community." The report "will detail trends in global and regional climate based upon surface, radiosonde [weather balloon], and satellite measurements of temperature, on precipitation, and other variables relative to the climate change issue." The report will be edited by Patrick J. Michaels of the University of Virginia, with contributions from Dr. Robert Balling, Dr. David Legates, Dr. Robert Davis, and other meteorologists and climatologists.

Each will write about “their work within their area of expertise and examine the factual underpinnings of the claim of apocalyptic global warming and climate trends.”

At the same time that the British are engaged in promoting falsified temperature data, several groups of scientists around the world are engaged in providing accurate data. The satellite temperature record comes from a group of scientists led by John Christy of the Earth System Science Lab at the University of Alabama at Huntsville. Their data come from satellites that use microwave sounding units to measure air columns in the troposphere. These data are not only very accurate, but they have the advantage of global coverage. The British Meteorological Office relies on land-based stations and ocean-going ships. Thus, the British rely on data that cover less than two-thirds of the Earth’s surface and are plagued with problems, such as the urban heat-island effect, and hence are quite inaccurate. According to the satellite data, last year was almost the coldest year on recent record.

‘Utter nonsense’

The *New York Times* has claimed that the recent blizzards in the U.S. Northeast should be blamed on global warming, while *Newsweek* ran a cover story titled “Blizzards, Floods, and Hurricanes: Blame Global Warming.” These claims are as absurd as they seem.

Atmospheric scientist Patrick Michaels from the University of Virginia told a Marshall Institute round table discussion recently that these claims were “utter nonsense.” Michaels said that “any suggestion that ocean warming caused the blizzard of ’96 makes no sense. Sea surface temperature over the Western Atlantic has changed very little in the recent decade—except for a profound cooling of the northwestern portion.” Michaels added that “the problem with generating mid-Atlantic snow is, in any case, not a lack of moisture. The problem is getting enough cold air from southeastern Canada into a storm. Yet all projections for an enhanced greenhouse effect *reduce* the depth of cold air. So blaming the blizzard on the greenhouse effect is 100% wrong.”

Both Michaels and the Marshall Institute have produced an extensive body of work demonstrating that the global warming theory lacks any scientific credibility. In the latest issue of his newsletter, *World Climate Report*, Michaels details how all recent claims by the British Meteorological Office and the United Nations apparatus are not only misleading, but incorrect.

The report, released by the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change on Nov. 29, 1995, claims that there is now evidence to indicate that the activities of man are behind global warming. This report has been roundly denounced by scientists from all over the world. According to these scientists, the methodology used by the IPCC is not rigorous, particularly their use of summaries of data used to compile models that predict the climate. The IPCC report states that they

have detected a “discernible human influence” on climate. Environmental groups are using this report to lobby for draconian cuts in carbon dioxide emissions that would complete the destruction of industrial society.

Warming debate boils over

One of the critics of the report, Dr. Frits Bottcher, chairman of the Global Institute for the Study of Natural Resources in The Hague, told Reuters that “instead of scientific discussion we have groups of hundreds of scientists and civil servants, and by a majority of votes they decide. That’s not how science should work.” According to Bottcher, computer predictions by the IPCC are loaded to make sure they produce the desired results, and the conclusions are warped by environmental activists.

“I totally disagree with the IPCC conclusions. They put wrong physical equations in their computer, the wrong figures and all kinds of tricks. But they have to defend the case of global warming because they get hundreds of millions of dollars. If they say it [global warming] is not happening, they won’t get their money,” he said. This is a very interesting statement coming from one of the founders of the Club of Rome, the institution that was created to promote these kinds of scientific doomsday stories in order to implement a policy of population reduction. Over the recent period, many Club of Rome members have begun to denounce some of the well-known environmental scares as unfounded.

Dr. Jack Barrett of London’s Imperial College is another critic of the IPCC data, who is saying that conclusions may be based on misunderstandings. According to Barrett, the chronology of any warming of the planet, which he says is probably due to a natural historical cycle, is inconsistent with IPCC theory. He says that most warming this century took place before 1940, but a big increase in carbon dioxide emissions took place after then.

“The IPCC is working with an incomplete understanding of a very complex system, and it is understating the uncertainties in its predictions. The IPCC is almost exclusively dependent on computer modelling and it is unnecessarily influencing governments and industries to take injudicious and expensive actions,” Barrett said.

These breaking developments seem to be the beginning of an offensive in the scientific community against the global warming theory. Up until this point, however, the main public criticisms have been against the empirical data that are used to back the global warming theory, and the use of such data in climate models. The next step is to overturn the axioms behind the climate models themselves, including the mistaken belief that the “radiation budget” of the Earth is defined in terms of “thermodynamics,” i.e., heat and cold. The correct approach includes an overview of the biosphere and the interactions between the Earth and the Sun and the Solar System.