

Brief Overview of the US Global Warming Movement

Since I've been deeply immersed in the Global Warming¹ issue for over 20 years (as a physicist), it's easy to fall into the trap where I assume that others have a similar perspective on this complex technical topic. Here is a simple synopsis of the situation, so that those without the benefit of years of experience, can have a better understanding of what's going on here, and what's at stake...

1 - The Global Warming matter is actually **not** about climate, but is really a [political movement](#) focused on profoundly changing our American way of life. (Reading through the proposals of the [Green New Deal](#) should make that abundantly clear.)

2 - Studying the writings of the environmental movement's worldwide leader, [Bill McKibben](#), it's apparent that their objective is for America to abandon "modernity"² and to revert to an agrarian lifestyle.

3 - "Global Warming" was latched onto because it was the only tool powerful enough to enable and justify these extraordinary societal changes (e.g. get rid of all fossil fuels). Wind energy was put forth as a primary solution, as it is consistent with us reverting to antiquity energy sources, suitable for an agrarian society.

4 - One of the key elements that appears to give the Global Warming movement credibility, is that its promoters claim that it has the imprimatur (blessing) of Science.

5 - Despite what the public has been told by the media and social activists, the Global Warming matter has **not** been scientifically resolved. In technical terms, it remains as a scientific [hypothesis](#).

6 - The way real Science works is that it is 100% the obligation of the scientists making a claim, to provide the scientific proof for their hypothesis. *This has not happened here.*

7 - The UN [IPCC](#) has been the primary "scientific" source of [material](#), supporting the Global Warming movement³. However, the UN is a *political* organization, and at no time has the IPCC done a genuine scientific assessment of the Global Warming hypothesis. Instead they started with the unproven assumption that it was true!⁴

8 - A genuine scientific assessment has four necessary components. It is: **a)** objective, **b)** comprehensive, **c)** transparent, *and* **d)** empirical⁵. There has never been a true scientific assessment of the Global Warming hypothesis, anywhere on the planet.

9 - [Thousands](#) of independent scientists have questioned the Global Warming hypothesis. If this was a real science issue, the promoters would make their scientific case, and then would *welcome* other scientists critiquing it. *That has not happened.*

10-The fact that the scientists who critique the Global Warming hypothesis are called “deniers,” is another tip-off that we have left the field of Science — and are now in the realm of *political* science.

11-Thousands of independent scientists have advocated for years that we have a genuine scientific assessment of the profoundly important Global Warming hypothesis. This has continually been derailed by politics, so has not happened *anywhere*.

12-For the first time ever, the US has a President who is willing to actually examine the claims of the Global Warming movement. To that end he recently proposed a *Presidential Committee on Climate Science* (PCCS). This is a generational opportunity.

13-The head person of the proposed PCCS is an extremely competent, a-political scientist, [Dr. William Happer](#). We’d be hard-pressed to come up with a better person for such a huge, thankless task.

14-Using a football analogy, scientists advocating traditional methodologies have been slowly grinding away on this issue for a bruising 30± years — and have only now brought the ball down to within the five yard line.

15-The Left is apoplectic that their carefully contrived world-plan may collapse if the PCCS succeeds. As a result they are making a ferocious goal-line stand against the PCCS, and against Dr. Happer (e.g. see [here](#), [here](#), [here](#), [here](#), [here](#), and [here](#)).

It’s now up to those who value our American Way of Life: are we going to aggressively punch the ball across the goal line (i.e. support the PCCS and Dr. Happer), or will we fold to the defense of our anti-American opponents?

Literally, the future of our country hangs in the balance.

As busy as we are, there is no more important issue on our plate than defending our way-of-life from this extraordinary attack to undermine our society.

Time is of the essence here, as the decision about whether or not there will be a PCCS will likely happen within the next week.

john droz, jr. physicist 3-8-19

Some Notes —

¹ The technical term is *Anthropogenic Global Warming* (AGW). “Anthropogenic” means primarily man-made. For the sake of brevity — and to use a term more commonly employed — I’ll say “Global Warming” here.

— continued on next page —

² This is the “modernity” that the Left is **opposing**:

“As a historical category, Modernity refers to a period marked by a questioning or rejection of tradition; the prioritization of individualism, freedom and formal equality; faith in inevitable social, scientific and technological progress and human perfectibility; rationalization and professionalization; a movement from feudalism (or agrarianism) toward capitalism and the market economy; industrialization, urbanization and secularization; the development of the nation-state and its constituent institutions (e.g. representative democracy, public education, modern bureaucracy)...” (Foucault 1995, 170–77)

³ Since the Global Warming advocates knew that the IPCC’s reports were not enough, their marketers decided to bolster their position by claiming that their hypothesis was supported by 97% of the world’s scientists.

But that’s false, and purposefully deceptive. **Fact one:** there never has been a survey of the world’s 2+ million scientists on *anything*. **Fact two:** There may indeed be a majority of certain subsets of scientists that hold an opinion about Global Warming – however, none of them has done a genuine scientific analysis of the Global Warming matter. **Fact three:** Science is never determined by a vote. Was Einstein’s *Theory of Relativity* accepted due to a poll of scientists – or because of scientific proof? **Fact four:** If the AGW supporters had scientific proof of their position, they would not be arguing consensus. **Fact five:** Scientific consensus has been wrong *many* times in our history – like [here](#). (Also note that over 12 years after the definitive study about ulcers was published, accepted and widely distributed, 75% of MDs were still doing it wrong!)

⁴ It’s extremely significant to understand that the IPCC started (back in 1988) with a mandate, based on the *assumption* that Global Warming was primarily caused by [man-made influences](#). This is not how real science works. We do not *assume* the answer to a problem – and then come up with ways to explain our assumption. The IPCC would have a lot more credibility if it *thoroughly* and *objectively* investigated **all** possible contributors to any unusual Global Warming, but they have **not** done that.

⁵ The empirical part is particularly problematic, as (compared to the other three) it is not only hidden from view, but is also extremely difficult to assess. “Empirical” means “based on real-world, verifiable observations.” Instead, many issues today (including AGW) are primarily based on **computer models**. The problem with that is that there are dozens of *unidentified* and *unproven* assumptions imbedded in these complex algorithms. A competent programmer can easily adjust coded variables to produce a desired outcome – and uncovering that manipulation is nearly impossible. For these (and other) reasons, reliance on computer models has become a favorite tactic of hidden agenda promoters... There is also this question: even if everything in the model is accurate and transparent, can a computer model accurately represent something so complicated? There is considerable evidence that says **no** – like these [examples](#).