

# **Restructuring of the Global Economy: The Role of Climate Alarmism**

**Robert Halliman  
Austin Peay State University  
College of Health & Behavioral Sciences  
Department of Leadership and  
Organization Administration**

*Is the Restructuring of the Global Economy (ROGE) needed or is it part of a U. N. master plan? The evidence indicates that it is a U.N. master plan using global warming/climate change alarmism as the vehicle to accomplish a restructuring from a capitalist global economy to a more socialist global economy. This paper addresses the validity of the U.N.'s global warming narrative and the economic impact of following the U.N.'s agenda.*

## **INTRODUCTION**

The title, Restructuring of the Global Economy, suggests that either such restructuring is needed, or that we are currently undergoing such restructuring and, therefore, must find ways to adapt. This paper examines the proposition that the U.N. has been attempting to restructure the global economy for decades and may have found the means to effectively reach that goal using climate alarmism as the catalyst.

The world breathlessly waited for President Donald Trump to announce whether he will stay in the Paris Climate Accord, that was signed by over 170 nations, including the U.S. under President Barack Obama. Under the agreement the nations have agreed to contribute billions of dollars to the U.N. to aid poor countries as the world attempts to wean itself from fossil fuels and move to more renewable sources of energy in order to reduce emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> and keep global warming to less than 2 degrees centigrade. If the U.S. withdraws from the agreement, there will be no incentive for the other nations to stay with it, and the accord will likely fall apart.

Adding to the pressure, the Pope has spoken. If the world's leaders do not agree to halt carbon emissions and stop global warming, it would be suicide. Former U.S. President Obama said that climate change is a more important national security issue than Islamic terrorism. Former Presidential candidate, Bernie Sanders, speaks of climate change as a pending worldwide catastrophe that will decimate civilization as we know it. Candidate Hillary Clinton proclaimed she would reduce "carbon pollution" by putting coal mines out of business and coal miners out of work. The U.N. has been pushing the global warming/climate change alarmism to world leaders since the late 80s. On April 22, 2016, over 170 world leaders agreed to combat climate change by signing an agreement at the U.N., hammered out in Paris in December, 2015, in which they agree to reduce emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> by certain percentages by 2030.

The fervor over anthropogenic climate change is reminiscent of the story of Chicken Little that the sky is falling and the end of the world is nigh. Versions of the Chicken Little story are found around the world and, go back in print, at least as far as 1849 (Ashliman, D.L., 2014). Word-of-mouth stories likely

go back further. The idea that the sky is falling can be traced as far back as biblical times (<http://english.stackexchange.com/questions/305312/where-does-the-sky-is-falling-come-from>). The moral of the Chicken Little story is don't panic, be logical, and do not believe everything people tell you.

The question that must be asked is "is the global warming/climate change narrative just another Chicken Little story with a modern-day scenario?" or "does the climate change narrative have substantial truth?" If the climate change narrative is not supported by fact, then what is the purpose of the continuous promotion of the narrative?

President Obama stated that the debate is over, climate change is settled science. Is it settled? The simple answer is that, contrary to the statement of President Obama, the debate over anthropogenic global warming (AGW), aka climate change, is not settled. There is a growing body of scientists and academics worldwide who are coming out against the claims that man-made emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> are causing drastic shifts in climate that are behind recent extreme weather events, and against the prediction of more devastation to come unless mankind steps up to stop the harmful emissions. In fact, over 31,000 scientists and academics in the U.S. have recently signed a petition against the claims of AGW and urging the government not to try to pursue an expensive cure for a condition that does not exist (<http://www.petitionproject.org/>).

That the debate over AGW still rages on and is not settled is exemplified by the fact that every year, the Annual International Conference on Climate Change, an international conference of AGW "skeptics" is held in Washington, D.C. The problem is that world leaders, including the Pope, have so totally accepted the AGW hypothesis, that they are willing to spend billions of dollars and risk damaging strong economies by enacting policies to limit CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and move away from dependence on fossil fuels to the use of more renewable sources of energy such as solar, wind, and other bio-fuels. It is a problem because solar, wind, and bio-fuel technology has not yet advanced to the point that they are economically viable and dependable enough to replace fossil fuels.

The parties to the Paris agreement have committed to contributing \$100 billion a year, collectively, to help underdeveloped countries reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. The U.S. has already given the U.N. Green Climate Fund \$500 million dollars of a \$3 billion dollar commitment (Pandey,A., 2016).

The debate relates to business practices because the solutions proposed to halt CO<sub>2</sub> emissions could result in higher costs of doing business resulting in higher consumer costs, massive unemployment and sharp spikes in energy costs. Sharp spikes in energy costs will make it more difficult for the world's workers and the poor to heat their homes in the winter, cool them in the heat of summer, travel to work, and manage their budgets. The proposals for addressing AGW could devastate healthy economies and throw third world economies further backward.

This paper will examine the issue of Restructuring of the Global Economy from the perspective of whether such restructuring is needed or is it simply the ultimate goal of the U.N. using global warming/climate change as the tool to accomplish that purpose.

## **POLITICAL CONTEXT**

Agenda 21, published by the UN Conference on Development and Environment, held in Rio de Janeiro in June, 1992, is a detailed plan of the United Nations to promote what it calls "sustainable growth." Agenda 21 claimed that current patterns of consumption by developed countries were not sustainable and that the undeveloped countries had no chance to catch up. It called for a change in consumption, massive redistribution of wealth, slower population growth, and a move from fossil fuels to more sustainable sources of energy (<http://www.un.org/documents/ga/conf151/aconf15126-4.htm>).

The U.N. appears to have found the "hot button" it needed to strengthen its relevance as a world body and help propel the implementation of Agenda 21. The IPCC has been the driving force behind the AGW movement ever since, such that global warming became a key plank in the U.N.'s Agenda 21 plan at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro in 1992. Beginning in 1995, the U.N. has been holding annual climate conferences with the participants of the Rio conference.

The IPCC and the U.N.'s Agenda 21 have become political hot potatoes in the U.S., and other nations, with political conservatives claiming that the U.N. is using the environment as a tool to establish a single world government or to institute socialism as the economic model for the world economy. While establishing a single world government may be a stretch, the goal of establishing socialism in the world economy may not be so far-fetched, considering the massive redistribution of wealth called for in both Agenda 21 and its climate initiatives. It is clear that the U.N. has found a measure of success in using the environment to strengthen its influence on world governments. It seems that most world leaders have accepted AGW as fact and have committed to spending huge sums to combat AGW. Of course, the U.N. is the collector and distributor of those funds. After all, no government wants to be known as one that does not care about the environment. At the Rio conference in 1992, the U.N. was able to get most of the world governments, including the U.S. to commit to the principles outlined in Agenda 21. Further commitments were made at the conference in Kyoto, Japan, in 1997, known as the Kyoto Protocol ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United\\_Nations\\_Climate\\_Change\\_conference#1997:\\_COP\\_3.2C\\_The\\_Kyo\\_to\\_Protocol\\_on\\_Climate\\_Change](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_Nations_Climate_Change_conference#1997:_COP_3.2C_The_Kyo_to_Protocol_on_Climate_Change)).

The commitments being made are to reduce emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>. Reducing CO<sub>2</sub> necessitates the reduction of the use of fossil fuels, coal and oil, and switching from fossil fuels to more renewable sources of energy. Some countries have committed to reduce emissions by as much as 30% by the year 2030 and 50% by 2050.

## CLAIMS AND ALARMISM

Alarmist warnings by the academic and scientific community, and environmentalists are not new. This writer is old enough to remember hearing warnings on the radio in the 1960s warning of a coming ice age. The age-old story of Chicken Little bespeaks of the fact that alarmism has been around much longer than we would like to think and such alarmist rhetoric is often found to be nothing more than misguided thinking or active imagination. The media is complicit in the alarmism because alarmism brings more attention, sells books and newspapers/magazines, and drives TV ratings.

### **Claim: More Frequent and Extreme Weather Events**

The media quickly and repetitively carry the alarmist stories and rarely present stories that weaken the alarm. Every major weather event news story seems to be preceded with the word “unprecedented,” and the event is usually blamed on global warming. We hear about the unprecedented flooding in Houston, or the unprecedented heat of 2014, or the unprecedented severity of recent hurricanes. The truth is that these events are not unprecedented. For example, the recent flooding in Houston, Texas was described as unprecedented. However, Houston has had serious flooding events, that matched the 2015 flooding, in 2009, 2006, 2001, 1998, 1994, 1989, 1983, and 1979, to name a few years. The media presented an aerial photo of Houston to show the extent of the 2015 flooding. The problem was that the picture was taken in 2001.

Another example of media hype is the coverage of hurricane Patricia in October of 2015. This storm was hyped as the biggest and strongest to ever hit North America, or the worst tropical storm in history. The reality was something not so remarkable and the storm fizzled when it made landfall. Despite the hype, there have been numerous tropical storms in history that were worse than Patricia. (Harris, T. & Ball, T. 2015).

Politicians and the media love to predict doom and gloom. It has been said that AGW would cause more frequent and more severe hurricanes and tornadoes. It would cause deadly heat waves, drought, and more frequent and devastating forest fires. A *Reuters* article in June, 2015 stated “The direct health impacts of climate change come from more frequent and intense extreme weather events, while indirect impacts come from changes in infectious disease patterns, air pollution, food insecurity and malnutrition, displacement and conflicts.”

Reality has proven such predictions wrong. Climatologist and former NASA scientist, Dr. Roy Spencer reported in October, 2014 that we had 3,264 days, nearly nine years, without a major hurricane,

cat 3 or above, making landfall in the U.S. The U.S. tornado count has plummeted to record lows for 2011 to 2013 and was on track for a record low count in 2014. (climate depot, 2014). Flooding has not increased in the U.S. over records of 85 – 127 years (Pielke, 2011). The frequency of 90 degree heat days has plummeted with three of the mildest summers occurring since 2004 (Climate science, 2014). 2014 was the quietest fire season of the decade (Morano, 2014). The world-wide percentage of drought has not changed since 1901 (McCabe & Wolock, 2015).

### **Claim: Glacial Melt and Flooding**

Catastrophic glacial melting is another claim of AGW that does not seem to be consistent with reality. Six years ago the BBC predicted that the Arctic would be ice free by 2013. It is now 2017 and data shows that Arctic ice is growing, not retreating (Choy, 2013).

Horror stories of glacial melting are often accompanied with film showing a portion of a glacier breaking off and falling into the sea. What the story tellers do not mention is that the breaking off of the portion of the glacier is called calving and is a normal process and indicates glacier growth and has been occurring as long as there have been glaciers. Evidence seems to indicate that glacial melting is cyclical. There was massive melting in the 20s and 30s, prior to the rise of CO<sub>2</sub> from the industrial revolution, and then a refreezing that ended in 1979 (Choy, 2013). With the current growth in Arctic ice, some scientists are saying that the earth is in a cooling trend that may extend to the middle of the century (Choy, 2013). In fact, an article was published July 12, 2015, in which UK scientists predict that we will be in a mini-ice age in 15 years, based on solar cycles (<http://www.aol.com/article/2015/07/12/>).

### **Claim: 97% Of Scientists Believe That Climate Change Is Real**

President Barack Obama has recently said that global warming/climate change is the greatest security threat facing the U.S. He claimed that there was 97% consensus of the scientific community on global warming/climate change. Such claim is not in step with the facts. Over 31,000 scientists in the U.S. have signed a petition opposing the AGW hypothesis and urging President Obama not to spend money on combating AGW (<http://www.petitionproject.org/>).

At a recent meeting of Nobel Prize-winning scientists, nearly half of the 70 attendees refused to sign a declaration supporting the AGW hypothesis Bastasch, M., 2015).

With the “97% consensus on global warming” apparently falling apart, the question is from where did that claim arise? Adrian Vance, author of *Vapor Tiger* (2014) decided to investigate the origin of the 97% consensus claim. Vance found that the number came from a study done by Dr. Naomi Oreskes, of the Scripps Institute in 2004. Dr. Oreskes claimed to do a survey of the ISI Web of Science database of 928 papers and found 97% to agree that global warming was real. Vance also discovered that a Dr. Ben Peiser of John Moores University examined the work of Dr. Oreskes and found it lacking. The work had actually been done by students, which was forbidden by all professional journals. The ISI database had actually contained 12,000 papers. The students were told to choose only the abstracts that supported AGW. An examination of the 928 abstracts by Lord Monckton found that less than half of the 928 abstracts actually agreed with the AGW hypothesis (Vance, 2014).

### **Claim: Apocalyptic Predictions for 2015**

On June 12, 2008, correspondent Bob Woodruff was on ABC’s *Good Morning America* to promote an upcoming ABC special on global warming called *Earth 2100*, which would offer predictions of what the world would be like by June 2015 if global warming continued unabated, without any human intervention (Whitlock, S. 2015). *Earth 2100* was aired June 2, 2009. Among the predictions is that New York city would be destroyed by flooding, a “storm of the century” would wipe out Miami, Las Vegas would be abandoned, and there would be flames covering hundreds of miles. It was also predicted that conditions resulting from global warming would cause tremendous inflation of consumer product prices such that a gallon of gasoline would be close to \$9 and a carton of milk close to \$13 (Whitlock, S., 2015).

It is now well past June of 2015 and none of the dire predictions have occurred. Were the “warmers” wrong or did we humans intervene sufficiently to halt global warming? It is probably safe to say that CO<sub>2</sub>

emissions have not been reduced in the intervening years, at least not to the extent the “warmers” said would be necessary to stop global warming. Some scientists say the earth has been in a cooling trend for 17 to 18 years while others fiddle with the data to claim we are still warming (Bastasch, M., 2015).

So what can be concluded? If earth has been in a cooling trend for 18 years and CO<sub>2</sub> levels are still high and climbing, can we conclude that the elevated CO<sub>2</sub> levels have nothing to do with global warming? If we are still in a warming trend, as NASA claims, can we conclude that the warming will not cause catastrophic events as predicted? After all, historical data shows that we had 3,264 days without a major hurricane, cat 3 or above, making landfall in the U.S.; the U.S. tornado count has plummeted to record lows for the last three years and is on track for a record low count this year. (climate depot, 2014); Flooding has not increased in the U.S. over records of 85 – 127 years (Pielke, 2011); The frequency of 90 degree heat days has plummeted with three of the mildest summers occurring since 2004 (Climate science, 2014); 2014 was the quietest fire season of the decade (Morano, 2014); and, the percentage of world-wide drought has not changed since 1901 (McCabe & Wolock, 2015). Probably the safest conclusion to make is that computer models cannot be depended on to accurately predict weather phenomena, and its impact, 5, 10, 20, or even 100 years out. They, often, cannot accurately predict weather three to five days in the future.

## **THE SCIENCE BEHIND AGW**

### **The Theory and Data Evidence**

The evidence supporting the hypothesis is garnered from historical temperature recordings from the various monitoring sites of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and temperature measurements from satellites of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). This temperature data is then averaged to obtain an average global temperature. The average global temperature is then plotted on a graph to determine the trend.

“Evidence” of the impact of global warming is based on computer models and on other data showing such things as glaciers shrinking, sea level rising, sea ice retreating, animal migrations, widening of animal ranges, extreme weather events, unusual animal behavior, and other anomalies.

The problem with the “evidence” is computer models are not evidence of anything but the assumptions and hypotheses of the warmers. As has been shown, other anecdotal “evidence” proves nothing. Glacial shrinkage has been observed since the early 1900s, before the rise of CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere. There is no evidence of abnormal sea level rise, and sea ice seems to be increasing now, thicker and faster than ever. There is absolutely no empirical evidence linking CO<sub>2</sub> to global warming or linking human-caused CO<sub>2</sub> emissions to climate change. The entire global warming/climate change narrative is based solely on the computer models.

### **Problems with the Theory**

Skeptics of AGW point out that there are inherent problems with the theory, the first of which is the issue of whether a global average temperature is meaningful. Temperatures vary significantly depending on where you are on this planet, from the extreme cold of the polar areas to the sweltering tropics. When it is hot in one place, it will be below freezing in another. At any place on the earth the temperature is determined by many factors including the tilt of the earth, the wobble of the earth as it rotates on its axis, the relative distance from the sun determined by where the earth is in its orbit around the sun, the terrain, vegetation, elevation, the presence of clouds, whether the location is urban or rural, and the level of solar activity on the sun’s surface. In some parts of the earth we have four seasons and in others just one season, either very cold or very warm. Temperature also changes in any given location through any given day from a variety of natural causes. The point being made is that an “average temperature” is fleeting, at best, and meaningless.

The role of CO<sub>2</sub> seems to be overblown. The warmers are quick to mention that we spew millions of tons of CO<sub>2</sub> into the atmosphere from the burning of fossil fuels, or that the 385 ppm of CO<sub>2</sub> is the highest level it has been in several hundred years but they are negligent to acknowledge that given that, the

human-caused portion of CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere is a mere .00016%. NASA has stated that human CO<sub>2</sub> emissions is the major driver of climate change (NASA/NOAA, 2015). The reality is that there is no empirical evidence, whatsoever, linking CO<sub>2</sub>, or human-caused CO<sub>2</sub>, to any change in climate or weather event.

The warmers seem to ignore the climatological history of our planet. The planet has gone through at least four ice-ages and as many inter-glacial periods. In the inter-glacial periods the earth warmed and atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> levels rose considerably, sometimes to levels much higher than we are experiencing now or expect to experience. The net result of this warming and rise of CO<sub>2</sub> was not more devastation of the earth but the opposite. The interglacial periods were periods of tremendous greening of the earth and increased biological diversity of plant and animal life. Glaciers melted, which provided more habitable land for human settlement.

To infer causation, the cause must precede the effect. Ice core studies, covering 420 thousand years reveal that warming of the earth, during interglacial periods, always preceded the rise in CO<sub>2</sub> levels by 800 years, and the cooling of the earth preceded the drop of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> by several thousand years (Petit, J.R., Jouzel, J., Raynaud, D., et.al., 1999). The same ice core studies have also revealed that global warming rose to several degrees higher during the previous four interglacial periods than it has during the current period (Petit, J.R. et. al., 1999).

The AGW hypothesis seems to be inconsistent with known laws of science. The theory says that the sun warms the earth and the earth radiates the heat back into the atmosphere which is absorbed by the CO<sub>2</sub> and re-radiated back to earth, causing additional warming. The second law of thermodynamics states that heat only moves from a warm area to a colder area. For the heat to be radiated back to earth to cause more warming would mean that the CO<sub>2</sub> would have to be warmer than the earth. Also heat transfer stops when there is temperature equilibrium across the two bodies.

Most of the heating of the atmosphere occurs close to the earth and is by the process of conduction. In other words heat is transferred from the warmer earth to the cooler atmosphere in contact with the earth. The heat transfer stops when the temperature of the atmosphere in contact with the earth reaches equilibrium with the temperature with the earth. Because it is at equilibrium, heat cannot be re-transferred back to earth. As the molecules of the atmosphere, including the CO<sub>2</sub>, are heated they rise and instantly begin cooling. The cooling occurs at a known rate of 2° centigrade per 1000 feet of altitude. At some point the atmospheric temperature reaches the freezing point. This is called the adiabatic lapse rate. As the CO<sub>2</sub> is constantly cooling as it rises, it is not likely radiating heat back to earth. Also, add to this the fact that the further away from earth the atmosphere gets thinner and thinner. That means that all the molecules in the atmosphere are dispersed further and further apart so that there are much fewer per unit of space than on earth's surface. That is why commercial aircraft must have supplemental oxygen in case of sudden decompression at altitude, and pilots of unpressurized aircraft must be on supplemental oxygen when flying above 10,000 feet.

The idea that the “greenhouse” gases form a shield preventing heat from escaping defies logic. The “hot car syndrome” is an even more illogical analogy. Greenhouses have plastic and other materials that are impermeable. In other words, the air in the greenhouse cannot pass through the material. A car is even worse. It has glass and steel preventing the passage of the hot air out of the car. The plastic of a greenhouse and the glass and steel of a car do not themselves create heat. They merely prevent the heated air from escaping. The heat comes from the Sun's radiation being absorbed by the materials in the car's interior and being heated by that radiation. Remove the source of the heat, the Sun, and the greenhouse and car immediately start to cool.

The atmosphere is an open system made up of gases. Nothing prevents the warmer air below from rising into the upper atmosphere where it gets much colder in accordance with the adiabatic lapse rate. The value of the greenhouse gases is that they filter the radiation of the Sun so that humans, animals, and plants do not cook. The filtering of the greenhouse gases provides a cooler, more hospitable environment for life on earth to survive than it would be without them.

According to the warmist's theory, there should be a hot spot in the upper part of the troposphere where the warm air is “trapped.” This hot spot has never been found, even though weather balloons are

launched every day that ascend to the upper troposphere and send a continuous stream of temperature measurements. That the warm can rise and stay warm defies logic. As air rises it cools according to the adiabatic lapse rate.

### **Problems with the Data**

The data on which the narrative of climate change is built is not without its own problems. The problems with the data began with the famed “hockey stick” graph that Al Gore presented when he began his crusade against global warming. The graph showed a drastic jump in global temperatures in the last years shown on the graph such that the trend line looked like a hockey stick. The graph was the product of Michael Mann, a climate scientist working with the IPCC. The problem with the graph is that the data was not really temperature data. The data on which the graph was made was from an analysis of tree rings (Bright-Paul, 2014). Tree rings showed changes in rates of growth, presumed to be from changes in rainfall and other climate conditions contributing to the growth rates. The particular tree rings in question showed tremendous growth rate for a period of a few years with biologists attributing the growth to increased rainfall. Michael Mann inferred the increased temperatures from the increased rainfall. Therefore the graph was not showing actual temperature data but guesses of what they thought the temperature might be. Mann’s work discounts the various other factors that influence tree growth. The challenge to the “hockey stick” data was only the beginning.

The source of the temperature data has been subject to intense criticism. In 1990, NASA said that temperature data from satellite measurements was more accurate and should be used as the standard for measuring global temperature (Canberra Times, 1990). In 2015, when satellite measurements indicated that the earth had not warmed in over 15 years, NASA ignored that data and went to ground-based measurements to show warming, or adjusted the satellite data to show warming. It claimed the satellite data was not accurate (Watts, A. 2016). Ground-based measuring stations tend to be biased toward warming because they are largely located in urban areas and pick up additional heat from concrete, asphalt, brick and other materials that absorb and retain heat in much greater measure than natural surroundings. A significant proportion of the earth is not covered by any instrumentation and temperatures for those areas are inferred. In other words, the temperatures attributed to those areas are mere guesses.

At a meeting last year, of Nobel prize winners in science, Dr. Ivar Giaever cast aspersions on the data of global warming by stating “global warming was a non-problem and that there had been no warming in 17 years, but was made to look like a problem because some scientists are “fiddling” with the data to make it show what they want to show.”(Bastasch, M., 2015).

Calling it “fiddling” is probably a nice way of referring to it, but others have blatantly called it fraud. From where does this charge come? In 2009, hackers were able to hack into the computers of the Climate Research Unit (CRU) of the University of East Anglia in the United Kingdom. Emails and records were obtained that indicate a rather widespread practice of manipulating climate data in order to show global warming (Moore, 2009). One email that has received much attention is one in which the sender is saying that he just completed using the “trick” of making adjustments to 20 years of data to “hide the decline.” The “decline” being a reference to the real data actually showing a decline in global temperature rather than an increase. Emails and documents also show that the climate scientists were colluding to rig the peer review process where their papers would get the most favorable treatment and the papers of skeptics would be excluded from publication. (Moore, 2009).

Dr. William Gray, Emeritus Professor of Atmospheric Science at Colorado State University, stated in an op-ed that the “Climate-Gate’ revelations coming out of the UK University of East Anglia are but the tip of a giant iceberg of a well-organized international climate warming conspiracy that has been gathering momentum for the last 25 years. (Gray, 2009). Dr. Gray also said that there has been slight warming of the globe but not caused by man-made CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, but from changing ocean currents.(Gray, 2009).

Christopher Booker, a reporter for the Sunday Telegraph in the UK claims that the fiddling with temperature data is the biggest science scandal ever (Booker, 2015). Booker tells of a researcher, Paul

Homewood, who compared published temperature data charts from regions around the world to the actual recordings and found that all of the recorded data had been changed in the published data to show a warming trend. These published records were made by the US government's Global Historical Climate Network (GHCN). They were then amplified by two of the main official surface records, the Goddard Institute for Space Studies (Giss) and the National Climate Data Center (NCDC), which use the warming trends to estimate temperatures across the vast regions of the Earth where no measurements are taken. Yet these are the very records on which scientists and politicians rely for their belief in "global warming" (Booker, 2015). A researcher with programming experience looked into the computer code of the data sets and found evidence of methodical alteration of data (The Tribune Papers.com, 2013).

In January 2015, NASA/NOAA, in a published article admitted that the global warming trend line had "flattened" for the last 15 years (NASA/NOAA, 2015). "Flattened" means there was no warming trend. Subsequently, NOAA has applied "correction factors" to the data to show a warming trend because it was presumed that the recorded data were wrong (Curry, 2015).

On June 29, 2015, John Casey of the Space and Science Research Corporation (SSRC), a leader in climate prediction, stated in an article on <http://www.spaceandscience.net>, that the SSRC was dropping the U.S.'s ground-based global temperature data set because it was deemed unreliable. Casey said that the data sets of NASA and NOAA lost their credibility because of allegations of data manipulation to support President Obama's policies on climate change (Casey, 2015). Casey also accused the Obama administration of developing "a culture of scientific corruption permitting the alteration or modification of global temperature data in a way that supports the myth of manmade global warming.(Casey, 2015)." Casey gave an example of the political agenda driving NOAA statements. In June NASA/NOAA came out saying that May 2015 was the warmest May since 1880. SSRC says the statement is not true and that the satellite measurements for May 2015 show May as being in the normal range of temperature for the last ten years.

The question arises regarding the motivation for reputable scientists to manipulate data and promote a false narrative regarding climate change. Money has been suggested as a prime motive. One scientist, for example, Phil Jones, received over \$22 million dollars in grants to provide climate research on global warming (Shedlock, 2009). The NSF reports that it has issued over \$29 million in research grants listing a George Mason University scientist, Jagadish Shukla, as the primary researcher (Lott, M. 2015). An additional \$12 million in grants has been issued to a research group founded by Shukla (Lott, M., 2015). Shukla, also, was one of the scientists who recently urged the government to prosecute businesses, that opposed the global warming narrative, under the RICO laws (Lott, M., 2015). Insuring the research supports global warming keeps the grant dollars flowing.

### **Problems with the Solutions to AGW**

The proposed solution to AGW, according to the U.N. is to cut back human-caused emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>. The goal appears to be to cut CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 30% by year 2030. The Obama administration used the Environmental Protection Agency(EPA) to aggressively pursue regulatory action to help reduce emissions. It was recently reported that the EPA has forced the 200<sup>th</sup> U.S. coal plant to shut down (Bastasch, 2015). EPA regulations and fines made it much too expensive for coal plants to operate profitably, thereby causing them to slowly close.

Besides the immediate loss of jobs, when a plant shuts down, there is a huge ripple affect across the economy. To start, it impacts the ability of producers of electric power to provide low-cost electricity because many of those producers use coal energy to generate electricity. The electricity producers are having to transition from low-cost coal to more expensive energy sources. This, in turn, drives up the cost of electric power for businesses and consumers. Home and business electric bills could easily double in the next few years. This additional cost will also affect the cost of consumer goods, such as groceries and other products as the cost of electricity is passed on in higher prices of those goods. This inflationary spiral will put a greater squeeze on the budgets of the middle class and the poor (Richard, 2015.)



Other EPA mandates could be on the horizon. Mandates in vehicle and other engine emissions could severely impact transportation throughout the country from the family car to the transportation of goods via truck and rail. Manufacturing emissions would need to be under greater control.

Other issues must be considered as well. The countries that are a party to the Paris Accord have agreed to contribute billions of dollars to the U.N. to aid the poorer countries in moving to alternative fuels. The U.N. has a wretched history of managing such funds, such that little really gets to those that need it. On its face it is a vast plan to redistribute wealth. As a practical matter, it may end up funding the lavish lifestyles of U.N. members and dictators of third world countries. Strong economies will be weakened as their wealth goes to the U.N. and they fund the high cost of moving from fossil fuels to renewable energy, and put in place plans to manage consumption by the citizens of their respective countries.

### **The Costs of Moving Away from Fossil Fuels**

Switching from fossil fuels to renewable energy comes with massive costs. Fossil fuel energy is relatively inexpensive. Solar and wind energy is expensive and unreliable. The U.S. and other countries are engaging in the practice of subsidizing companies that develop renewable energy sources, sometimes with poor results. After over \$500 million dollars were given by the U.S. government to a solar energy company called Solyndra, the company went bankrupt and shut down (Stevens, J. & Leonig, C.D. 2011). The difficulties facing those companies engaged in renewable energy production is that the technology is not yet to the point where wind and solar are economically viable as a substitute for fossil fuels. Sterling Burnett (2017) presented statistics from a study by the Institute for Energy Research that showed striking costs differences per MegaWatt Hour (MWh) between traditional energy sources and solar and wind. The cost per MWh for coal was \$39, for natural gas, \$34, for nuclear power, \$29.10, and hydro-electric, \$35.40, as opposed to wind power at \$107.40 per MWh and solar at \$140.30 per MWh.

In addition, solar and wind energy production is environmentally destructive in terms of the acreage required to produce electricity. For example, the Ivanpah Solar Power Facility in the Mohave Desert, California produces a meager 392 megawatts of electricity and occupies 3500 acres. On the other hand, a 1000 megawatt nuclear plant would take up less than 100 acres and a gas-fired plant only 50 acres (Burnett, 2017). Wind farms also require huge tracts of land to produce meager amounts of electricity compared to the traditional forms of generating power. Wind farms also present great hazards to birds, especially endangered species and protected species, such as the bald eagle.

The market demand is not there. This caused the Obama administration to attempt to force a market where none exists, by limiting the availability of fossil fuels through regulatory measures. The EPA has already forced the shutdown of many coal producers and has limited drilling and oil exploration. The Keystone Pipeline from Canada was touted as a way of getting less expensive North American oil pumped into the U.S. but the Obama administration refused to approve the pipeline. President Obama's expectation was to drive the price of gasoline to \$6 a gallon or higher in hopes of making the switch to electric cars more acceptable. The problem that arose to thwart those plans was the advent of fracking. Fracking became economically feasible when gasoline prices rose. Then Saudi Arabia decided it wanted to do something to halt fracking. It flooded the market driving oil prices down, making fracking less profitable. Low oil prices pulled gasoline prices way down such that consumers are thinking less about electric cars.

Switching from fossil fuels will require expensive changes in manufacturing and energy production. Many electricity producers currently use coal in the production of electricity. Switching from coal to other forms of energy to produce electricity will, of necessity, cause electricity prices to rise dramatically because of the immense capital investment required. In its efforts to switch from coal to other forms of energy the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has produced and enforced a number of regulatory measures that make it impossible for coal producers to make a profit. Already, over 200 coal producers have gone out of business (Bastach, 2015), putting thousands of people out of work, and devastating state economies that depend on coal. The largest coal producer in the U.S. recently declared

bankruptcy. Because of the shutdown of so many coal producers, those companies that still use coal energy will find the cost of coal rising.

This is already happening in the U.S. Transportation will become more expensive as consumers and businesses are forced to purchase and use vehicles that do not use fossil fuels. The costs of everything that relies on transportation will also rise as transportation costs rise.

Rather than let market forces determine how energy will be produced and used, governments are making that determination.

In view of the non-legally binding agreements, one of the U.N.'s objectives for the 2015 climate conference in Paris was to get legally binding agreements from the participating countries. President Barack Obama had already stated his intention to sign such an agreement although there is some question whether it could be legally binding on the U.S. if Congress does not vote its approval.

The continuous attempts of the U.N. to get legally binding agreements, brings back the question of the true intentions of the U.N. Is the environment the real concern or is the goal the strengthening of the U.N.'s influence over world governments and the establishment of its ideological framework? Is the push to make the agreements legally binding for the purpose of insuring more control in the hands of the U.N.? The question seems justified when the Agenda 21 document consistently calls for massive transfers of wealth and resources, from developed countries to developing countries, and more "sustainable" use of land and other resources in the developed countries. EPA head, Gina McCarthy, recently said that the climate rules put forth by her agency were "driving investment in renewables..., [and] advancing our ongoing clean energy revolution... That's what... reinventing a global economy looks like." (Morano, M., 2016)

The question of the true purpose of the U.N.'s climate activism was raised by an *Investor's Business Daily* (IBD) editorial on February 10, 2015 quoting Christiana Figueres, the Executive Secretary of the U.N.'s Framework Convention on Climate Change, as saying:

*"this is the first time in the history of mankind that we are setting ourselves the task of intentionally, within a defined period of time, to change the economic development model that has been reigning for at least 150 years since the industrial revolution."*

In other words, it appears that Ms. Figueres is saying that the goal of the climate change activism is to destroy capitalism. (*Investor's Business Daily*, editorial, February 10, 2015). This, then, begs the question of whether the threat of climate change is real and changing the economic model is believed necessary to save the planet or, has climate change merely been over-hyped so it can be used as a tool to bring about the change in the economic model? If it turns out that the AGW hypothesis and its claims of coming doom are not scientifically supported, then the latter is likely true.

## CONCLUSION

The debate over global warming and climate change is certainly not over and the science is not settled, and does not favor the AGW hypothesis. There is evidence that the earth has not warmed in 15 years or more, as confirmed by NASA/NOAA(2015). There is increasing evidence that we may be heading into another mini ice age because the Sun is moving into its cyclic period of low solar activity(AOL.com, 2015). The polar ice caps are growing, not shrinking (Choy, 2013), and the polar bear population is thriving (Bastasch, 2015). There is no evidence of a positive link between increased CO<sub>2</sub> levels and climate change. As one will learn in any college course on research methods, correlation is not causation. If correlation does show causation then the increase in CO<sub>2</sub> would be caused by increased warming since the evidence shows that warming spikes preceded any rise in CO<sub>2</sub> (Bright-Paul, 2014). And, there is evidence of widespread tinkering or manipulation of data to insure that the studies showed global warming/climate change.

It appears the AGW movement is more about the agenda than the science. That would explain the attempts to silence and marginalize the skeptics and "deniers," because the skeptics could derail the agenda.

In the face of increasing and conflicting evidence, the question is why is the U.N., President Obama, the Pope, and other world leaders so set on spending billions of dollars to stop global warming/climate change instead of preparing their citizens for a coming ice age? Marc Morano, founder of Climate Depot offers the following insight:

*“the “global warming” movement was never about the science behind the issue; it was always about creating a global system of controlling energy production and consumption.”* (Unruh, 2015).

Morano went on to say:

*“that’s why, despite the facts, America is on the verge of cap and trade, carbon taxes, renewable energy mandates and more. President Obama’s agenda on renewable energy has been aggressive, often times at the expense of the U.S. taxpayers. We’re being imposed the same regulations [as global warming legislation would] through the EPA. These regulations will be codified and solidified into law. The ultimate goal is centralized planning* (Unruh, 2015).”

Morano’s statement is consistent with the statement made by Christiana Figueres, the Executive Secretary of the U.N.’s Framework Convention on Climate Change, when she said:

*“this is the first time in the history of mankind that we are setting ourselves the task of intentionally, within a defined period of time, to change the economic development model that has been reigning for at least 150 years since the industrial revolution.”* (Investor’s Business Daily. editorial, February 10, 2015).

Morano’s statement is also consistent with a statement by former EPA head, Gina McCarthy, that the climate rules put forth by her agency were *“driving investment in renewables..., [and] advancing our ongoing clean energy revolution...That’s what... reinventing a global economy looks like.”* (Morano, M., 2016).

It’s all about reinventing a global economy.

In a statement made at a hearing of the U.S. Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, on 12/06/2006, Dr. David Deming, geophysicist with the University of Oklahoma, said the following:

*“There is an overwhelming bias today in the media regarding the issue of global warming. In the past two years, this bias has bloomed into an irrational hysteria. Every natural disaster that occurs is now linked with global warming, no matter how tenuous or impossible the connection. As a result, the public has become vastly misinformed on this and other environmental issues.*

*Earth’s climate system is complex and poorly understood. But we do know that throughout human history, warmer temperatures have been associated with more stable climates and increased human health and prosperity. Colder temperatures have been correlated with climatic instability, famine, and increased human mortality.*

*The amount of climatic warming that has taken place in the past 150 years is poorly constrained, and its cause--human or natural--is unknown. There is no sound scientific basis for predicting future climate change with any degree of certainty. If the climate does warm, it is likely to be beneficial to humanity rather than harmful. In my opinion, it would be foolish to establish national energy policy on the basis of misinformation and irrational hysteria.* “ (Deming, D. 2006.)

Given the evidence that the AGW narrative may be inconsistent with known laws of science, and given that it may be an agenda driven narrative fraught with data manipulation, a good dose of skepticism

is in order, especially when the proposed solutions to AGW could wreck many economies and put additional burdens on the poor.

## REFERENCES

- Ashliman, D.L., (2014). *The End of The World: the sky is falling*.  
<http://www.pitt.edu/~dash/type2033.html#harris>.
- Bast, J., and Spencer, R. (2014). The myth of the climate change “97%”. *The Wall Street Journal*. May 26, 2014.
- Bastasch, M. (2015). Nobel Prize-winning scientist says Obama is ‘dead wrong’ on global warming. *The Daily Caller*. July 8, 2015.
- Bastasch, M. (2015) Scientists: Polar Bears are thriving despite global Warming. *The Daily Caller*. July 7, 2015.
- Bastasch, M. (2015) Environmentalists, EPA Force The 200th US Coal Plant To Retire. *The Daily Caller*, July 15, 2015.
- Read more: <http://dailycaller.com/2015/07/15/environmentalists-epa-force-the-200th-us-coal-plant-to-retire/#ixzz3gG3HAXbT>
- Booker, C. (2015) The fiddling with temperature data is the biggest science scandal ever. *The Telegraph*. February 7, 2015.  
<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/earth/environment/globalwarming/11395516/The-fiddling-with-temperature-data-is-the-biggest-science-scandal-ever.html>
- Bright-Paul, A. *Climate for the Layman*. Authors OnLine Ltd. Sandy Bedfordshire, England.
- Burnett, H. Sterling (2017) Panel Analyzes the High Cost of Alternative Fuels. *Environment & Climate News*, vol. 20 no. 5., June 2017, The Heartland Institute.
- Canberra Times, 1990, NASA 1990: No Global Warming- Surface Temperature Record Should Be Replaced by More Accurate Satellites. April, 1, 1990.
- Casey, J. (2015) Government Climate Data Found Unreliable. <http://www.spaceandscience.net/id16.html>. 29 Jun 2015.
- Choy, D. (2013) Global Cooling: Arctic Ice Cap Grows 60 Percent In A Year. *iScience Times*. September 11., 2013.
- Curry, J. (2015) Has NOAA ‘busted’ the pause in global warming? *Climate Etc*.  
<http://judithcurry.com/2015/06/04/has-noaa-busted-the-pause-in-global-warming/>
- D'Aleo, J. (2010) Climategate: NOAA and NASA Complicit in Data Manipulation.  
<http://pjmedia.com/blog/climategate-noaa-and-nasa-complicit-in-data-manipulation/>
- Delingpole, J. (2009). Climategate: the final nail in the coffin of 'Anthropogenic Global Warming'? *The Telegraph*. November 20, 2009.  
<http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/news/jamesdelingpole/100017393/climategate-the-final-nail-in-the-coffin-of-anthropogenic-global-warming/>
- Deming, D. 2006. [http://www.epw.senate.gov/hearing\\_statements.cfm?id=266543](http://www.epw.senate.gov/hearing_statements.cfm?id=266543)
- Gray, W. (2009). Climategate revelations top of giant iceberg. *Climatedepot.com*. 13 December 2009).
- Harris, T. & Ball, T. (2015). Patricia was nowhere near the worst tropical storm. *Climate Depot*. November 2, 2015.
- Heyes, J.(2014) NOAA quietly revises website after getting caught in global warming lie, admitting 1936 was hotter than 2012. <http://www.naturalnews.com>. July 1, 2014.  
[http://www.benjerry.com/values/issues-we-care-about/climate-justice/foods-endangered-climatechange?utm\\_source=outbrain&utm\\_medium=cpc&utm\\_campaign=desktop&utm\\_term=4775950&utm\\_article=41226175](http://www.benjerry.com/values/issues-we-care-about/climate-justice/foods-endangered-climatechange?utm_source=outbrain&utm_medium=cpc&utm_campaign=desktop&utm_term=4775950&utm_article=41226175)  
<http://english.stackexchange.com/questions/305312/where-does-the-sky-is-falling-come-from>
- The Tribune Papers.com.(2013). <http://www.tribunepapers.com/2013/03/06/ncdc-charged-with-manipulating-data-to-prove-global-warming-2/>

- Investor's Business Daily*(2015). editorial, U.N. Official Reveals Real Reason Behind Warming Scare. February 10, 2015
- Kaiser, K.L.E. (2015). Lindau Nobel Laureate Meetings – and their meaning. *Canada Free Press* (2015), *Ice Age Now* (2015) and *Principia Scientific International* . July 3, 2015.
- Lott, M. (2015), *FoxNews.com*, October 7, 2015.
- McCabe, G. & Wolock, D. (2015). Variability and trends in global drought. *Journal of Earth and Space Science*. Vol. 2, Issue 6. pp. 223-228. June, 2015.
- Meadows, D.H., Meadows, D.L., Randers, J., and Behrens III, W.W. (1972). *The Limits to Growth*. 2ed. Patomac Associates.
- Moore, M. (2009) Lord Lawson calls for public inquiry into UEA global warming data 'manipulation'. *The Telegraph*. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/earth/environment/globalwarming/6634282/>
- Morano, M.(2104) *Climate Depot*. October 1, 2014
- Morano, M. (2016), *Climate Depot*. May 12, 2016.
- NASA/NOAA (2015). *NASA, NOAA Find 2014 Warmest Year in Modern Record*. <http://www.nasa.gov/press/2015/january/nasa-determines-2014-warmest-year-in--record>
- Newman, A. (2014). U.S. Agencies Accused of Fudging Data to Show Global Warming. *The New American*. 28 January 2014. <http://www.thenewamerican.com/tech/environment/item/17500-u-s-agencies-accused-of-fudging-data-to-show-global-warming>
- Nuccitelli, D. (2014). The Wall Street Journal denies the 97% scientific consensus on human-caused global warming. *The Guardian*. May 28, 2014.
- Pandey, A. (2016). US Deposits \$500M Into UN-Backed Green Climate Fund. *International Business Times*. March 8, 2016.
- Petit, J.R., Jouzel, J., Raynaud, D., Barkov, N.I., Barnola, J.M., Basile, I., Bender, M., Chappellaz, J., Davis, M., Delaygue, G., Delmotte, M., Kotlyakov, V.M., Legrand, M., Lipenkov, V.Y., Lorius, C., Pepin, L., Ritz, C., Saltzman, E., and Stievenard, M. (1999). Climate and atmospheric history of the past 420,000 years from the Vostok ice core, Antarctica. *Nature* 399; 429-436.
- Pielke, R. (2011) <http://rogerpielkejr.blogspot.com/2011/10/are-us-floods-increasing-answer-is.html>
- Plautz, J. (2015). Draft of Pope Francis' Climate Change Encyclical Leaks. *National Journal*. June 15, 2015.
- Powell, M. (2009). Critical Review of Robinson, Robinson, and Soon's "Environmental Effects of increased Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide." *Rabbit Run*. October 30, 2009.
- Reuters*.(June 22, 2015). Climate change health risk is a medical emergency, experts warn.
- Richard, T. (2015). EPA: We don't need to justify our regulations to avert warming .01 degrees. *The Examiner*. July 10, 2015. <http://www.examiner.com>
- Robinson, A.B., Robinson, N.E., and Soon, W.(2007). Environmental Effects of Increased Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide. *Journal of American Physicians and Surgeons* (12:79-90)
- Shedlock, M. (2009) Phil Jones has collected a staggering \$22.6 million in grants. <http://www.iceagenow.com>. 21 November 2009.
- Siciliano, J. (2015). EPA chief says climate change deniers not 'normal'. *Washington Examiner*. June 23, 2015.
- Stevens, J. & Leonig, C.D. (2011) Solyndra: politics infused Obama energy programs. *The Washington Post*. December 25, 2011.
- Unruh, B. (2015). What those climate geniuses aren't telling you. *World Net Daily*. <http://www.wnd.com/2015/07/ice-age-heat-wave-doesnt-matter-to-global-warming-activists/>
- Vance, A. (2014). *Vapor Tiger: Global warming explained and documented completely for all*. Amazon.
- Watts, A. 2016. The Climateers new pause excuse born of desperation: "the satellites are lying." <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2016/01/15/the-climateers-new-pause-excuse-born-of-desperation-the-satellites-are-lying/>.

Whitlock, S. (2015) FLASHBACK: ABC's '08 Prediction: NYC Under Water from Climate Change By June 2015. <http://newsbusters.org/blogs/scott-whitlock/2015/06/12/flashback-abcs-08-prediction-nyc-under-water-climate-change-june#sthash.ZEvvSbat.dpuf>