

ICE AGE ARMAGEDDON

The Greens' campaign of a man-made Ice Age that would engulf the world by the year 2000 was probably the worst timed campaign that has ever been run by the Greens. On noticing that there was a natural cooling period that started in approximately 1945, the Greens decided to use this to blame Man for their next Armageddon event. Unfortunately for them, the natural cooling period ended in 1970, to be replaced by a natural warming period that would not come to an end until 1998.

Not aware of the changing global temperatures, the Greens' Ice Age Armageddon campaign picked up momentum in the early 1970s and later, faced with the obvious warming of the planet, petered out in the early 1980s. Without a blink of their collective conscience, the Greens then started their present global warming campaign using some of the same scientists¹ as "proof" of man-made global warming, even though 'the day before' these scientists had been offering "proof" of an impending Ice Age Armageddon.

The Media, as usual, uncritically accepted the Greens' propaganda as fact, and helped 'educate' the World's citizens about the impending disaster. The following are just some of the stories told. As you read through the following quotes, you might note the similarity in the methodology used by the Greens in this campaign and the present global warming campaign. You will see the same; fear and emotion, guilt for Man's actions, demands for quick action, and the appeal to authority - "the scientists say so", consensus, and that millions will die etc. etc..

The claims of global catastrophe were remarkably similar to what the media deliver now about global warming. - *"The cooling has already killed hundreds of thousands of people in poor nations,"* wrote Lowell Ponte in his 1976 book *"The Cooling."* If the proper measures weren't taken, he cautioned, then the cooling would lead to *"world famine, world chaos, and probably world war, and this could all come by the year 2000."*

Science News on the 15th November 1969, quoted meteorologist Dr. J. Murray Mitchell Jr. about global cooling worries. *"How long the current cooling trend continues is one of the most important problems of our civilization,"* he said. *"If the cooling continued for 200 to 300 years, the earth could be plunged into an ice age,"* Mitchell continued.

Six years later, the periodical reported *"the cooling since 1940 has been large enough and consistent enough that it will not soon be reversed."*

The first Earth Day was celebrated on April 22, 1970, amidst hysteria about the dangers of a new ice age. The media had been spreading warnings of a cooling period, but those alarms grew louder in the 1970s. Three months before, on January 11, The Washington Post told readers to *"get a good grip on*

your long johns, cold weather haters – the worst may be yet to come,” in an article titled *“Colder Winters Herald Dawn of New Ice Age.”* The article quoted climatologist Reid Bryson, who said *“there’s no relief in sight”* about the cooling trend.

Journalists at the Fortune Magazine, in February 1974, took the threat of another ice age seriously. Fortune Magazine actually won a “Science Writing Award” from the American Institute of Physics for its own analysis of the danger. *“As for the present cooling trend a number of leading climatologists have concluded that it is very bad news indeed.” “It is the root cause of a lot of that unpleasant weather around the world and they warn that it carries the potential for human disasters of unprecedented magnitude,”* the article continued.

That article also emphasized Bryson’s extreme doomsday predictions. *“There is very important climatic change going on right now, and it’s not merely something of academic interest.”* Bryson warned, *“It is something that, if it continues, will affect the whole human occupation of the earth – like a billion people starving. The effects are already showing up in a rather drastic way.”*

However, the world’s population increased by 2.5 billion since that warning.

Time Magazine on the 24th June 1974 stated: *“Climatological Cassandras are becoming increasingly apprehensive for the weather aberrations they are studying may be the harbinger of another ice age.”*

New Scientist in 1970, reports cooling went from *“one of the most important problems”* to a first-place tie for *“death and misery.”* *“The threat of a new ice age must now stand alongside nuclear war as a likely source of wholesale death and misery for mankind,”* said Nigel Calder, a former editor of “New Scientist.”

He claimed it was not his disposition to be a *“doomsday man.”* His analysis came from *“the facts [that] have emerged”* about past ice ages, according to the July/August International Wildlife Magazine.

The idea of a worldwide deep freeze snowballed. Naturally, science fiction authors embraced the topic. Writer John Christopher delivered a book on the coming ice age in 1962 called *“The World in Winter.”* In Christopher’s novel, England and other *“rich countries of the north broke down under the icy onslaught.”* *“The machines stopped, the land was dead and the people went south,”* he explained.

In April 1975, Newsweek aired its concerns about the coming ice age fears: *"The longer the planners delay, the more difficult will they find it to cope with climatic change once the results become grim.* Remember, it was Newsweek Magazine which in the 1970's proclaimed meteorologists were *"almost unanimous in their view that a coming Ice Age would have negative impacts."* It was also Newsweek in 1975 which originated the eerily similar "tipping point" rhetoric of today.

So what can we learn about the Greens' Ice Age Armageddon campaign. First, were they wrong? Yes, once again, they were wrong. Second, were they very wrong? Yes, once again, they were very wrong. We could not find an icicle that had anything resembling global properties. We did not have a 75%, 50% or 5% ice age – they were very wrong.

They used all their usual tools to convince many people that they were right, only later to discover that they were very wrong. Lies, deceit, propaganda, fear and emotion, irrational thought, appeals to authority, faked consensus, and abuse of our automatic trust in scientists, are their tools of trade. All these tools have been honed to near perfection, and are in use in the current global warming campaign. Why do they still use these tools? Because, unfortunately, they achieve success with a majority of our citizens, who uncritically accept all the words delivered by the Greens using these tools.

AN IMPORTANT SIDE ISSUE

Just as Rachel Carson's book "Silent Spring" galvanised the Avian Armageddon campaign, the work of Professor Stephen Schneider gave impetus to the Ice Age Armageddon campaign. It was clearly not enough to merely warn of an impending Ice Age, but he also had to blame its potential onset on human activities causing aerosol discharge into the atmosphere. After all, every disaster must have a scapegoat.

However, his work is not important here, it is his infamous quotation below. This quotation was not only going to define the man himself, but also the Green movement, and most of the climate scientists in the world today.

"On the one hand, as scientists we are ethically bound to the scientific method, in effect promising to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but — which means that we must include all the doubts, the caveats, the ifs, ands, and buts. On the other hand, we are not just scientists but human beings as well. And like most people we'd like to see the world a better place, which in this context translates into our working to reduce the risk of potentially disastrous climatic change. To do that we need to get some broadbased support, to capture the public's imagination. That, of course, entails getting loads of media coverage. So we have to offer up scary scenarios, make simplified, dramatic statements, and make little mention of any doubts we might have. This 'double ethical bind' we frequently

find ourselves in cannot be solved by any formula. Each of us has to decide what the right balance is between being effective and being honest. I hope that means being both.” (Quoted in Discover, pp. 45–48, Oct. 1989.)

Once we strip the self-serving, immoral rationalisation from this quotation what do we have left?

We have a person who has decided that he, and only he, has the right to decide what “a better place” is for all the people on the Earth. He is also the only one who can determine what is going to put this “better place” at risk - in this case, “potentially disastrous climate change”. In achieving his ‘ends’, and his ‘ends’ only, any ‘means’ he employs is justified. So how will he act?

Apparently, he is willing to lie and deceive people. He is also willing to forgo any semblance of the professionalism of a scientist, and ignore his ethical duty to adhere to the ‘scientific method’. Yet at the same time, he wishes to maintain the status, respect, and trust that we give to scientists, apparently not understanding that to earn such accolades he needs to be a professional scientist abiding by the ‘scientific method’. Why should we listen to a mere human that lies and deceives, and falsely cloaks himself in a respectful white scientist’s coat, but does not behave as a scientist? How can we ever tell when he is not lying and his science is good, when he tells us he will lie and not produce good science whenever he feels it is necessary?

He also does not see the irony of the 1989 quote coming from a man whose 1970s predictions about a devastating Ice Age was so woefully wrong, yet here he is arrogant enough to have confidence in his next non-scientific guess and not bother the peasants in the world with his so called ‘facts and science’.

We also should be suspicious of a person who is confident he is right, but lacks the confidence that he can rationally put a convincing case, based on facts, to the rest of humanity. Instead he wishes to lie and deceive us, and is arrogant enough to believe he is doing this for the best of reasons, and eventually we will thank him.

Although my comments are directed at Professor Schneider’s comments, it is much more important than one man’s immorality and lack of professionalism. I believe the whole Green movement and most of the climate scientists around the world today, would embrace his comments as a foundation for their own private and professional lives. Both these accusations are defended in other Handouts.

Even in 2001, Bjorn Lomborg had detected this attitude in the Green movement as the following more sensitive quote² shows.

“Many people have pointed out at lectures that although I might be right in claiming that [Environmental]³ things are not as bad as we thought they were, such arguments should not be voiced in public as they might cause us to take things a bit too easy. Although one can argue such a position, it is

*important to understand how antidemocratic such an attitude really is: we (**the few [GREENS] and the initiated**)³ know the truth, but because general knowledge of the truth will cause people to behave "incorrectly" we should refrain from broadcasting it. Moreover, such a course of argument will also be harmful to the environmental movement in the long run, since it will erode its most valuable asset, its credibility. I think that, in general, pretty strong arguments have to be presented for it to be permissible to withhold the truth for the sake of some elitist, general good."*

CONCLUSION

In this Handout, we not only see yet another failed campaign by the Greens, but we also see the hypocrisy of the Green movement as they moved from one failed campaign, reverse their direction, and go to the latest campaign about global warming in 'a blink of the eye'. Why should we continue to believe a group of people who have been so consistently wrong in the past? The Greens continue to ignore their past failures, yet become incensed if any non-Green suggests their latest campaign may be another Green failure.

More importantly, because they have not been held accountable for their past behaviour and predictions, they are emboldened to embrace, both in their private and professional lives, the immoral behaviour described in Professor Schneider's now infamous comment.

Notes:

1. Both Dr James Hansen and Professor Stephen H. Schneider were both strong advocates of the Ice Age Armageddon in the 1970s, only to reverse their stance and their science to support the Global Warming Armageddon campaign from the mid-1980s.
2. Lomborg, Bjorn, "The Skeptical Environmentalist", Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001, p.32.
3. Bolding and the words 'Environmental and 'GREENS' inserted by author.