

## Trump Climate Panel Could Expose Huge Fraud, Hence the Hysteria

Written by [Alex Newman](#) | Friday, 08 March 2019

The collective freak out over President Donald Trump's proposed Presidential Committee on Climate Science (PCCS) highlights the fact that the hysteria surrounding the man-made global-warming hypothesis is unscientific — and that it must be re-examined by competent, credible experts. According to scientists and experts, if the science on



“climate change” were truly settled, Democrats, tax-funded climate alarmists, and the establishment media would all be celebrating another committee to confirm that “conclusion.” Instead, the unhinged shrieking over Trump's plan to investigate the matter strongly suggests something very fishy is going on, critics argued. Indeed, there is a good chance [that even more fraud could be revealed](#).

The hysteria first broke out last month. In late February, documents emerged showing that [the White House was planning](#) to create a committee of federal scientists. Their job: re-examine widely disputed conclusions on climate change by previous government bodies. Especially problematic to the man-made global-warming theorists was [the prestigious scientist selected to lead the commission, Princeton University physicist and national security advisor Dr. William Happer](#) (shown). Of course, Happer is a widely respected scientist who happens to disagree with the increasingly discredited hypothesis that man's emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> — a fraction of one percent of all the greenhouse gases in the atmosphere — control the climate.

“CO<sub>2</sub> will be good for the Earth,” Happer told *The New American* magazine at a [2016 climate conference in Phoenix, Arizona, that brought together leading scientists and experts](#) in various fields to expose the lies and alarmism. “If you look at geological history, CO<sub>2</sub> levels are unusually low right now, it's very seldom that they've been this low. Many plants are not growing as good as they could if they had more CO<sub>2</sub>, so CO<sub>2</sub> by itself will be very good for the Earth, more will be a good thing.” He also said it was “pretty clear that we're not going to see dangerous climate change” as a result of human CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.



After the news of Happer's appointment and the commission was reported by the anti-Trump Washington Post, a bastion of pseudo-scientific climate hysteria, other anti-Trump climate alarmists in the media took their cue. Indeed, the out-of-control outrage and vitriol pumped out by the establishment over the proposed commission reached outlandish proportions. CNN, for example, which the president has described as “very fake news,” could barely contain its disgust, running a column blasting the climate panel as “a waste of time and money.” The fringe left-wing Vox, meanwhile, warned that Happer has “bizarre, backward views about climate science.” Some especially ludicrous screeds warned of an alleged “threat to national security.”

Democrats in the House of Representatives sent a [furious letter](#) to the president making all sorts of wild demands and claims. A group of a dozen or so Democrat senators even called the commission “dangerous.” “Climate change is widely acknowledged to be a global threat, and enabling climate skeptics to undermine the views of our nation’s scientific leaders on this critical issue is dangerously misguided for both our national and economic security,” they wrote, claiming that Happer's comments show he “denies” the “overwhelming body of scientific evidence on the topic.”

And now, it is all coming to a head. Independent physicist John Droz, who is [working with a network of concerned scientists against the corruption of science](#), argued that the 30-year battle over global-warming is set to reach a pivotal juncture within the next few days. In short, under tremendous pressure from the establishment media, the Democrat Party, Deep State swamp creatures, and even a handful of fringe “Republicans in Name Only” (RINOs), sources say the administration is re-considering the commission and its mission. Droz urged citizens to contact the White House right away and show their support for the plan by calling 202-456-1111 or sending an e-mail at [whitehouse.gov/contact](mailto:whitehouse.gov/contact).

In commentary about the ongoing uproar, Droz noted the absurdity of claiming a new commission would be a waste of money when the price tag for “climate” schemes is in the tens of trillions of dollars. “If the U.S. was about to spend an enormous amount of

money, would you say that an investigation costing one-billionth(!) of the expenditure, would be a waste of money?” Droz asked, calling it the “\$64 trillion question.” “That’s what we are talking about here.” He also refuted the “waste of time” objection, noting that Trump has already made clear that without new facts, he does not intend to do anything consequential on the “climate” front.

As for the objection that the “science is settled,” Droz again highlighted the absurdity and unscientific nature of the claim. The issue of whether man's CO2 emissions are driving dangerous warming or climate changes has not been resolved, he said. A genuine scientific assessment would require four components: It should be comprehensive, objective, transparent, and empirical. “There has never been a scientific assessment of the Global Warming issue, anywhere on the planet,” Droz observed, adding that the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's assessment reports failed on at least three of the four criteria.

Indeed, many of the voices seeking to shut down the presidential committee point to the UN IPCC's findings as proof that the science is settled. And yet, *The New American* magazine [just interviewed former UN IPCC sea-level reviewer Dr. Nils-Axel Morner](#), who became a whistleblower after the UN body refused to correct easily discredited misinformation on sea levels and other matters despite his bringing it to their attention. “There is no rapid sea-level rise going on today, and there will not be,” he explained, citing observable data and his more than 50 years of research in the field. “On the contrary, if anything happens, the sea will go down a little.” He also warned of a looming global cooling period caused by the Sun.



Droz, the U.S. physicist, then proceeded to debunk the false claim that 97 percent of the world's scientists agree with the man-made warming hypothesis. “Fact one: there never has been a survey of the world’s 2+ million scientists on anything,” he wrote. “Fact two: There may indeed be a majority of certain subsets of scientists that hold an opinion about Global Warming. However, none of them has done a genuine scientific analysis of the Global Warming matter. Fact three: Science is never determined by a vote. Do

you think that Einstein's Theory of Relativity was accepted due to a poll — or because of scientific proof?"

Other prominent scientists agreed that the commission was sorely needed. Writing in the [Daily Caller](#), for example, climatologist Patrick Michaels said it was "about time" that a commission to examine climate science was established. "And it's about time that the truly sloppy, shoddy science that the previous administration used be shown in the light of truth," said Michaels, who wrote seven books on climate, served as the Virginia State Climatologist and as president of the American Association of State Climatologists, and was a research professor of environmental sciences at University of Virginia. "Let's shine the light of truth on the notion that a temperature change equivalent to driving from Washington to Richmond is throwing the world into geopolitical chaos."

Similarly, climate skeptic Paul Driessen, who has degrees in geology and field ecology, slammed the opposition to Trump's commission in a column for [Townhall.com](#). "For years, you Democrats, environmentalists, Deep State bureaucrats, government-grant-dependent scientists, news and social media have colluded to censor and silence man-made climate chaos skeptics, and stifle any debate," he said, noting that the Climate Industrial Complex was now a \$2-trillion-per year global behemoth. "All of you have huge financial, reputational and power stakes in this."

Driessen explained that the climate alarmists hope to wrap up their "kangaroo court proceedings" without the other side being heard or being allowed to present evidence and cross-examine alarmist so-called experts. "If your evidence is so solid and unimpeachable, you should be more than happy to lay it on the table, subject it to scrutiny, question our experts, and let us question yours — extensively and mercilessly," he argued, calling the alarmists' agenda un-American, totalitarian, anti-science, and more. "After all, the future of our planet is at stake — or so you claim. The future of our country certainly is."

The ecologist turned attorney, author of the book *Eco-Imperialism: Green Power Black Death*, offered some blunt advice to the president on this issue. "Mr. Trump: Please stand up to these Climate Totalitarians who want to destroy our nation, in the name of saving the planet from climate disasters that exist only in computer models, Hollywood movies, and self-serving assertions from the Climate Industrial Complex," Driessen suggested. "Appoint your Presidential Committee on Climate Science right now. And may the best science win."

James Taylor, senior fellow for environment and energy policy at the non-profit Heartland Institute, said an inclusive climate change panel is "exactly what we need to get as close to the truth as we can" on the question of global warming. "Up to now, the panels put together by the federal government have been nothing more than a gathering of prominent alarmists rattling off activist talking points," he told *The New*

*American*. As an example, he noted that one of the lead authors of the [widely ridiculed National Climate Assessment](#), released just before the latest UN global-warming summit, represented the alarmist Union of Concerned Scientists. “Clearly, a climate assessment written by the Union of Concerned Scientists is not credible,” Taylor said.

An objective review of the science would reveal many such flaws, conflicts of interest, and more. “Alarmists fear and are vigorously objecting to President Trump appointing a science panel because they know an objective review of the science will poke gaping holes in the alarmist storyline,” he said. “But the proposed science panel is not about one side or another winning the debate, it is about discovering scientific truth by critical inquiry rather than political bullying.”

At [American Thinker](#), David Archibald, who has lectured on climate science in Senate and House hearing rooms, argued that Dr. Happer's commission could set the world free from the one-world-order plotting totalitarians behind the warming hypothesis. “At the moment, the Marxist plotters bang on about the 97 percent scientific consensus on global warming,” he wrote. “They have created a sealed edifice of lies and have maintained it assiduously. After Dr. Happer's report is released, the mantra of 'Are you denying the science?' will be turned on its head. Global warming has been a state-sponsored religion, with its priesthood funded from the public purse to the tune of \$2.5 billion a year in the U.S. alone. The priests of that cult will be plucked off the public teat, and the memory of what they preached will fade.”

Writing for the environmentalist [Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow \(CFACT\)](#), Dr. David Wojick ridiculed one of the pseudo-scientific screeds seeking to undo the commission. In his insightful piece, Dr. Wojick pointed out that much of the hysteria over the examination of the climate hysteria is based on a critical fallacy: the notion that climate alarmism is the same thing as climate science. “This is wildly stupid,” he said. “It just shows that science news outlets like the *Science Mag* and E&E News have no real concept of what is actually going on, namely a serious scientific debate. It is no wonder then, that their readers also do not know what is going on. Even worse, this alarmist fallacy occurs in many other news outlet articles as well.”

The difference really is crucial. “Both alarmism and skepticism are based on climate science, but neither is the whole of climate change science, much less climate science, not even close,” noted Wokick, who has worked for Carnegie Mellon University, the U.S. Office of Naval Research, the Naval Research Lab, and the U.S. Department of Energy. “A quick search reveals that the scientific literature contains over 2 million articles that refer to 'climate change.' Alarmism and skepticism are differing claims about what this vast body of research adds up to. They are not that body itself, so it is wildly wrong to equate either view with climate science. The assessment of science is different from the science being assessed.”

It seems increasingly like Trump was right when he ridiculed the man-made warming hypothesis as a "hoax." In the end, there is a reason that the shrieking is getting so loud from the man-made warming theorists — a tax-funded “cult” movement, according to leading scientists such as Happer and MIT meteorologist Richard Lindzen. The reason is simple: The claim that man’s insignificant CO2 emissions drive “climate change” underpins their business models, their globalist ideology, their tax-funded pay checks, and their demands for ever greater and more intrusive government. If the science were truly settled, the warming cult would have nothing to fear from yet another government investigation of the science. As Queen Gertrude says in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, “The lady doth protest too much, methinks.”

*Photo at top: Dr. William Happer*