

SCEPTICS WORDS 4 - MUZZLING THE SCEPTICS

Handout Content

The words of sceptics that are in this handout have been chosen because most of their comments show how the Greens and their supporters are trying to muzzle anyone who does not agree with their views. This contrasts with previous Green campaigns where this authoritarian trait of enforcing censorship on the debate was absent. This is not a healthy change.

Some of these sceptics have worked within the IPCC, and this is noted by bold red coloured text. Hopefully, such identification might help dispel the IPCC myth that everyone within the IPCC agrees that Man is 100% responsible for global warming, and the small number of critics of this view are “uninformed, and outside this prestigious organisation.”

Item 4-1

Letter to The Australian May/June 2008

I hear on the scientific grapevine that CSIRO's biggest problem when providing formal advice to the federal Government on the matter of climate change is to say nothing that can be interpreted as giving aid and comfort to the army of irresponsible sceptics out there who are doubtful about the dreadful consequences of global warming.

One can only feel sorry for the Government. Where can it go these days to get unbiased advice on the issue of global warming? Its official sources are poisoned by the fear among many scientists that they may be labelled by their colleagues and by their institutions as climate-change sceptics.

Basically, the problem is that the research community has gone so far along the path of frightening the life out of the man in the street that to recant publicly even part of the story would massively change the reputation and political clout of science in general. And so, like corpuscles in the blood, researchers all over the world now rush in overwhelming numbers to repel infection by any idea that threatens the carefully cultivated belief in climatic disaster.

Garth Paltridge

Emeritus Professor and Honorary Research Fellow, Institute of Antarctic and Southern Ocean Studies, University of Tasmania

Item 4-2

In a US Senate hearing, the following email was discussed:

"Marlo

You are so full of crap.

You have been proven wrong. The entire world has proven you wrong. You are the last guy on Earth to get it. Take this warning from me, Marlo. It is my intention to destroy your career as a liar. If you produce one more editorial against climate change, I will launch a campaign against your professional integrity. I will call you a liar and charlatan to the Harvard community of which you and I are members. I will call you out as a man who has been bought by Corporate America. Go ahead, guy. Take me on.

Mike "

Michael T. Eckhart

President, American Council on Renewable Energy (ACORE)

If this was an email between two juveniles, you may not pay much attention. However, it was between the heads of two US organizations deeply involved in the debate on global warming. This is typical of the tactics used to silence opposition to the Green's view.

Item 4-3

Some other examples of intimidation targeted at climate skeptics:

Excerpt: *"Get rid of all these rotten politicians that we have in Washington, who are nothing more than corporate toadies," said Robert F. Kennedy Jr., the environmentalist author, president of Waterkeeper Alliance and Robert F. Kennedy's son, who grew hoarse from shouting. "This is treason. And we need to start treating them as traitors."*

Excerpt: *The Weather Channel's most prominent climatologist is advocating that broadcast meteorologists be stripped of their scientific certification if they express skepticism about predictions of manmade catastrophic global warming. This latest call to silence skeptics follows a year (2006) in which skeptics were compared to "Holocaust Deniers" and Nuremberg-style war crimes trials were advocated by several climate alarmists.*

Excerpt: *Grist Magazine's staff writer David Roberts called for the Nuremberg-style trials for the "bastards" who were members of what he termed the global warming "denial industry."*

Excerpt: *Global warming driven by greenhouse gas pollution (but ultimately by greed, racism and lying) is killing our Planet. Our Planet, the Earth - is under acute*

threat from Climate Criminals threatening the Third World with Climate Genocide and the Biosphere with Terracide (the killing of our Planet).

UN official warns ignoring warming would be 'criminally irresponsible'

Excerpt: *The **U.N.'s top climate official** warned policymakers and scientists trying to hammer out a landmark report on climate change that ignoring the urgency of global warming would be "criminally irresponsible." Yvo de Boer's comments came at the opening of a weeklong conference that will complete a concise guide on the state of global warming and what can be done to stop the Earth from overheating.*

Item 4-4

September 29, 2007: Virginia State Climatologist skeptical of global warming loses job after clash with Governor: 'I was told that I could not speak in public'

Excerpt: Michaels has argued that the climate is becoming warmer but that the consequences will not be as dire as others have predicted. Governor Kaine had warned Michaels not to use his official title in discussing his views. *"I resigned as Virginia State climatologist because I was told that I could not speak in public on my area of expertise, global warming, as state climatologist,"* Michaels said in a statement this week provided by the libertarian Cato Institute, where he has been a fellow since 1992. *"It was impossible to maintain academic freedom with this speech restriction."*

Dr. Patrick J. Michaels, former Virginia State Climatologist, a UN IPCC reviewer, and University of Virginia professor of environmental sciences.

Item 4-5

Dr. Timothy Ball called fears of man-made global warming "the greatest deception in the history of science" in a February 5, 2007 op-ed in Canada Free Press. "Believe it or not, Global Warming is not due to human contribution of Carbon Dioxide (CO₂). This, in fact, is the greatest deception in the history of science. We are wasting time, energy and trillions of dollars while creating unnecessary fear and consternation over an issue with no scientific justification," Ball wrote. "The world has warmed since 1680, the nadir of a cool period called the Little Ice Age (LIA) that has generally continued to the present. These climate changes are well within natural variability and explained quite easily by changes in the sun. But there is nothing unusual going on," Ball explained. "As [MIT's Richard] Lindzen said many years ago, 'the consensus was reached before the research had even begun.'

Now, any scientist who dares to question the prevailing wisdom is marginalized and called a skeptic, when in fact they are simply being good scientists. This has reached frightening levels with these scientists now being called climate

change denier with all the holocaust connotations of that word. The normal scientific method is effectively being thwarted," Ball concluded.

Ball also explained that one of the reasons climate models are failing is because they overestimate the warming effect of CO₂ in the atmosphere. Ball described how CO₂'s warming impact diminishes. "Even if CO₂ concentration doubles or triples, the effect on temperature would be minimal. The relationship between temperature and CO₂ is like painting a window black to block sunlight. The first coat blocks most of the light. Second and third coats reduce very little more. Current CO₂ levels are like the first coat of black paint," Ball explained in a June 6, 2007 article in Canada Free Press.

Canadian climatologist Dr. Timothy Ball, formerly of the University of Winnipeg, who earned his PhD from the University of London.

Item 4-6

Mike Thompson dissented from the view of a man-made climate crisis in 2008. "[Hurricane forecasting pioneer] Dr. William Gray is a very outspoken critic of the global warming proponents. As such, he has been attacked by the GW proponents, and funding for his research has dried up...he put \$100,000 of his own cash into his research," Thompson wrote on April 14, 2008. "He puts his money where his mouth is, and he would not do that were he not concerned over the derailing of logic in climate science.

This story has become all too common for those who dare speak up, and debunk Global Warming. Gray and other scientists with strong credentials in physics and climate science have been shouted down as climate heretics for disagreeing with the GW crowd," Thompson explained. "It is easier to silence scientific dissent by utilizing the politics of personal destruction, than to actually debate them on the merits of their arguments. That should tell you something about the global warming debate - there is none right now - it's either you believe, or you are to be discredited.

It's a slow process, but it is scary, because if someone can control your energy sources, they can control you. We are already being told what light bulbs we can and cannot use, - through legislation. We are being forced to fund research into alternative energies sources that are inefficient, and that cause the price of food, energy, and everything else to rise - through legislation, rather than allow free enterprise to allocate funds to those energy sources that will survive through good old American innovation!" Thompson added. "Even if you disagree with Dr. Gray, and others like him, you should fight against squelching the voices of those scientists who have spent a lifetime studying the climate, and have something very important to say. America is all about that sort of debate!" he concluded.

Chief Meteorologist, Mike Thompson of Kansas City.

Item 4-7

Dr. Robert Balling expressed skepticism about man-made climate fears in 2007. "In my lifetime, this global-warming issue might fade away," Balling said in a November 11, 2007 interview with the *Arizona Republic* newspaper. Noting the pressure he feels as a skeptical scientist, Balling explained, "Somehow I've been branded this horrible person who belongs in the depths of hell." He added, "There's just no tolerance right now." the article explained.

"Balling's research over the years has explored sun activity, pollution from volcanoes, the urban-heat-island effect and errors in past temperature models as possible causes of rising temperatures."

Climatologist Dr. Robert Balling of Arizona State University, the former head of the university's Office of Climatology, has served as a climate consultant to the United Nations Environment Program, the World Climate Program, the World Meteorological Organization, and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Balling, who has also served in the UN IPCC, would have preferred former Vice President Al Gore had won the presidency in 2000. He has authored several books on global warming, including *The Heated Debate* and *The Satanic Gases*.

Item 4-8

A March 17, 2007 article in *The Australian* newspaper explained Franks' climate views. Franks "is increasingly uneasy about the dangerous path the debate is taking, where alternative views are discouraged and reputations attacked and discredited. Franks says our understanding of the physics of climate is still so limited, we cannot explain natural variability or predict when droughts will break, or the when and why clouds form, which makes him wary of mainstream claims projecting temperature changes over the next century.

He argues that greenhouse gases in the atmosphere account for only about 2 per cent to 3 per cent of the overall warming effect, meaning even major increases in gases lead to only slight shifts in temperature: between 0.5C and 1C. He is less certain than other dissenting scientists that variation in solar activity is the cause, but doubts that greenhouse gases are the main driver of temperature changes," the article stated. "It's clear that we don't understand enough of the physics of climate to understand natural variability but I don't expect climate change from CO2 to be particularly significant at any point in the future," Franks said.

The article continued, "Franks points to new modeling which has measured changes in the Earth's albedo, or reflectance, driven mainly by cloud formation. The

paper by a team of geophysicists reported an unexplained decline in cloud cover until 1998, which caused the Earth to absorb more heat from the atmosphere. This resulted in increases in incoming solar radiation more than 10 times bigger than the same effect attributed to greenhouse gases. Franks says the current IPCC models assume albedo is constant but such research should be added to the body of knowledge, not excluded or rejected.

'It's reached the point that anyone who offers an open mind publicly is basically criticized and put down,' he says. "Franks also wrote a June 2007 paper titled "Multi-decadal Climate Variability: Flood and Drought - New South Wales" in which he concluded that "strong evidence of multi-decadal climate variability" has dominated the climate. "Climate has never been static!" Franks wrote. "Current droughts cannot be directly linked to 'climate change'" and "El Niño/La Niña variability [is] due to natural processes," Franks wrote.

Hydro-climatologist Stewart Franks is an Associate Professor of Environmental Engineering, at the University of Newcastle in Australia whose research has focused on flood and drought risk and seasonal climate prediction.

Item 4-9

Dr. Al Pekarek ridicules man-made global warming fears as a "media circus".

"Climate is a very complex system, and anyone who claims we know all there is to know about it, let's say, is charitably misinformed or chooses to be," Pekarek said according to a September 7, 2007 article. "We fool ourselves if we think we have a sufficiently well-understood model of the climate that we can really predict. We can't," he explained. "Geologists know that the Earth's climate has done this all the time in its history. We also know that man has not been around very long and could not have caused that. So we know that there are many natural forces that have caused our climate to change," he continued.

"Those of us who don't jump on the bandwagon - we're called deniers and Hitlers and I don't know what all else. Some of us have been threatened - I think some with their life, but more it's trying to destroy our reputations," Pekarek added.

He also pulled no punches in criticizing former Vice President Al Gore's documentary *An Inconvenient Truth*, calling the film "a total misrepresentation of science." He dismissed computer model fears of a climate doomsday. "It's an abuse of science. They are misquoting science. They are misusing science. They are making predictions of dire consequences in the name of science that will not come true, and science will lose its credibility," he explained.

"In some of our schools, we are scaring the hell out of our kids. They think they have no future," he said. "In 10 years, you won't hear anything about global warming," he concluded.

Geologist Dr. Al Pekarek, professor of geology, earth and atmospheric sciences at St. Cloud State University, Minnesota, US.

Item 4-10

Paltridge questioned the motives of scientists hyping climate fears. "They have been so successful with their message of greenhouse doom that, should one of them prove tomorrow that it is nonsense, the discovery would have to be suppressed for the sake of the overall reputation of science," Paltridge wrote in an April 6, 2007 op-ed entitled "Global Warming - Not Really a Done Deal?".

Paltridge is best known internationally for his work on atmospheric radiation and on the theoretical basis of climate change. He is a fellow of the Australian Academy of Science. Paltridge also worked with the National Climate Program Office. "Even as it is, the barriers to public dissemination of results that might cast doubt on one aspect or another of accepted greenhouse wisdom are extraordinarily high. Climate scientists rush in overwhelming numbers to repel infection by ideas not supportive of the basic thesis that global warming is perhaps the greatest of the threats to mankind and that it is caused by human folly - the burning of fossil fuels to support our way of life," Paltridge explained.

"In a way, their situation is very similar to that of the software engineers who sold the concept of the Y2K bug a decade ago. The 'reputation stakes' have become so high that it is absolutely necessary for some form of international action (any action, whether sensible or not) to be forced upon mankind. Then, should disaster not in fact befall, the avoidance of doom can be attributed to that action rather than to the probability that the prospects for disaster were massively oversold," he added. "Pity the politicians who (we presume) are trying their best to make an informed decision on the matter. Of course, politicians realize that those clamoring for their attention on any particular issue usually have other un-stated agendas. But they may not recognize that scientists too are human and are as subject as the rest of us to the seductions of well-funded campaigns.

One of the more frightening statements about global warming to be heard now from the corridors of power is that 'the scientists have spoken'. Well maybe they have - some of them anyway - but the implication of god-like infallibility is a bit hard to take," he concluded.

Atmospheric Physicist Dr. Garth W. Paltridge, an Emeritus Professor from University of Tasmania. Paltridge who was a Chief Research Scientist with the CSIRO Division of Atmospheric Research before taking up positions in 1990 as Director of the Institute of Antarctic and Southern Ocean Studies at the University of Tasmania and as CEO of the Antarctic Cooperative Research Center.

Item 4-11

David Noble of Canada, is a committed environmentalist and a man-made global warming skeptic. Noble now believes that the movement has "hyped the global climate issue into an obsession." Noble wrote a May 8, 2007 essay entitled "The Corporate Climate Coup" which details how global warming has "hijacked" the environmental left and created a "corporate climate campaign" which has "diverted attention from the radical challenges of the global justice movement." Noble wrote, "Don't breathe, there's a total war on against CO2 emissions, and you are releasing CO2 with every breath."

The multi-media campaign against global warming now saturating our senses, which insists that an increasing CO2 component of greenhouse gases is the enemy, takes no prisoners: you are either with us or you are with the 'deniers.' No one can question the new orthodoxy or dare risk the sin of emission. If Bill Clinton were running for president today he would swear he didn't exhale." Noble added, "How did scientific speculation so swiftly erupt into ubiquitous intimations of apocalypse?"

Professor David F. Noble of Canada's York University authored the book "America by Design: Science, Technology and the Rise of Corporate Capitalism" and co-founded a group designed to make scientific and technological research relevant to the needs of working people. Noble, is a former curator at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington and a former professor at MIT.

Item 4-12

Gould, who has made an intensive study of climate change, challenged climate fears in 2007. "There is (I have found) a huge problem in getting to learn of both sides of the AGW debate. But this 'debate' needs to be aired, regardless of what is being presented to scientists and to the public as the 'truth' about AGW," Gould wrote in a September 20, 2007 editorial titled "Global Warming from a Critical Perspective." "Although I have seen many articles arguing for the reality and danger of anthropogenic greenhouse warming (AGW), I have rarely seen one that presents scientific arguments against the AGW claims," Gould wrote.

"The implication [by many in the media] seems to be that anyone who has a contrary argument is not 'respectable' - yet there are many leading climatologists (such as Richard Lindzen of MIT) who have very good arguments disagreeing," Gould wrote.

Physicist Dr. Laurence I. Gould, Professor of Physics at the University of Hartford and former Chair of the New England Section of the American

Physical Society, has authored peer reviewed research articles and given numerous talks nationally and internationally.

Item 4-13

Ecologist Dr. Patrick Moore, a Greenpeace founding member who left the environmental organization because he believed it had become too radical, rejected climate alarmism and lamented the efforts to silence climate skeptics.

"It appears to be the policy of the [UK] Royal Society to stifle dissent and silence anyone who may have doubts about the connection between global warming and human activity. That kind of repression seems more suited to the Inquisition than to a modern, respected scientific body," Moore, the chief scientist for Greenspirit, wrote in a September 21, 2006 letter to the Royal Society accusing it of attempting to silence skeptics. "I am sure the Royal Society is aware of the difference between a hypothesis and a theory. It is clear the contention that human-induced CO2 emissions and rising CO2 levels in the global atmosphere are the cause of the present global warming trend is a hypothesis that has not yet been elevated to the level of a proven theory. Causation has not been demonstrated in any conclusive way," Moore wrote.

Item 4-14

Dr. Paul Reiter participated in the **UN IPCC** process and now calls the concept of consensus on global warming a "sham".

Professor Reiter, an expert in malaria, had to threaten legal action to have his name removed from the IPCC. "That is how they make it seem that all the top scientists are agreed," he said on March 5, 2007. "It's not true." Reiter has written more than 30 papers in peer-reviewed journals. Reiter also wrote on January 11, 2007: "For years, the public has been fed a lousy diet of climate doom and gloom, cooked and served by alarmists who use the language of science to push their agenda. Now, every politician of every stripe must embrace the 'climate consensus' or be branded a callous skeptic.

For twelve years, my colleagues and I have protested against the unsubstantiated claims that climate change is causing the disease [of malaria] to spread. We have failed miserably to alter the situation. Recently, the Associated Press quoted an entomologist who claimed there is an unprecedented outbreak of malaria in Karatina, Kenya, at 1,868 meters (6,130 feet). The heart-rending article began: 'The soft cries of children broke the morning stillness, as parents brought them into the hillside hospital, one by one - drained by a disease once unknown in the high country of Kenya.'

But there is nothing new about malaria in Karatina. Between World War I and the 1950s, there were ten disastrous epidemics in the region, and they extended much higher into these hills," Reiter wrote. "We have done the studies and challenged the alarmists - but they continue to ignore the facts, and perpetuate the lies," he concluded.

Dr. Paul Reiter, a malaria expert formerly of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and professor of entomology and tropical disease with the Pasteur Institute in Paris.

Item 4-15

Jennifer Marohasy dismisses climate fears.

"I've always considered it somewhat pretentious to believe humans can actually stop climate change, given the earth's climate has always changed," Marohasy wrote on May 25, 2007 in an article entitled "Cooling Heels on Global Warming." She also critiqued Gore's presentation of climate science. "Never once during this so-called documentary does Gore acknowledge that there is potential for an alternative thesis on global warming and the role of carbon dioxide.

All dissent is met with ridicule and/or name calling. Al Gore certainly doesn't appear to understand the potential value of hypotheses testing. Instead Gore reduces global warming to a moral issue and a contest between the good guys, which according to Gore includes all of the world's climate scientists, and the bad guys, the so-called skeptics, who he suggests are all hired guns," Marohasy wrote on September 16, 2006.

She has also stated, "As a consequence of the burning of fossil fuels, atmospheric carbon dioxide levels are currently increasing. There is no evidence, however, to suggest this will bring doom or that, by signing the Kyoto Protocol, Australia would make a significant difference to global carbon dioxide levels or to the rate of climate change."

Biologist Dr. Jennifer Marohasy, who has been a field biologist in remote parts of Africa and Madagascar, and published in international and Australian scientific journals.

Item 4-16

Dr. Tony Burns expressed skepticism of man-made global warming. "The common viewpoint is that man-made carbon dioxide is to blame, but the Earth has been through ice ages and periods of global warming for millions of years," Burns wrote in an April 2006 essay. "As recently as 1,000 years ago, the Earth was a

degree warmer in the 'Medieval Warm Period' and the Vikings could grow crops in Greenland," Burns explained. "No one questions how this could happen so many years before our recent fuel consumption excesses. No one questions why man-made carbon dioxide would have any effect on global warming when it constitutes less than 1 percent of greenhouse gases (the major greenhouse gas is water vapor).

No one questions the recent Antarctic ice cores from Dome Concordia, with ice up to 700,000 years old, which show increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide concentration occurring about 1,000 years after global temperature rises, thus suggesting that high carbon dioxide levels are a result of global warming, not a cause," he added.

Burns decried the demonization of climate skeptics. "In 1633, opposition to the common viewpoint could mean death. This was the case with Galileo when he proposed that the Earth revolved around the sun. He was tried for heresy. Of course things are different today. People who question dogma are no longer burnt at the stake. Instead, they're branded as having suspect motives, as reactionaries or simply as nutcases," he concluded.

Chemical Engineer, Dr. Tony Burns of the University of New South Wales in Sydney, Australia.

Item 4-17

Dr. Patrick J. Michaels a **UN IPCC reviewer** called Gore's film "science fiction" in a February 23, 2007 article.

"The main point of [Gore's] movie is that, unless we do something very serious, very soon about carbon dioxide emissions, much of Greenland's 630,000 cubic miles of ice is going to fall into the ocean, raising sea levels over twenty feet by the year 2100," Michaels wrote. Michaels is a senior fellow in environmental studies at the Cato Institute and author of "Meltdown: The Predictable Distortion of Global Warming by Scientists, Politicians, and the Media."

Michaels continued, "Nowhere in the traditionally refereed scientific literature do we find any support for Gore's hypothesis. Instead, there's an un-refereed editorial by NASA climate firebrand James E. Hansen, in the journal *Climate Change* - edited by Steven Schneider, of Stanford University, who said in 1989 that scientists had to choose 'the right balance between being effective and honest' about global warming - and a paper in the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* that was only reviewed by one person, chosen by the author, again Dr. Hansen. These are the sources for the notion that we have only ten years to 'do' something immediately to prevent an institutionalized tsunami.

And given that Gore only conceived of his movie about two years ago, the real clock must be down to eight years! It would be nice if my colleagues would actually level with politicians about various 'solutions' for climate change. The Kyoto Protocol, if fulfilled by every signatory, would reduce global warming by 0.07 degrees Celsius per half-century."

Michaels lost his position as the VA State Climatologist after a clash with the state's Governor: "I was told that I could not speak in public," Michaels said in a September 29, 2007 Washington Post interview. Excerpt from article: "Michaels has argued that the climate is becoming warmer but that the consequences will not be as dire as others have predicted. Governor Kaine had warned Michaels not to use his official title in discussing his views. 'I resigned as Virginia state climatologist because I was told that I could not speak in public on my area of expertise, global warming, as state climatologist,' Michaels said in a statement this week provided by the libertarian Cato Institute, where he has been a fellow since 1992. 'It was impossible to maintain academic freedom with this speech restriction.'

Dr. Patrick J. Michaels, former Virginia State Climatologist, a [UN IPCC reviewer](#), and University of Virginia professor of environmental sciences.

Item 4-18

Climatologist, George Taylor, had his job title threatened by the state's Governor over his skeptical stance on man-made warming fears.

Excerpt from a February 8, 2007 article from KGW.com: "[State Climatologist George Taylor] does not believe human activities are the main cause of global climate change. So the [Oregon] governor wants to take that title from Taylor and make it a position that he would appoint. In an exclusive interview with KGW-TV, Governor Ted Kulongoski confirmed he wants to take that title from Taylor." The article quoted Taylor as stating: "Most of the climate changes we have seen up until now have been a result of natural variations."

Oregon State Climatologist, George Taylor of Oregon State University's College of Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences.

Item 4-19

"Just when you thought some common sense was back in schools with the return of core subjects history and geography, it turns out there may be new nonsense on the agenda. Apparently, the NSW Board of Studies is looking to introduce climate change classes for kindergarten to Year 6 children as part of its science and technology syllabus. At first glance, it sounds sensible. Climate change

could be a critical issue for our children, as well as for us. The problem, of course, is what they will be taught.

There are plenty of reasons for concern on this score. Adults have barely engaged in a grown-up conversation over the causes of global warming. Debate over the what, how, why, and when on global warming has been drowned out by hysteria. Global warming has been cleverly framed as the big moral issue of our time to quarantine it from debate.

Even conservative politicians shy away from suggesting scepticism because anyone who is a sceptic is labelled a denier. If you disagree with some of the science, and the religious fervour it has fuelled, or even evince a level of agnosticism towards it, you are not just wrong. You are a bad person forced to defend your integrity as well as your arguments. This is an old trick, but a good one. Given that stultifying atmosphere among adults, it is a stretch to imagine that classroom talk will be different.

A hint of what students might learn came a few weeks ago. My 13-year-old daughter returned home from school to tell me our house on the coast would be swamped by 6m of water. Al Gore's *An Inconvenient Truth* was compulsory viewing for Year 8 students at her Sydney school that day. Gore told her sea levels would rise 6m by 2100. And people are causing this horrible global warming, she said.

Fortunately, I had just read up on the latest report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and informed her that their worst-case scenario prediction is that sea levels may rise by 26-59cm. Hold back the hysteria, I said. Some eminent scientists are suggesting other reasons for global warming, I added. Indeed, some point to evidence that the world may undergo a global cooling. Curious about the climate change curriculum, I asked the school if the movie coincided with a follow-up lesson to enable students to discuss or even question the Gore message on global warming. No, came the answer. "So Gore was it?" I asked. Yes, said the teacher.

So you see why it's time to ask serious questions about what our children will be taught about this issue. It will, no doubt, start at the silly, harmless end. Keeping it simple for kindy kids, will they be treated to entreaties by pop star cum global warming guru Sheryl Crow? Crow is calling on people to use only one sheet of toilet paper per visit, rising to two or three for "those pesky occasions" as she writes on her blog.

Then it will get more serious. Perhaps older students will read an extract from the Nicholas Stern report on global warming and be introduced to the growing fad of food-miles. They might be told that kiwi fruit is a climate change culprit because flying 1kg of kiwi fruit from New Zealand to Europe translates into 5kg of carbon being discharged into the atmosphere. Given the dumbed-down nature of other parts of the school curriculum, perhaps climate change lessons will involve

excursions to the local supermarket where children, armed with a food miles calculator, will add up the environmental impact of food travelling long distances to our shops.

Don't laugh. British organisation Carboninfo.org has developed a software package to do just that because "it is essential that people are able to make informed choices about buying food and the effect on the environment of moving food around the planet". Echoing that call, Tesco supermarkets in Britain are making the exercise easier with its plan to introduce a carbon count on their products - little stickers that will allow you to spot the products that, as the Environmental News Network suggests, "only a carbon criminal would dare take ... to the checkout". Tesco is also planning to halve the amount of air freighted fresh produce - a good green initiative that our own supermarkets ought to follow, the students might be told.

Children might then be taught that individual action is all well and good. By all means, count your food miles - but governments must also do something to save the planet. Friends of the Earth might pop up in the curriculum with their demand that we need tougher policies to stop out-of-town stores to put an end to car-based shopping. They want government-funded schemes to ensure local and regional food supplies. Governments must, they say, get tougher to reduce food miles. Like Earth Hour, when Sydneysiders were asked to turn off the lights, there is a certain child-like appeal to these think global, act local campaigns.

But unlike flicking a light switch, the focus on food miles provides a number of lessons on what is wrong with many of the reactions to the global warming hysteria - lessons unlikely to make it into the classroom. Will students, for example, be told that poor African farmers will be the real victims of conscientious Westerners looking to reduce their food miles? When buying local produce is promoted as good, buying foreign food must be bad. And, as the BBC reported earlier this year, that is bad news for countries such as Kenya where horticulture is second only to tourism as the biggest foreign exchange earner. We rightly encourage poor countries to build up their economies and sell their wares to rich, Western countries. Now they are being punished for doing so all in the name of global warming. Will students be asked to consider that?

Indeed, of all the reasons to be sceptical of the climate change agenda is the way it is coalescing with the anti-globalisation, anti-capitalism movements. Will students be asked to reflect on whether food miles is a new form of old-fashioned protectionism dressed up in the alluring language of global warming? Unlikely.

Which brings us back to the core problem. Making students aware of climate change is necessary. Infusing hysteria is downright dangerous. If we do not encourage students to debate, dare one say, to be sceptical about global warming, we risk creating a generation that will demand policy responses that end up causing more harm than good. Even worse, they will be denied the essence of a good

education - recognising uncertainty, challenging assumptions and asking questions in the quest for the truth.

An article by Janet Albrechtsen, *The Australian*, 2May07.

Item 4-20

Senator Inhofe slams DiCaprio and Laurie David for scaring kids in a two-hour Senate speech debunking climate fears Senator James Inhofe (R-OK), Ranking Member of the Environment and Public Works Committee, delivered a more than two-hour floor speech today debunking fears of man-made global warming. Below is an excerpt of his remarks about how Hollywood, led by Leonardo DiCaprio and Laurie David, has promoted unfounded climate fears to children.

"We are currently witnessing an international awakening of scientists who are speaking out in opposition to former Vice President Al Gore, the United Nations, the Hollywood elitists, and the media-driven "consensus" on man-made global warming. We have witnessed Antarctic ice **grow** to record levels since satellite monitoring began in the 1970's. We have witnessed NASA temperature data errors that have made 1934 - not 1998 - the hottest year on record in the U.S. We have seen global averages temperatures flat line since 1998 and the Southern Hemisphere cool in recent years. These new developments in just the last six months are but a sample of the new information coming out that continues to debunk climate alarm. But before we delve into these dramatic new scientific developments, it is important to take note of our pop culture propaganda campaign aimed at children.

In addition to Gore's entry last year into Hollywood fictional disaster films, other celebrity figures have attempted to jump into the game. Hollywood activist Leonardo DiCaprio decided to toss objective scientific truth out the window in his new scarefest "The 11th Hour." DiCaprio refused to interview any scientists who disagreed with his dire vision of the future of the Earth. In fact, his film reportedly features physicist Stephen Hawking making the unchallenged assertion that "the worst-case scenario is that Earth would become like its sister planet, Venus, with a temperature of 250 [degrees] centigrade."

I guess these "worst-case scenarios" pass for science in Hollywood these days. It also fits perfectly with DiCaprio's stated purpose of the film. DiCaprio said on May 20th of this year: "I want the public to be very scared by what they see. I want them to see a very bleak future While those who went to watch DiCaprio's science fiction film may see his intended "bleak future," it is DiCaprio who has been scared by the bleak box office numbers, as his film has failed to generate any significant audience interest. Children are now the number one target of the global warming fear campaign. DiCaprio announced his goal was to recruit young eco-

activists to the cause. "We need to get kids young," DiCaprio said in a September 20 interview with USA Weekend.

Hollywood activist Laurie David, Gore's co-producer of "An Inconvenient Truth" recently co-authored a children's global warming book with Cambria Gordon for Scholastic Books titled, *The Down-To-Earth Guide to Global Warming*. David has made it clear that her goal is to influence young minds with her new book when she spoke at the release of her book. Apparently, David and other activists are getting frustrated by the widespread skepticism on climate as reflected in both the U.S. and the UK according to the latest polls.

It appears the alarmists are failing to convince adults to believe their increasingly shrill and scientifically unfounded rhetoric, so they have decided kids are an easier sell. But David should worry less about recruiting young activists and more about scientific accuracy. A science group found what it called a major "scientific error" in David's new kid's book on page 18. According to a Science and Public Policy Institute release on September 13:

"The authors [David and Gordon] present unsuspecting children with an altered temperature and CO₂ graph that reverses the relationship found in the scientific literature. The manipulation is critical because David's central premise posits that CO₂ drives temperature, yet the peer-reviewed literature is unanimous that CO₂ changes have historically followed temperature changes." David has now been forced to publicly admit this significant scientific error in her book.

A Canadian high school student named McKenzie was shown Gore's climate horror film in four different classes. "I really don't understand why they keep showing it," McKenzie said on May 19, 2007.

In June, a fourth grade class from Portland Maine's East End Community School issued a dire climate report: "Global warming is a huge pending global disaster" read the elementary school kids' report according to an article in the Portland Press Herald on June 14, 2007. Remember, these are fourth graders issuing a dire global warming report. And this agenda of indoctrination and fear aimed at children is having an impact.

Nine year old Alyssa Luz-Ricca was quoted in the Washington Post on April 16, 2007 as saying: "I worry about [global warming] because I don't want to die." The same article explained: "Psychologists say they're seeing an increasing number of young patients preoccupied by a climactic Armageddon." I was told by the parent of an elementary school kid last spring who said her daughter was forced to watch "An Inconvenient Truth" once a month at school and had nightmares about drowning in the film's predicted scary sea level rise.

The Hollywood global-warming documentary "Arctic Tale" ends with a child actor telling kids: "If your mom and dad buy a hybrid car, you'll make it easier for

polar bears to get around." Unfortunately, children are hearing the scientifically unfounded doomsday message loud and clear. But the message kids are receiving is not a scientific one, it is a political message designed to create fear, nervousness and ultimately recruit them to liberal activism.

There are a few hopeful signs. A judge in England has ruled that schools must issue a warning before they show Gore's film to children because of scientific inaccuracies and "sentimental mush". In addition, there is a new kids book called "The Sky's Not Falling! - Why It's OK to Chill About Global Warming." The book counters the propaganda from the pop culture.

A speech by Senator Inhofe in the US Senate 2008.
