



CLIMATE TRUTH FILE 2016



Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow
By Marc Morano

The scientific reality is that on virtually every claim – from A to Z – the promoters of manmade climate fears are falling short or going in the opposite direction.

- Global temperatures have been virtually flat for about 18 years according to satellite data, and peer-reviewed literature is now scaling back predictions of future warming.
- The U.S. has had no Category 3 or larger hurricane make landfall since 2005 – the longest spell since the Civil War.
- Strong F3 or larger tornadoes have been in decline since the 1970s.
- Despite claims of snow being 'a thing of the past,' cold season snowfall has been rising.
- Sea level rise rates have been steady for over a century, with recent deceleration.
- Droughts and floods are neither historically unusual nor caused by mankind, and there is no evidence we are currently having any unusual weather.
- So-called hottest year claims are based on year-to-year temperature data that differs by only a few HUNDREDTHS of a degree to tenths of a degree Fahrenheit – differences that are within the margin of error in the data. In other words, global temperatures have essentially held very steady with no sign of acceleration.
- A 2015 NASA study found Antarctica was NOT losing ice mass and 'not currently contributing to sea level rise.'
- 2016 Arctic sea ice was 22% greater than the recent low point of 2012. The Arctic sea ice is now in a 10-year 'pause' with 'no significant change in the past decade'
-
- Deaths due to extreme weather have declined dramatically.
- Polar bears are doing fine, with their numbers way up since the 1960s.

Have climate change skeptics lost the climate debate?

No! Climate skepticism enjoys huge popularity in polling data, and every time a climate bill has come before the U.S. Congress it has failed to pass. There never was any real climate debate! One of the key reasons climate fear proponents don't want to debate is what happened during a pivotal high-profile debate in 2007 in New York City, where [skeptics were voted the clear winners against global warming proponents](#).

NASA's Gavin Schmidt appeared so demoralized at losing that debate that he announced debates equally split between believers in a climate 'crisis' and scientific skeptics are probably not "worthwhile" to ever agree to again. And climate change promoters listened, with debates becoming rarer and rarer.

In fact, instead of engaging in debates, prominent climate activists now call for jailing skeptics. [Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., declared he wanted to jail his climate skeptics. "They ought to be serving time for it," Kennedy said in 2014.](#) And [Bill Nye -- 'The Jail-The-Skeptics Guy!' -- entertained the idea of jailing climate skeptics for "affecting my quality of life" in 2016, while](#)

[U.S. Senators and top UN scientists called for RICO-style charges against skeptics.](#)

Will the UN Paris climate change agreement save the planet from 'global warming'?

No! Even if you accept the UN's and Al Gore's version of climate change claims, the UN Paris agreement would not 'save' the planet. [Prominent scientists from MIT and Princeton have declared the basis for the UN agreement to be "irrational" and "based on nonsense."](#)

University of Pennsylvania Geologist Dr. Robert Giegengack noted in 2014, "None of the strategies that have been offered by the U.S. government or by the EPA or by anybody else has the remotest chance of altering climate if in fact climate is controlled by carbon dioxide."

In layman's terms: All of the so-called 'solutions' to global warming are purely symbolic when it comes to climate. So, even if we actually faced a climate catastrophe and we had to rely on a UN climate agreement, we would all be doomed!

Will the UN Paris agreement keep Earth's average temperature to within the 2-degree Celsius limit that climate activists have set as a goal?

Even top UN scientists have mocked the notion that a 2-degree Celsius temperature limit is meaningful. Dr. Phil Jones revealed that the 2 deg C limit was "plucked out of thin air" with no scientific basis. "The 2 deg C limit is talked about by a lot within Europe. It is never defined though what it means. Is it 2 deg C for the globe or for Europe? Also when is/was the base against which the 2 deg C is calculated from? I know you don't know the answer, but I don't either! I think it is plucked out of thin air," Jones wrote in the leaked Climategate emails.

Princeton Physicist Dr. Will Happer rejects the whole notion of reducing emissions to control temperature. "Policies to slow CO₂ emissions are really based on nonsense. We are being led down a false path," Happer said in 2015.

Why would the UN and other organizations push manmade 'global warming' fears if the science is not there to support their claims? What possible reason could they have to hype science?

The United Nations has publicly stated its goal is not to 'solve' climate change, but to seek to redistribute wealth and expand its authority through more central planning.

UN official Ottmar Edenhofer, co-chair of the IPCC Working Group III, admitted what's behind the climate issue: "One must say clearly that we redistribute *de facto* the world's wealth by climate policy ... One has to free oneself from the illusion that international climate policy is environmental policy. This has almost nothing to do with environmental policy anymore."

EU climate commissioner Connie Hedegaard revealed: *Global Warming Policy Is Right Even If Science Is Wrong*. Hedegaard said in 2013, "Let's say that science, some decades from now, said 'we were wrong, it was not about climate,' would it not in any case have been good to do many of things you have to do in order to combat climate change?"

The UN is seeking central planning. UN climate chief Christiana Figueres declared in 2012 that she is seeking a "centralized transformation" that is "going to make the life of everyone on the planet very different." She added: "This is a centralized transformation that is taking place because governments have decided that they need to listen to science."

The UN and EPA regulations are pure climate symbolism in exchange for a more centrally planned energy economy. The UN and EPA regulations are simply a vehicle to put politicians and bureaucrats in charge of our energy economy and 'save' us from bad weather and 'climate change.'

Is the UN IPCC the gold standard for science?

It is fool's gold. The UN IPCC is a political organization masquerading as a scientific body. Many UN lead authors have now resigned from the IPCC or had their names removed due to the politicization of science to fit the climate change narrative. The former chief of the UN IPCC, Rajendra Pachauri, declared global warming "is my religion." The UN IPCC is a lobbying organization that seeks to enrich the UN by putting it in charge of 'solving' climate change.

Will stopping global warming help poor nations?

Quite the opposite. Attempting to control weather and climate will have no impact on climate, but a huge impact on economic development of poor nations due to so-called 'solutions' of global warming that would limit development and ban many forms of life-saving carbon based energy.

Penn State Prof. Michael Mann has called the UN Paris agreement the "last chance" to battle global warming. Is it the last opportunity?

The fact is that every UN Climate Summit is hailed as the "last chance" to stop 'global warming' before it's too late. Previous "last chance" deadlines turned out to be - well - not the "last chance," after all.

In 2001, and at almost every annual UN climate summit after that, every deadline has been heralded as the "last chance" to stop 'global warming.' It seems the earth is serially doomed. The UN issued environmental "Tipping Points" in 1982 and another 10-year climate "Tipping Point" in 1989. There have even been tipping points of Hours, Days, Months, Years, and even on Millennial time scales.

The 2015 UN Paris climate agreement was hailed as historic. Did it solve climate change?

If climate activists at the UN and in the media actually believed the UN agreement 'solved' global warming, shouldn't that mean we never have to hear

about 'solving' global warming ever again? If it really 'solved' climate change, does this mean we can halt the endless supply of federal tax dollars funding 'climate change' studies? Does this mean we can stop worrying about the ability of 'global warming' to end civilization and cause wars, and increase [prostitution](#), [bar room brawls](#), [rape](#), [airline turbulence](#), etc.? If activists truly believed a UN treaty could 'solve' global warming, they would move on to a new issue.

Will EPA climate regulations impact the Earth's climate?

NO! President Obama's own [EPA Chief Gina McCarthy admitted that the EPA regulations are symbolic and will have no measurable climate impact - even if you believe in the climate activist version of science](#). "The value of this rule is not measured in that way [temperature impact]," McCarthy said in 2015. "I am not disagreeing that this action in and of itself will not make all the difference we need to address climate action, but what I'm saying is that if we don't take action domestically we will never get started," she added. Obama's former EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson had previously noted that ["U.S. action alone will not impact world CO₂ levels."](#)

Climatologist Dr. Patrick Michaels' analysis says any potential impact on climate from EPA regulations would be "so small as to be undetectable, less than two one-hundredths of a degree C." "We're not even sure how to put such a small number into practical terms, because, basically, the number is so small as to be undetectable."

Even NASA's former lead global warming scientist James Hansen has called Obama's EPA climate regulations "practically worthless," and added, "You've got to be kidding me."

Yet, despite the fact that EPA regulations would have no impact on global CO₂ levels, Obama advisor John Podesta claimed in 2014 that the EPA CO₂ regulations are needed to combat extreme weather: "The risk on the downside you're seeing every day in the weather."

Why would skeptics seek to overturn Obama's EPA climate executive orders?

Obama's EPA regulations (including the Clean Power Act) bypassed Congress and imposed domestic climate regulations on America without a single vote of Congress. Obama's Harvard Law School Professor Laurence Tribe said the EPA climate regulations are akin to "burning the Constitution."

Tribe, a liberal constitutional scholar at Harvard University, declared that Obama's executive orders "raised serious questions under the separation of powers" because "the EPA is attempting to exercise lawmaking power that belongs to Congress and judicial power that belongs to the federal courts." Tribe added, "Burning the Constitution cannot be part of our national energy policy."

Climate activists seem to think we need more taxes and regulation to somehow stop bad weather.

Shouldn't all Americans want to reduce 'carbon pollution' for our health?

CO₂ is not 'pollution.' The term 'carbon pollution' is unscientific and misleading. As James Agresti wrote: "The phrase conflates carbon dioxide with noxious chemicals like carbon monoxide and black carbon." "The phrase 'carbon pollution' is scientifically inaccurate because there are more than ten million different carbon compounds, and the word 'carbon' could refer to any of them. Some of the more notorious of these compounds are highly poisonous, such as carbon monoxide (a deadly gas) and black carbon (the primary ingredient of cancerous and mutagenic soot). Using a phrase that does not distinguish between such drastically different substances is a sure way to misinform people."

Carbon Dioxide - CO₂ - is a harmless trace essential gas in the atmosphere that humans exhale from their mouth (after inhaling oxygen).

Princeton Physicist Dr. Will Happer has said: "To call carbon dioxide a pollutant is really Orwellian. You are calling something a pollutant that we all produce. Where does that lead us eventually?"

CO₂ is a greenhouse gas and it has been rising steadily. How can you deny global warming?

CO₂ is not the tail that wags the dog. CO₂ is a trace essential gas, but without it life on earth would be impossible. Carbon dioxide fertilizes algae, trees, and crops to provide food for humans and animals. We inhale oxygen and exhale CO₂. Slightly higher atmospheric CO₂ levels cannot possibly supplant the numerous complex and inter-connected forces that have always determined Earth's climate.

As University of London professor emeritus Philip Stott has noted: "The fundamental point has always been this. Climate change is governed by hundreds of factors, or variables, and the very idea that we can manage climate change predictably by understanding and manipulating at the margins one politically selected factor (CO₂), is as misguided as it gets." "It's scientific nonsense," Stott added.

Even the global warming activists at RealClimate.org acknowledged this [in a September 20, 2008 article](#), stating, "The actual temperature rise is an emergent property resulting from interactions among hundreds of factors."

Haven't the past few years shown global warming is worse than we thought?

As the real world evidence mounts that global warming claims are failing, climate activists have ramped up predictions of future climate change impacts, declaring that it is 'worse than we thought.' But a prediction or projection 50 to 100 years into the future is not 'evidence.'

Climate activists have said every storm is now influenced by 'global warming.'

These types of unscientific claims have a long history. In Australia in 1846, Aborigines blamed the bad climate on the introduction of the white man in

Australia. During World War II, some blamed the war for causing unusual weather patterns. In 1933, Syria banned the Yo-Yo because they thought it caused drought. In the 1970s, extreme weather was blamed on manmade global cooling.

If CO₂ is not the main driver of global temperatures, what is? The sun?

When global temperatures are the question, the answer is not the sun or CO₂. It is the sun, volcanoes, tilt of the Earth's axis, water vapor, methane, clouds, ocean cycles, plate tectonics, shifting ocean currents, albedo (Earth's changing reflective properties), atmospheric dust, atmospheric circulation, cosmic rays, particulates like carbon soot and volcanic dust, forests and grasslands, and urban and other land use changes. Climate change is governed by hundreds of factors, not just CO₂.

Hasn't the Earth overheated in the past when CO₂ rose?

The geologic history of the earth undercuts rising carbon dioxide fears. CO₂ levels were higher in the past and there was no climate apocalypse. Greenpeace co-founder Dr. Patrick Moore has testified to Congress: "The fact that we had both higher temperatures and an ice age at a time when CO₂ emissions were 10 times higher than they are today, fundamentally contradicts the certainty that human-caused CO₂ emissions are the main cause of global warming. An Ice Age occurred when CO₂ was 10 times higher than today."

Are there just a handful of skeptical scientists who dissent from the UN IPCC claims?

Scientists who are skeptical about "dangerous manmade climate change" have been speaking out for years. Many former prominent former believers in manmade global warming announced they were reconsidering the science.

Scientists like Dr. Leonard Bengtsson, Dr. Judith Curry, and UN IPCC Lead Author Dr. Richard Tol are growing more skeptical of climate claims.

The 2016 film *Climate Hustle* documented many of the politically left scientists (who voted for Gore and endorsed Obama) who have reexamined the evidence and are now skeptical.

Climate scientist Mike Hulme [dismantled the "thousands of scientists agree" claim](#) put forth by the United Nations and news media. Claims that "2,500 of the world's leading scientists have reached a consensus that human activities are having a significant influence on the climate" are disingenuous, Hulme noted. The key scientific case for CO₂ driving global warming, like many others in the IPCC reports, "is reached by only a few dozen experts in the specific field of detection and attribution studies; other IPCC authors are experts in other fields." Other scientists are excluded or not consulted.

Dr. William Schlesinger agrees with the UN climate view but has admitted that [only 20% of UN IPCC scientists deal with climate](#). In other words, 80% of the UN's IPCC membership are experts in other fields and have no dealing with or expertise in climate change as part of their academic studies.

How can you reject the National Academy of Sciences and other science organization that all agree manmade global warming is a threat?

Proponents of manmade global warming often point out the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) and American Meteorological Society (AMS) have issued statements endorsing the so-called 'consensus' view that human emissions drive climate change. However, neither the NAS nor the AMS has ever allowed member scientists to vote directly on these statements. A couple of dozen members of the institutions' governing boards produced the statements - and then issued press releases.

The governing boards are steeped in politics and seek more funding for 'research' that promotes currently accepted viewpoints. The full membership of actual scientists never gets to vote on the activist statements and in many cases is completely unaware until too late that the boards have issued them. Many such organizations have faced [open rebellion](#) by their skeptical member scientists for such actions, including the American Chemical Society, American Physical Society, and International Geological Congress.

But don't 97% of scientists say manmade climate change is real?

The claim that "97% of scientists agree" is in part based on 77 anonymous scientists who responded to a survey. The survey started by seeking opinions from 10,257 scientists. However, [only 77 responded](#). So the 97% "consensus" claim is not based on *thousands* of scientists or even *hundreds* of scientists - but only on 77 scientists. Out of those 77 scientists, 75 answered the survey to form the mythical 97% 'consensus.'

In 2013 and 2014, other claims of an alleged 97% climate 'consensus' emerged, prompting UN IPCC lead author Dr. Richard Tol to publish a critique and declare: "The 97% is essentially pulled from thin air, it is not based on any credible research whatsoever."

The new 97% claim by climate activist John Cook was so "[so broad that it incorporates the views of most prominent climate skeptics](#)."

Another researcher, Andrew Montford, commented: "The [97%] consensus as described by the survey is virtually meaningless and tells us nothing about the current state of scientific opinion beyond the trivial observation that carbon dioxide is a greenhouse gas and that human activities have warmed the planet to some unspecified extent."

Lord Christopher Monckton's analysis found that "only 41 papers - 0.3% of all 11,944 abstracts or 1.0% of the 4,014 expressing an opinion, and not 97.1%" actually endorsed the claim that "more than half of recent global warming was anthropogenic."

Bjorn Lomborg wrote: "Do you remember the '97% consensus,' which even Obama tweeted? Turns out the authors don't want to reveal their data. It has always been a dodgy paper. Virtually everyone I know in the debate would automatically be included in the 97%."

The Associated Press reported in 2015 that, "In the worst case scenario, Antarctica's melt could push sea levels up 10 feet worldwide in a century or two, recurving heavily populated coastlines." Don't we owe it to millions of people to stop this?

A 2015 NASA study found that Antarctica was NOT losing ice mass and "not currently contributing to sea level rise," but actually *reducing* sea level rise. The NASA study found that the ice mass gains of the Antarctic ice sheet are greater than their losses.

The Associated Press was not the first one to hype these same Antarctica melt fears. Virtually the exact same claims and hype were reported in 2014, 1990, 1979, 1922, and 1901! In 1990, NBC's Today Show featured Paul Ehrlich warning of impacts of Antarctic ice melt: 'You Could Tie Your Boat to the Washington Monument.'

1979 New York Times: "Boats could be launched from the bottom of the steps of the Capitol' in DC."

1922: "Mountain after mountain of [Antarctic] ice will fall into the sea, be swept northwards by the currents, and melt, thus bringing about, but at a much more rapid rate, the threatened inundation of the land by the rising of the sea to its ancient level."

1901: "Geologists believe that this great ice sucker has reached the stage of perfection when it [Antarctica] will, break up again, letting loose all the waters of its auction over the two hemispheres, and completely flooding the low-lying lands of Europe, Asia, and North America."

NOAA reported that manmade climate change has doubled the chances for the type of heavy downpours that caused devastating Louisiana floods in August 2016. Is climate change increasing rain and floods?

NOAA chose media hype over science. Climatologist Dr. Roger Pielke, Sr., slammed the NOAA modeling study as "manipulation of science for political reasons," adding "NOAA should be embarrassed" and labeling the study "a dismaying example of manipulation of science for political reasons."

Real Climate Science's Tony Heller noted the NOAA claim "has no scientific basis, and ignores all available actual data." "Software models can be written to produce any result the author wants to produce. They are not evidence of anything. There has been no increase in heavy rains in Louisiana."

Climate models can be twisted to make it appear the invisible hand of 'global warming' has a role in almost every weather event. Ironically, heavy rains used to be caused by 'global cooling' in the 1970s. *Time Magazine* noted in a 1974 article titled "Another Ice Age" that "record rains" were accompanying a cooling climate trend.

Any attempt to link manmade global warming to [rainfall events](#) in any specific region is the stuff of pure politics - not science. As a result of this and similar realities, global warming activists are desperately seeking to tie any and all weather events to global warming.

In Australia, climate activists were caught blaming too little rain on manmade global warming, and then - when there was too much rain - they blamed *that* on manmade global warming, too. Other studies have found both temperatures and precipitation were higher 1,000 years ago during the Medieval Warm Period.

Did 'climate change' cause Hurricane Hermine that hit Florida in 2016?

No. Hurricane Hermine was a Category 1 storm that finally broke the record 11-year span of no land-falling hurricanes hitting Florida. Meteorologist Joe Bastardi noted "portraying Hermine as some kind of climate change demon is either ignorance as to the history of hurricanes or deceit." They are "warning us about something [Florida hurricanes] that occurred much more frequently in the past, yet trying to blame it on an agenda-driven issue," Bastardi added.

Does global warming cause wars? Is it a national security threat?

Ironically, the data and studies reveal that warm periods coincide with less conflict. This same argument was used by the CIA in 1974 to claim that 'global cooling' would cause conflict and terrorism. To believe that rising CO₂ is a key cause for the creation of ISIS is akin to believing that the Middle East was a peaceful region until modern 'global warming' set upon it. The Center for Strategic and International Studies report noted the opposite of recent claims regarding 'global warming' and war. "Since the dawn of civilization, warmer eras have meant *fewer* wars."

Another study published in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences found that "Cooler periods coincided with conflicts and disease outbreaks."

The 'hottest year' on record occurred in recent years.

Actually, global temperatures have been holding nearly steady for almost two decades (nearly 18 years according to RSS satellite data). While 2005, 2010, and 2015 were declared the 'hottest years' by global warming proponents, a closer examination revealed that the claims were "based on year-to-year temperature data that differs by only a few HUNDREDTHS of a degree to tenths of a degree Fahrenheit - differences that were within the margin of error in the data." In other words, global temperatures have essentially held very steady with no sign of acceleration.

The media and climate activists hype 'record' temperatures that are not even outside the margin of error of the dataset as somehow meaningful. Even former NASA climatologist James Hansen admitted 'hottest year' declarations are "not particularly important."

MIT climate scientist Dr. Richard Lindzen ridiculed 'hottest year' claims in 2015. "The uncertainty here is tenths of a degree. When someone points to this and says this is the warmest temperature on record, what are they talking about? It's just nonsense. This is a very tiny change period," Lindzen said. "If you can adjust temperatures to 2/10ths of a degree, it means it wasn't certain to 2/10ths of a degree."

So-called 'hottest year' claims are just a fancy way of saying that the 'global warming pause' has essentially continued.

Isn't the U.S. experiencing unprecedented heat waves?

Climatologist Dr. John Christy: "About 75% of the states recorded their hottest temperature prior to 1955, and over 50% of the states experienced their record cold temperatures after 1940." In 2014, the U.S. experienced a brutally cold winter and a cool summer.

Arctic ice melted to record lows in 2012. Isn't that due to manmade global warming?

In 2016, Arctic ice made was 22% greater than the satellite era low point of 2012. The 2016 Arctic sea ice minimum is now in a 10-year 'pause' with 'no significant change in the past decade'

According to climate analyst Dr. David Whitehouse of the UK Global Warming Policy Forum, "There is no general decrease in minimal ice area, by this measure, between 2007 - 2016 - ten years! The case can be made that the behavior of the Arctic ice cover has changed from the declining years of 1998 - 2007."

Arctic ice changes are not 'proof' of manmade global warming, nor are they unprecedented, unusual, or cause for alarm, according to experts and multiple peer-reviewed studies. After weeks of media hype blaming global warming, NASA finally admitted in September 2012 that an August Arctic cyclone "broke up" and "wreaked havoc" on sea ice. According to NASA: "The cyclone remained stalled over the arctic for several days ... pushing [sea ice] south to warmer waters, where it melted."

In 2013, the Arctic ice cap grew by 29% over 2012 in the summer with 533,000 more square miles of ocean covered with ice than in 2012.

Global warming activists have long hyped satellite era data, which begin in 1979, to claim [record low Arctic sea ice](#) - while ignoring the satellite data that showed record or near record sea ice expansion in the Antarctic in previous years. Moreover, satellite monitoring of Arctic ice began at the end of a 40-year cold cycle (remember [the 1970s fears of a coming ice age?](#)), when ice was most likely at its highest extent in the modern era.

We have had similar Arctic ice panics in the past. A November 2, 1922 [Washington Post article](#) was headlined, "Arctic Ocean getting warm: Seals vanish and icebergs melt." The Arctic Ocean is warming, icebergs are growing scarcer, and in places the seals are finding the water too hot, it claimed.

Isn't manmade global warming causing extreme weather?

"There is a lack of evidence to blame humans for an increase in extreme events. One cannot convict CO₂ of causing any of these events, because they've happened in the past before CO₂ levels rose," climatologist John Christy [testified before Congress](#) in 2012. "There are innumerable types of events that can be defined as extreme events - so for the enterprising individual (unencumbered by the scientific method), weather statistics can supply an unlimited, target-rich environment in which to discover a 'useful' extreme event."

"There is no evidence that disasters are getting worse because of climate change," [notes Professor Roger Pielke, Jr.](#) "There's really no evidence that we're in the midst of an extreme weather era - whether man has influenced climate or not."

Aren't hurricanes getting bigger, stronger, and more frequent due to manmade global warming?

As of 2016, the U.S. has gone 11 years (since Hurricane Wilma in 2005) with no Category 3 or larger hurricanes making landfall, the longest spell since at least 1900.

Even with the recent Hurricane Matthew which skirted the Florida coast as a category 3 hurricane, the U.S. is still currently in a record-breaking hurricane drought of no Category 3 or larger storms making landfall. In fact, the last Category 4-5 hurricane that made landfall in the US was 24 years ago in 1992 [Andrew]. For the United States, during the past four decades, "The fewest number of major hurricanes struck during any 40-year period since at least the 1800s."

The worst decade for major (Category 3, 4, and 5) hurricanes was the 1940s, according to the website Real Science which analyzed National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration data. In 2011, a new study found that "overall global tropical cyclone activity has decreased to historically low levels during the past five years."

Isn't global warming causing bigger, more dangerous tornadoes?

No. In fact, big tornadoes have seen a drop in frequency since the 1950s. "There has been a downward trend in strong (F3) to violent (F5) tornadoes in U.S. since 1950s." "Warming causes fewer strong tornadoes, not more," [climatologist Dr. Roy Spencer explained.](#)

The years 2012, 2013, and 2014 all saw at or near record low tornado counts in the U.S.

In 2015, the number of major tornadoes was "one of the lowest on record," according to NOAA.

And 2016 has so far been another below-normal tornado season, according to NOAA.

There is "no scientific consensus or connection between global warming and tornadic activity," [emphasized Greg Carbin](#), tornado warning coordination meteorologist at NOAA's Storm Prediction Center in Norman, Oklahoma. "NOAA statistics show that the last 60 years have seen a dramatic increase in the reporting of weak tornadoes, but no change in the number of severe to violent ones," Corbin commented.

In 1975, tornado outbreaks were blamed on 'global cooling.'

Don't we need to stop global warming to keep cities from being inundated by rising seas?

Sea levels have been rising since the last ice age ended more than 10,000 years ago. There is currently no acceleration in sea level rise.

Global sea levels have been naturally [rising for ~20,000 years and have decelerated over the past 8,000 years](#), [decelerated over the 20th century](#), [decelerated 31% since 2002](#), and [decelerated 44% since 2004](#) to less than 7 inches per century. There is [no evidence of an acceleration of sea level rise](#), and therefore no evidence of any effect of mankind on sea levels.

According to tide gauges, sea levels are rising LESS than the thickness of one nickel (1.95 mm thick) per year or about the thickness of one penny (1.52 mm thick) a year. According to satellite info, it is rising slightly more than two pennies a year (3.04 mm)

Aren't the recent droughts in the U.S. due to manmade global warming?

Across time scales required for any meaningful analysis, "Droughts have, for the most part, become shorter, less frequent, and cover a smaller portion of the U. S. over the last century," [Professor Roger Pielke, Jr. observes](#). "U.S. Midwestern drought has decreased in past 50+ years? That is not skepticism; that's according to the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change," he adds.

Even U.S. government scientists have admitted that recent droughts are not due to climate change. "This is not a climate change drought," [said Dr. Robert Hoerling](#), a NOAA research meteorologist, who served as the lead author of the U.S. Climate Change Science Plan Synthesis and Assessment Report. "The good news," he emphasized, "is that this isn't global warming. This is not the new normal in terms of drought."

For scientists who take the long view of history, the U.S. drought of 2012 is "merely a climatological blip," [E&E News reported](#), in an article titled "Dust Bowl and 1988 both eclipse 2012 drought, scientists say."

What about California's record drought?

California's current drought is not related to climate change. Much more severe California droughts occurred with lower allegedly 'safe' CO₂ levels. [According to the data, "past dry periods have lasted more than 200 years."](#) "Researchers have documented multiple droughts in California that lasted 10 or 20 years in a row during the past 1,000 years - compared to the mere 3-year duration of the current dry spell. The two most severe mega-droughts make the Dust Bowl of the 1930s look tame: a 240-year-long drought that started in 850 and, 50 years after the conclusion of that one, another that stretched at least 180 years."

Isn't climate change making floods more severe?

Peer-reviewed studies reject these claims, too. "Are US floods increasing? The answer is still 'No,'" says a new scientific paper by Roger Pielke, Jr. The evidence demonstrates that "flooding has not increased in U.S. over records of 85 to 127 years. This adds to a pile of research that shows similar results around the world," Pielke said. It is also worth noting that

"the world's ten deadliest floods all occurred before 1976." [In other words,](#) "All of the world's deadliest floods occurred with CO₂ well below 350 ppm."

In addition, a recent study by the U.S. government found no evidence that climate change caused more severe flooding during last century. In fact, the U.S. Geological Survey found that in some regions "floods become *less severe* as greenhouse gas emissions increased." Moreover, at this time, "We do not see a clear pattern that enables us to understand how climate change will alter flood conditions in the future," USGS scientist Robert Hirsch explained.

Aren't wildfires getting worse?

No. "Data from both the U.S. and Canada show [the number of wildfires has declined](#) over the past 40 to 50 years and that the number of wildfires was higher during the global cooling scare of the 1970s." In fact, the number of U.S. wildfires has dropped 10% per decade. The U.S. government's National Interagency Fire Center has reported that U.S. wildfires now occur "half as often as they did 50 years ago."

Spanish researchers confirmed [climate change is not to blame for increased forest fires](#). "The change in the occurrence of fires that are recorded in the historical research cannot be explained by the gradual change in climate," they reported. Instead, it "corresponds to changes in the availability of fuel, the use of sources of energy, and the continuity of the landscape." In the United States, wildfires are also due to a failure to thin forests or remove dead and diseased trees - due largely to environmentalist protests and lawsuits.

Aren't polar bears dying, threatened with extinction by receding Arctic ice?

No. Polar bears are at or near historic population highs. The only threats they face are from virtual world computer model predictions that do not reflect reality or account for the adaptability of these animals.

"The only reason the service listed them was based on speculation from fairly untested models, based on what the fate of polar bears may be in the future," like *if* global warming ever dramatically alters the bears' habitat, [Alaska's coordinator for endangered species explained](#).

"The polar bear population is very, very healthy," [Canadian Inuit have emphasized](#). "We live in polar bear country. We understand the polar bears. We are unanimous in our belief that polar bears have not declined."

Evolutionary biologist and paleozoologist Dr. Susan Crockford of the University of Victoria agrees. "Polar bears have survived several episodes of much warmer climate over the last 10,000 years than exists today," she wrote. "There is no evidence to suggest that the polar bear or its food supply is in danger of disappearing entirely with increased Arctic warming, regardless of the dire fairy-tale scenarios predicted by computer models."

Crockford added: "The annual minimum reached in late summer has little impact on polar bear health and survival. What matters most to polar bears is the presence of ample ice in spring and early summer (March-June), which is their critical feeding period."

University of Iceland professor and award-winning quaternary geologist Dr. Olafur Ingolfsson notes that a fossil specimen "confirms that the polar bear was a morphologically distinct species at least 100,000 years ago, and this basically means that the polar bear has already survived one interglacial period." This tells us that, "Despite the on-going warming in the Arctic today, maybe we don't have to be quite so worried about the polar bear."

Professor J. Scott Armstrong, a forecasting expert at the Wharton School, says [polar bear models are critically flawed](#). "To list a species that is currently in good health as an endangered species requires valid forecasts that its population would decline to levels that threaten its viability." In fact, the polar bear populations have been increasing rapidly in recent decades, due to hunting restrictions.

Biologist Josef Reichholf heads the Vertebrates Department at the National Zoological Collection in Munich. "In warmer regions, it takes far less effort to ensure survival," he points out. "How did the polar bear survive the last warm period? Whether bears survive will depend on human beings, not the climate."

Don't graphs show that current temperatures are the highest in 1,000 years?

Penn State professor and UN IPCC modeler Michael Mann did publish a hockey stick-shaped graph that purportedly showed an unprecedented sudden increase in average global temperatures, following ten centuries of supposedly stable climate. However, Dr. Mann was at the center of the Climategate scandal. His graph and the data and methodology behind it have been scrutinized and debunked in peer-reviewed studies by numerous climate scientists, statisticians, and other experts.

The latest research clearly reveals that the Medieval Warm Period (also called the Medieval Climate Optimum) has been verified and was in fact global, not just confined to the Northern Hemisphere. The [Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change](#) reported in 2009 that "the [Medieval Warm Period](#) was: (1) global in extent, (2) at least as warm as, but likely even warmer than, the Current Warm Period, and (3) of a duration significantly longer than that of the Current Warm Period to date."

The Science and Public Policy Institute [reported in May 2009](#): "More than 700 scientists from 400 institutions in 40 countries have contributed peer-reviewed papers providing evidence that the Medieval Warm Period (MWP) was real, global, and warmer than the present. And the numbers grow larger daily."

Weren't the Climategate scientists exonerated - meaning there was no scandal?

Many in the media repeatedly cite the various Climategate investigations as an 'exoneration' of the UN global warming scientists. But a closer look reveals that the investigations were nothing more than the global warming industry pretending to investigate itself, and of course finding no wrongdoing.

Penn State's investigation of Michael Mann is a prime example of what a mockery the process became. Clive Crook of the *Atlantic Monthly* [summed it up this way](#): "The Penn State inquiry exonerating Michael Mann would be difficult to parody. Three of four allegations were dismissed out of hand at the outset."

Why do you oppose government taking steps to solve the climate crisis?

Despite all the evidence and studies presented in this fact sheet, many people continue to say that Congress and the United Nations need to take immediate action to prevent more extreme weather, rising sea levels, and planetary 'overheating.' The reality is that politicians who say government "can do something about" droughts, floods, sea levels, hurricanes, and tornadoes are practicing the equivalent of medieval witchcraft.

Laws, treaties, and regulations - whether from the United Nations, the U.S. Congress, or the Environmental Protection Agency - cannot control the weather. CO₂ does not control global temperatures, and current global temperatures are well within natural variability, as demonstrated by surface and satellite data and extensive historic records. Scientific studies and data also show that droughts, floods, wildfires, and other extreme weather are not unusual, unprecedented, or related to CO₂ emissions or climate change.