

SILENCING THE CRITICS

“In my opinion, these CEOs should be tried for high crimes against humanity and nature. Conviction of ExxonMobil and Peabody Coal CEOs will be no consolation if we pass on a runaway climate to our children.”

NASA Scientist James Hansen

Introduction

In this section of the website, we have seen appalling misbehaviour of many groups in our society. The most unsettling is the very poor behaviour of scientists – a group that we would normally revere.

The worst of this behaviour are the attempts - often successful – to silence any opposing views or criticism of their science. If their science was solid, they would proudly put it on display for replication and would challenge anyone to find fault in their work. They do neither.

However, as we have seen in the first page of this website, there is no solid science or logic that forms the basis of the campaign about catastrophic global warming. This might be the reason for their misbehaviour, but it certainly is not an excuse for it.

The Different Ways to Silence Critics.

Universities use to encourage openness and show a tolerance of a variety of views, encouraging robust debate on all issues. Those days are gone, with academic freedom and freedom of speech under attack in most universities. Popular and irrational positions are taken on any issue and any dissent must be crushed.

Today we see professors and other academics in prestigious universities attacking critics demanding they should be,

- Shot,
- Institutionalised,
- Drugged so they could no longer converse with anyone,
- Have their houses burnt down,
- Treated as criminals and brought before “Climate Courts”,
- Stop their promotion,
- Remove their research funding,
- Stop publishing houses and prestigious scientific magazines from publishing their work,
- Threaten their tenure,
- Ostracize them, vilify them, and take some very childish actions to punish any misdemeanour,
- Any indication of not supporting the cause is punished, and finally

- Sack them from their jobs.

These are effective threats to silence their critics, especially against young scientists who are just beginning their careers. Those that resist, suffer the worst and a very clear message is sent “You must toe the party line and support our view, or you will be harshly punished”.

A Potpourri of Examples.

Example 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

Example 2

September 29, 2007: Virginia State Climatologist skeptical of global warming loses his job after clashing with the 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, and as the state’s 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.**

Example 3

Disturbing Report: 'Green Prof. Calls for Drugging of Climate Skeptics' EFG-BN, April 3, 2012

The globalists are moving quickly to develop their final plans to transition the world into a one world form of governance. Those who are conservative in thinking or reject the notion of global warning and climate change are now being marked as mentally defective human beings who need treatment and medication.

As you listen to this report, you will find it hard to believe, but top US University scientists are actually supporting this reality based on fraudulent research.

Example

Back to Parncutt:

"ACTION is urgently needed. We are in a very real sense talking about something similar to the end of the world. . . . Much more would have happened by now if not for the GW deniers . . . I have always been opposed to the death penalty in all cases . . . Even mass murderers should not be executed, in my opinion (but) GW deniers fall into a completely different category . . . They are already causing the deaths of hundreds of millions of future people. We could be speaking of billions, but I am making a conservative estimate . . . I wish to claim that it is generally OK to kill someone in order to save one million people . . . That raises the interesting question of whether and how the Pope and his closest advisers should be punished for their consistent stand against contraception in the form of condoms . . . We are talking about millions of deaths, so according to the principle I have proposed, the Pope and perhaps some of his closest advisers should be sentenced to death . . . In such a trial, ignorance of scientific research would be no excuse . . . Here is a scenario for what might happen if my argument is broadly accepted . . . The universal declaration of human rights and every national constitution would be amended to include the rights of future generations . . . The proposed legal change would be announced . . . During that time, GW deniers would have a chance to change their ways and escape punishment.

The police would start to identify the most influential GW deniers who had not responded to the changed legal situation. These individuals would then be charged and brought to justice. If a jury of suitably qualified scientists estimated that a given GW denier had already, with high probability (say 95 per cent), caused the deaths of over one million future people, then s/he would be sentenced to death . . . Right now, in the year 2012, these ideas will seem quite crazy to most people . . . (But) If someone found this document in the year 2050 and

published it, it would find general support and admiration . . . Who knows, perhaps the Pope would even turn me into a saint."

Example

Science paper doubts IPCC, so whole journal gets terminated!



In extraordinary news, the scientific journal *Pattern Recognition in Physics* has been unexpectedly terminated, a “drastic decision” taken just ten months after it started.

The publisher appears to be shocked that in a recent special issue the scientists expressed doubt about the accelerated warming predicted by the IPCC. For the crime of not bowing before the sacred tabernacle, apparently the publishers suddenly felt the need to distance themselves, and in the most over-the-top way. The reasons they gave had nothing to do with the data, the logic, and they cite no errors. There can be no mistake, this is about enforcing a permitted line of thought.

I must say, it's a brilliant (if a tad expensive) way to draw attention to a scientific paper. It's the Barbara-Streisland moment in science. Forget “withdrawn”, forget “retracted”, the new line in the sand is to write a paper so hot they have to terminate the whole journal! Skeptics could hardly come up with a more electric publicity campaign.

Naturally, as with all good Barbara Streisland moves intended to suppress information, as soon as I heard, the first thing I did was to seek out and download copies of all the papers. Right now, people everywhere would be starting to do the same, curious to know what could be so unsayable.

In the official announcement the excuses are amazingly transparent. There is little attempt to cover up the reasons. The publisher pays the usual lip service saying

science needs disputes and discussion of controversial topics. But some things are apparently too awful to contemplate — like pointing out how the high priests of the IPCC might be incorrect.

Example

The science on global warming is settled, so settled that 20 climate scientists are asking President Barack Obama to prosecute people who disagree with them on the science behind man-made global warming.

Scientists from several universities and research centres even [asked Obama to use the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act \(RICO\)](#) to prosecute groups that “have knowingly deceived the American people about the risks of climate change, as a means to forestall America’s response to climate change.”

RICO was a law designed to take down organized crime syndicates, but scientists now want it to be used against scientists, activists and organizations that voice their disagreement with the so-called “consensus” on global warming. The scientists repeated claims made by environmentalists that groups, especially those with ties to fossil fuels, have engaged in a misinformation campaign to confuse the public on global warming.

“The actions of these organizations have been extensively documented in peer-reviewed academic research and in recent books,” the scientists wrote.

Example

This year has been a trying one for global warming skeptics. Earlier this year, Democratic lawmakers [began an investigation](#) into scientists who disagreed with the White House’s stance on global warming. Many of these skeptical scientists were often cited by those critical of regulations to curb greenhouse gas emissions.

Arizona Democratic Rep. Raul Grijalva went after universities employing these researchers, which [resulted in one expert](#) being forced to get out of the field of climate research altogether.

“I am simply not initiating any new research or papers on the topic and I have ring-fenced my slowly diminishing blogging on the subject,” Dr. Roger Pielke Jr. of the University of Colorado [wrote](#) on his blog.

“Congressman Grijalva doesn’t have any evidence of any wrongdoing on my part, either ethical or legal, because there is none,” Pielke wrote. “He simply disagrees with the substance of my testimony – which is based on peer-reviewed research funded by the US taxpayer, and which also happens to be the consensus of the IPCC”

Example

LAST month in this newspaper, I wrote an irreverent piece, "Losing Their Religion as Evidence Cools Off", illustrating how the global warming establishment was like a religion, replete with the structure, scripture and financial resources required to promote a faith-based movement and how it is losing disciples as the truth wears off.

I don't know about other readers, but at the ABC, for those with the religion it hit a nerve.

On November 24, Robyn Williams intoned to his audience on ABC's The Science Show, *"if I told you that paedophilia is good for children, or asbestos is an excellent inhalant for those with asthma, or that smoking crack is a normal part and a healthy one of teenage life, you'd rightly find it outrageous. Similar statements are coming out of inexpert mouths again and again, distorting the science"*. My article was given as an example of an anti-scientific position.

Really? Questioning climate science is like advocating paedophilia, abetting mesothelioma, and pushing drugs to teenagers? Well yes, according to the ABC's science man. Stephan Lewandowsky, a guest on the program, asserted that those with a free market background were, according to his research, more likely to be sceptical of science. As well as climate science, *"they are also rejecting the link between smoking and lung cancer; they are rejecting the link between HIV and AIDS"*, the professor said. Happily, it was extremely difficult to detect people on the "Left side of politics who are rejecting scientific evidence".

Williams confirmed that after "a learned lecture" by one of the world's most famous scientists, bankers remained unconvinced.

So, there you have it. No more proof needed. Free marketers, bankers and science contrarians are simply despicable flat earthers. Best to keep away from them.

Example

Another case of "[hide the decline](#)" - warmist scientists stifling evidence questioning dangerous man-made warming. And it seems this whistle blower is a prominent warmist scientist who turned sceptic and was last week **so threatened by warmists** that he had to quit the board of a sceptic organisation:

[Research which heaped doubt on the rate of global warming was deliberately suppressed by scientists because it was "less than helpful" to their cause](#), it was claimed last night.

In an echo of the infamous "Climategate" scandal at the University of East Anglia, one of the world's top academic journals rejected the work of five experts after a reviewer privately denounced it as "harmful"...

Professor [Lennart] Bengtsson's paper challenged the finding of the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) that the global average

temperature would rise by up to 4.5C if greenhouse gases in the atmosphere were allowed to double.

It suggested that the climate might be much less sensitive to greenhouse gases than had been claimed by the IPCC in its report last September and recommended that more work be carried out “to reduce the underlying uncertainty”.

The five contributing scientists, from America and Sweden, submitted the paper to Environmental Research Letters, one of the most highly regarded journals, at the end of last year but were told in February that it had been rejected.

A scientist asked by the journal to assess the paper under the peer review process wrote that he strongly advised against publishing it because it was “less than helpful”.

The unnamed scientist concluded: *“Actually it is harmful as it opens the door for oversimplified claims of ‘errors’ and worse from the climate sceptics media side.”*

Example

Yes, warmist Steve Zwick said this in *Forbes* magazine!

Zwick: “We know who the active denialists are – not the people who buy the lies, mind you, but the people who create the lies. Let’s start keeping track of them now, and when the famines come, let’s make them pay. Let’s let their houses burn. Let’s swap their safe land for submerged islands. Let’s force them to bear the cost of rising food prices. They broke the climate. Why should the rest of us have to pay for it?”

Looks like old-fashioned Soviet purge techniques to me.

If “skeptics” said something like this, we’d be thrown in jail as terrorists. This kind of intimidation is inexcusable. What in the hell is *Forbes* doing, giving coverage to this sort of tripe?

Example

With [NASA scientists disputing](#) their global-warming mantra, with the [Bering Sea setting new records](#) for the most ice in recorded history, with [polar bears](#) and [penguins](#) thriving, and with [Himalayan glaciers growing bigger](#), global-warming alarmists have apparently decided to become more aggressive against anyone who dares question their twisted beliefs.

Just last month, Professor Kari Norgaard of the University of Oregon called for climate skeptics to be likened to racists and [‘treated’ for having a mental disorder](#). *“Resistance at individual and societal levels must be recognized and treated,”* yelled Norgaard.

Norgaard has also [urged Obama to act like a dictator](#), virtually suspend democracy, ignore public sentiment, and enforce climate change mandates by executive fiat.

This is scary! I hope the American public rebels against these sorts of terror tactics.

Example

Oxfam's fantasy 'climate court' is both prescient and practical

Guardian.co.uk, 4Dec10

Over a thousand legal experts, politicians and economists gathered in Dhaka this week to explore routes to justice for the victims of climate criminals – and found that precedents exist



Oxfam's alliance on Economic Justice called climate criminals to account in a prototype climate court at a Dhaka conference this week. Photograph: CSRL

Imagine an international court where the poorest people in the world could sue countries such as the US or Britain for failing to keep to agreements to reduce climate emissions or for knowingly causing devastating [climate change](#).

It's some way off, but this week has seen an extraordinary tribunal being held in Dhaka, the capital of [Bangladesh](#), with more than 1,200 people including British lawyers, politicians and economists, listening to the testimonies of villagers living at the frontline of climate change.

It was only a mock tribunal, organised by Oxfam, but it explored the growing idea that the largest carbon emitters should be bound by international law to protect the lives and livelihoods of those most at risk from the impacts of climate change.

Rushanara Ali, the newly elected MP for Bethnal Green and Bow, who is already shadow minister for international development, was there along with Richard Lord QC, who will be looking at the legislation that is available for affected countries to pursue.

The stories the tribunal heard were heartbreaking. Mamtaz, one of four plaintiffs, wanted to know who was legally responsible for her fisherman husband's death. She and others testified that the seas off Bangladesh are now rougher more often and that boats were capsized more frequently in the increasingly stormy weather. Barek Majhi, a fisherman, told the tribunal how his three trawlers had sunk and ruined his means of making a living.

The cries for climate justice are growing stronger by the day. In Latin America, President Evo Morales has formally proposed to the UN that an International Court of Climate Justice is established. It would have the capacity to restrain, prosecute and punish states, companies, and people who, by act or omission, make major contributions to climate change.

Support at the [World People's Conference on Climate Change](#) in April has come from tens of thousands of people, including Miguel D'Escoto, a former president of the United Nations, and Adolfo Pérez Esquivel, who won a 1980 Nobel peace prize.

Of interest to Oxfam and even the UN could be a new paper from Field, the London-based [Foundation for International Environmental Law & Development](#). This shows how there are many existing laws and principles available for states to sue one another for damage caused by climate change, and how this could pressure nations into stronger international action.

Top of the list was the "no-harm rule", a widely recognised principle of customary international law, which Field's lawyers say is directly applicable to climate change.

Under the principle, nations are bound to prevent, reduce and control the risk of environmental harm to other nations. The classic example of this was litigation over trans-national air pollution between Canada and the United States, where Canada was forced to compensate the US for damage caused by sulphur dioxide emissions.

Meanwhile, senior academics, judges, and lawmakers from around the world are backing the International Court for the Environment. It would be an over-arching global institution that would provide improved access to justice following incidents of environmental damage and breaches of international treaties, and would, exclusively, sit above – and adjudicate on – disputes arising out of UN environmental treaties, such as 1992's Convention on Biological Diversity and its Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Kyoto protocol.

The Left is the natural home of the modern totalitarian - and of all those who feel entitled by their superior morality to act as savages.

Example

How the ACT Government justify spending taxpayers' money on a theatre work entitled "[Kill Climate Deniers](#)"?

2015 ACT Arts Fund successful applicants

Project Funding

The Project Funding round is offered once a year and presents the ACT community with the opportunity to propose one-off arts activities.

Successful 2015 Project Funding applicants were announced in September 2014. Below is a list of successful applicants by name in alphabetical order, or click here for an easy-to-read table of [2015 Project Funding successful applicants](#) (PDF 144KB)



- A Chorus of Women: \$24,990 to assist with costs of performances of a community oratorio 'A Passion for Peace'.
- Art Song Canberra Inc: \$6,713 to assist with costs of presenting art song concerts, classes and events.
- ArtSpace: \$15,600 to assist with costs of a creative development project with artists living with disability.
- Aspen Island Theatre Company: \$18,793 to assist with costs of the creative development of a new theatre work, '[Kill Climate Deniers](#)'.

What sane Government donates to a project urging others to kill fellow citizens, even as a "joke"? Are these people mad?

Showing that they were not hypocrites, would they spend an equal amount on the follow titled plays.

- Kill Muslims,
- Kill refugees,
- Kill lesbians and homosexuals,
- Kill blacks,
- Kill aborigines,
- Kill single mothers,
- Kill boat people, or
- Kill pensioners

Of course they would, because they are tolerant and inclusive! But they are not doing it to date.

Example

Resistance at individual and societal levels must be recognized and treated before real action can be taken to effectively address threats facing the planet from human-caused contributions to climate change.

That's the message to this week's Planet Under Pressure Conference by a group of speakers led by Kari Marie Norgaard, professor of sociology and environmental studies at the University of Oregon. In a news briefing today, Norgaard discussed her paper and issues her group will address in a session Wednesday, March 28.

Warmism has become a religion, and Oregon is its spiritual capital, so this would-be priestess of the cult calling for unbelievers to be brainwashed fits a pattern seen before in history.

The pride of the Department of Sociology continues: "*Climate change poses a massive threat to our present social, economic and political order. From a sociological perspective, resistance to change is to be expected,*" she said. "*People are individually and collectively habituated to the ways we act and think. This habituation must be recognized and simultaneously addressed at the individual, cultural and societal level - how we think the world works and how we think it should work.*"

"*We have to address the way people think, the ways they are habituated to act. Collectively, naturally.*" Then goes on to advocate that Deniers should be drugged so they cannot influence any other member of society.

Example

This notion of groupthink in the scientific profession is reinforced by Anne Glover, appointed in 2011 to give the European Commission with independent scientific advice. She found "*countless examples*" of confirmatory bias driving policy and that there was "*little incentive to produce evidence that contradicts the commission's political agenda*".

Then there was the treatment of Danish physics professor Henrik Svensmark. His controlled experiments using the Large Hadron Collider confirmed his thesis that the sun was the dominant influence on climate (his CLOUD Cosmic ray experiment). Having been delayed for two years, the results were deliberately downplayed.

British science writer Nigel Calder alerted us to this when the director-general of CERN, a Geneva-based European collaboration, apparently worried by the clear inferences to be drawn from a "CLOUD" cosmic ray experiment, warned that interpretations should be politically correct about climate change.

Calder observed: "*The implication was that they should on no account address Danish heresy — Henrik Svensmark's hypothesis that most of the global warming of the 20th century can be explained by the reduction in cosmic rays due to livelier solar activity.*" If people this close to the epicentre are questioning climate research, should we too not be curious?

How many lesser careers have been derailed and projects unfunded because they deviated from the authorised narrative?

Example

Mike Thompson who dissented from the view of a man-made climate crisis in 2008, talks about Dr Gray.

"*[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.

Example

The world is also suspicious of the constant politicisation of science and the attacks meted out to anyone who dares to question the official line. It is asking how personal abuse and the resort to authority and slogans can substitute for reasoned scientific debate.

It is disgusted by the vicious attacks on award-winning Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change author and distinguished scientist Lennart Bengtsson, the Swedish meteorologist.

For not toeing the party line and for saying climate change *"is so complex that one cannot ask the people to be convinced that the whole economic system must be changed just because you have done some computer simulations"*, he has faced extraordinary group pressure and bullying, including colleagues withdrawing from joint authorship. He has feared for his health and safety.

Example

A few years ago, a young lady I know, teaching in a top environmental engineering program at a top university, was approaching her tenure review. She had a solid record of published peer reviewed technical papers on subjects having little to do with climate, and strong teaching evaluations. But she had written one

newspaper op-ed expressing skepticism about one aspect of the climate change narrative that came squarely in her field of special expertise. This was enough for some faculty to argue her tenure should be denied.

If you know anything about science departments in leading universities, they are desperate for women faculty. (At MIT, I am told the science departments are to look *first* for a woman for every new faculty vacancy. Unofficially, of course, since an explicit policy like this would be illegal.) Armed with this leverage, I told my friend that she should march into the dean's office and tell him bluntly; *"If you want to give in to this crap, go right ahead. I'm sure if I start calling around at lunchtime, I can get five offers by the end of the day from other universities."*

I don't know if she spoke to the dean thusly, but she got her tenure.

Example

Then there is Caleb Rossiter, Democratic congressional candidate, climate statistician and an adjunct professor at the American University in Washington, DC. He had his fellowship with a progressive US think tank withdrawn because in an opinion piece for *The Wall Street Journal* he warned about *"unproved science"* and wrote: *"The IPCC uses tricks that scientists and statisticians rage about, almost like a mimicking of the classic text, 'How to lie with statistics'"*.

"For example, the IPCC claims a '90 per cent certainty' in its attribution of the warming of the last 50 years to human causes. All scientists know that using this phrase implies a statistical test using random data leaving only a 10 per cent chance that the conclusion is incorrect. But there is no testing and there are no statistics involved in the IPCC statement — just a number pulled out of thin air as a self assessment."

Example

Speaking of the Australian climate-science community, the American blogger Brandon Shollenberger has managed to attract the attention of the University of Queensland. I don't know much about Mr Shollenberger except that he thinks [Michael E Mann has a case against me and the case ought to be permitted to go to trial](#). (Shollenberger rests this belief on the quaint assumption that Mann has been "cleared" by ["eight different investigations"](#)).

Latterly, Brandon Shollenberger has been exploring a paper that purports to "prove" that there's a 97 per cent consensus in climate science in favor of "climate change". Like [Steve McIntyre](#), I'm not terribly bothered about the "97 per cent consensus" thing myself. Aside from the climate of fear Mann & his fellow Warmanos have ushered in, there seems to be a fair element of genuine groupthink at work. Indeed, the very idea of scientists conducting scientific research to determine scientifically that 97 per cent of scientists agree on the science is itself a bizarre example thereof. The notion of an organization called "Skeptical Science"

launching something called "[The Consensus Project](#)" is either Orwellian or beyond parody, according to taste.

But the story of what happened to Shollenberger when he attempted to dig into the so-called data behind the 97 per cent reveals, as do Mann's multiple lawsuits and the Lennart Bengtsson hockey-sticking, the peculiar insecurity of this rock-solid consensus. Somebody called Jane Malloch, who describes herself as "a solicitor for the University of Queensland", has sent Shollenberger a cease-&-desist letter. Indeed, it's such a forceful cease-&-desist letter that Ms Malloch demands he cease-&-desist from telling anyone about her cease-&-desist letter:

The University of Queensland owns the copyright in this letter, and you are advised that any publication by you of this letter, or persons acting in concert with you, will constitute an infringement of The University's copyright. The University of Queensland reserves its right to take any and all legal action against any person, including you, who publishes this letter.

Well, naturally, I take such legal threats extremely seriously, so I've published the entire letter [here](#). If Ms Malloch wants to have me served or perform a citizen's arrest, I'll be appearing live in Brisbane later this year on my Oz tour and will gladly hold a couple of seats for her.

Example

Such is the power of political correctness, [The Australian](#) August 13, 2011
12:00AM

THE mainstream media are fond of telling us that the scientific debate is over, global warming is real, and we should give all our money to Julia Gillard so she can use it to build windfarms or whatever. They seem not to have heard that the business is plagued with uncertainty.

The uncertainty is not about the existence of global warming as such. Rather, it's about whether the warming will be significant over any time-scale of reasonable concern to the present-day public. It's about whether the impact will in any event be noticeable amid the normal ups and downs of human activity. It's about whether the impact will be good, bad or indifferent overall, and if it's bad, whether it will be sufficiently bad to justify expensive present action to limit carbon emissions. Sufficiently bad, that is, when compared with the unknown future-discounted costs of adaptation.

Presumably the media are influenced by the fact that knowledgeable climate researchers don't say much in public about uncertainties. Funny that. I attended a climate conference a couple of years ago where there was a lot of argument about uncertainties in the science. The chairman, in his summary of the proceedings, expressed relief that there were no reporters in the audience who might seize upon the discord to destroy the public's belief in impending climatic disaster. One has to assume that he simply couldn't hear what he was saying.

I have lost count of the number of times that climate scientists of my acquaintance have expressed a doubt about something to do with global warming, and quickly followed up with a plea, "*For goodness sake, don't tell anyone I said that*". Their hearing of themselves isn't too good either.

And one very respectable scientist in the game recently told me that he was getting worried because some of his colleagues were beginning to suspect he was a closet sceptic. Such is the power of political correctness.

Professor Garth Paltridge, Sandy Bay, Tas

Example

Now the Vatican is adopting the same secretive, totalitarian, inquisition tactics.

Its Pontifical Academy of Sciences recently [held a workshop](#) on climate change and [sustainability](#). But only religious leaders, scientists, bureaucrats and regulators who support alarmist perspectives on these issues were invited. Those with contrary views were neither invited, welcomed nor tolerated.

But when [Climate Depot](#) director Marc Morano tried to ask UN Secretary General to advise Pope Francis that many Catholics and other Christians believe the papal position on global warming is ill-advised, a security guard took Morano's microphone away and told him, "*control yourself, or you will be escorted out of here.*" Apostates have no rights here.

Example

Our scientific method and traditions of free speech and open debate are under assault as never before, by intolerant inquisitors in our media, universities, government agencies, and even Congress and the Vatican.

They threaten our most basic rights and freedoms, our political and scientific processes – and ultimately our continued innovation and invention, energy reliability and affordability, job creation and economic growth, and modern living standards, health, and welfare.

Congressman Grijalva and Senators Markey, Boxer and Whitehouse [sent letters](#) to universities, think tanks and companies, demanding detailed information on sceptics' funding and activities – in an attempt to destroy their funding, reputations and careers, while advancing "[crony climate alarm science](#)"

Example

Richard Tol's resignation last May from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change is harder to dismiss.

As the 20th most-cited climate scholar in the world, he was part of the team that prepared the draft of the Summary for Policy Makers to the Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) Working Group 11. He claims: "*The panel is directed from within the environmental lobby and not from within the science.*" He says that "*after the debacle of AR4 where the Himalayan glacier melt really was the least of the errors*", he had criticised the IPCC for "*faulty quality control*".

He believes that "*many of the more worrying impacts of climate change really are symptoms of mismanagement and under development*". This message, he says, does not support the political agenda for greenhouse gas emission reduction.

Tol says: "*The IPCC does not guard itself against selection bias and group think.*" Tol's frank insider assessment of the IPCC suggests that rather than accept its authority we should apply caution and curiosity.

Example

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.

Example

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.

Example

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 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.*

Example

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.

Example

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.

Example

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 flood and drought risk and seasonal climate prediction.

Example

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.

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

Example

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. *"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. Pity the politicians who (we presume) are trying their best to make an informed decision on the matter".*

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.

Example

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 supporting 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.

Example

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.

Example

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.

Example

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 lusty 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.

Example

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 so-bad 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.

Example

James Cook University slapdown of Great Barrier Reef science critic heads to court

A Case of Collateral Damage



James Cook University Professor Peter Ridd in Townsville. Picture: Cameron Laird

Professor Peter Ridd had worked for the James Cook University (JCU) for more than three decades and was the former Head of Physics at the university. He cares deeply for the Great Barrier Reef (GBR) and the environment more generally. He is a past president of Townsville's Wildlife Preservation Society.

Ridd has an extraordinary wide and deep knowledge of the Great Barrier Reef, having studied it for three and a half decades and supervised dozens of PhD students on reef related topics. He has invented instruments that provide unique insights into aspects of the GBR water quality and has published more than 100 peer reviewed technical articles on the GBR and other topics.

So why did the university sack him. In short, for behaving like a professional scientist.

Over a period of years, Ridd became aware of the rapidly falling standards of science generally and, in particular, within his university. He brought this to the attention of the managers of the university, so the falling standards could be reversed. Nothing was done, but apparently that was his sin.

Ridd pointed out that "*The science is coming out not properly checked, tested or replicated, and this is a great shame.*" This was a good example of poor quality

assurance in science that has now being identified in the Replication Crisis. (See the first section of this webpage; <https://greenfacts.net.au/blog/misbehaviour-page-6/>).

Peter Ridd would still have his job today if his criticism of the science involved any science other than science connected to man-made catastrophic global warming. To challenge anything connected with this new age religion, will result in you being described as a “demented denier” and you will need to be crushed.

And so Ridd was to be crushed.

Sacking Ridd was easy – although taking three years 2015-2018 - because the university’s management were not only the “prosecutors but also the Judge”. However, when Ridd took the University to court for unfair dismissal, the legalities became messy. His employment contract had two clauses with no clear direction of which clause took priority.

Clause 13 dealt with a Code of Conduct and the university believed it had precedence over clause 14. Clause 13, in short, required Ridd to,

- Act in a collegial way and in the academic spirit.
- Respecting the reputation of other colleagues, and
- Uphold the integrity and good reputation of the university

Interpreting the first two bullet points was subjective and could be considered as “*Don’t hurt the feelings of your colleagues*”. The last bullet point could be interpreted a little more objectively.

Clause 14 detailed how JCU would protect and promote intellectual freedom. In particular;

- Pursue critical and open inquiry,
- Participate in public debate and express opinions about issues and ideas related to their respective fields of competence, and
- Express opinions about the operations of JCU and higher education policy more generally.

In 2019, the Federal Circuit Court found in favour of Ridd. JCU appealed the decision. In 2020, the Full Court of the Federal Court found in favour of JCU. Ridd appealed the decision. In 2021, the High Court of Australia has heard the appeal and is yet to make a decision.

Put yourself in Ridd’s position as he tries to protect the good name of science. The following quotes explains his aim. Remember Ridd had little interest in the global warming issue and has become collateral damage in this emotional war.

He hoped the court action would “*draw attention to the quality assurance problems in science and the obligation of universities in general to genuinely foster debate, argument and the clash of ideas*”.

“I think it is right to challenge our science institutions about whether their work is reliable and trustworthy,” he said.

How does any scientist attempt to repair the damage to science caused by the “Replication Crisis”?

“I think that most of the scientists who are pushing out this stuff — they genuinely believe that there are problems with the reef; I just don’t think they’re very objective about the science they do, I think they’re emotionally attached to their subject.” Not helping them is their science cannot be replicated!

Like most commentators on the Replication Crisis, Ridd stated, “We can no longer trust the scientific organisations like the Australian Institute of Marine Science, even things like the ARC Centre of Excellence for Coral Reef Studies.” By mentioning these organisations by name, JCU considered his action as *“attacking the integrity and good reputation of the university.”*

If the science is very poor and the reputation of the university has been built on this poor science, then the integrity and good reputation of the university does need to be attack if the university refuses to remedy the situation.

Obviously if the science is good and the university has a good reputation then Ridd is wrong. However, Ridd, like most other sceptics, cannot get Green scientists or followers engaged in any conversation about their differences. He is met with silence and then vitriolically attacked.

Some say for the obvious reason – their position and science supporting it is indefensible – as any science supporting any Armageddon story would be!