

Climate Articles

1: Is it clouds, shipping or a volcano? Scientists present potential reasons for record heat

Scientists are still puzzling over the reasons behind a streak of unexpected, record heat that scorched 2023 and into this year, sparking fears that the climate crisis could be moving faster than previously thought.

Is it the clouds? Or shipping? Or maybe a huge volcanic eruption?

A parade of climate researchers presented potential reasons for the apparent surge in global heating at the American Geophysical Union (AGU) meeting in Washington on Tuesday, although none were able to claim a full understanding of what has happened with the world's climate since the start of last year.

"We weren't expecting 2023 to be so exceptional," acknowledged Robert Rohde, a climate scientist at Berkeley Earth, who said last year's temperatures, 0.2C above the previous annual global record, were in the words of a colleague "gobsmackingly bananas".

Humans are causing the world to warm up by the burning of fossil fuels and last year was also influenced by an El Niño event, a naturally reoccurring climate phenomena that typically pushes up global temperatures. "But this was not normal," said Rohde. "Global warming and El Niño are the biggest factors but something else was going on."

"Maybe it's clouds," Rohde said, referencing new research that found there was record low cloud cover last year, which reduced the amount of reflective surface that would deflect the sun's energy back out of the atmosphere. "There was extra warmth because Earth was absorbing extra energy because of a deficit of clouds," he said. "But that just moves the question to 'why there weren't as many clouds?'"

Another potential explanation could be found in measures to cut the amount of air pollution emitted by ships, which came into effect in 2020. While the rules greatly cut this type of pollution, by as much as 90% according to another new paper, it thereby reduced the amount of sulfate aerosols being put into the atmosphere that block incoming solar radiation and help cool the planet slightly.

A further contributing factor might be the eruption of the Hunga Tonga volcano, located in the south Pacific, in 2022. Rohde said the event spewed 150m tons of water vapor into the atmosphere, helping trap more heat close to Earth's surface into 2023.

Among other pondered factors, discussed in front of an audience of several hundred other

researchers, was a reduction in the amount of dust whipping off the Sahara desert, which again would normally act as a solar blocking agent. "Also there could be some sort of climate change feedback we don't understand," said Rohde. "It's a possibility."

The elevated heat has continued throughout much of 2024, with scientists still waiting to see if the unexpected warming will die down. This year is certain to be the hottest on record, the first that will be 1.5C above the pre-industrial era and a signal that the longer-term international effort to keep the temperature rise below this level is probably doomed.

This level of global heating is already fueling dangerous heatwaves, floods and other disasters and scientists say more research is needed to grasp whether the climate system is heating up at an ominous rate beyond previous expectations.

"There is something to explain, there is still work to do," said Gavin Schmidt, a Nasa climate scientist who co-chaired the session and asked attendees to raise their hands if they thought the heat anomalies had been fully explained. Only a few out of several hundred did so.

2: World's forests failed to curb 2023 climate emissions, study finds

SAO PAULO, July 29 (Reuters) - Forests and other land ecosystems failed to curb climate change in 2023 as intense drought in the Amazon rainforest and record wildfires in Canada hampered their natural ability to absorb carbon dioxide, according to a study presented on Monday.

That means a record amount of carbon dioxide entered Earth's atmosphere last year, further feeding global warming, the researchers said.

Plant life helps to slow climate change by taking in huge amounts of carbon dioxide, the main greenhouse gas driving global warming. Forests and other land ecosystems on average absorb nearly a third of annual emissions from fossil fuels, industry and other human causes.

But in 2023, that carbon sink collapsed, according to study co-author Philippe Ciais of the Laboratory for Climate and Environmental Sciences (LSCE), a French research organization.

"The sink is a pump, and we are pumping less carbon from the atmosphere into the land," Ciais said in an interview. "Suddenly the pump is choking, and it's pumping less."

As a result, the growth rate of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere jumped 86% in 2023 compared to 2022, the researchers said.

Scientists at Tsinghua University in China, the University of Exeter in England and LSCE led the research into what caused the shift. Their study was presented at the International Carbon Dioxide Conference in Manaus, Brazil.

A major driver was record high temperatures globally that dried out vegetation in the Amazon and other rainforests, preventing them from taking up more carbon while also fueling record fires in Canada, the study found.

"Imagine your plants at home: If you don't water them, they're not very productive, they don't grow, they don't take up carbon," said Stephen Sitch, a study co-author and carbon expert at the University of Exeter.

"Put that on a big scale like the Amazon forest," Sitch told Reuters on the sidelines of the conference

The study is still in the process of peer review with an academic journal, but three scientists who were not involved in the research told Reuters that its conclusions were sound.

They said that dips in land carbon sinks tend to happen in years affected by the El Nino climate phenomenon, like 2023. But the record high temperatures being driven by climate change made last year's dip particularly extreme.

Also, the consequences of the dip are more severe than in the past because humans are now causing the emission of more carbon dioxide than ever before.

The scientists cautioned that Earth's carbon sink varies widely year to year, and a single year alone will not spell doom. But it would be alarming if what was observed in 2023 becomes a trend, they added.

"This is a warning," said Richard Birdsey of Woodwell Climate Research Center in the United States, who was not involved in the study. "There's a good chance that years like 2023 are going to be more common."

The less carbon the land ecosystems absorb, the less fossil fuels the world can burn before humankind blows past global climate targets, said Anthony Walker, an ecosystem modeler at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory in the United States who was not involved in the study.

"We cannot count on ecosystems to bail us out in the future," said Trevor Keenan, an ecosystem scientist at University of California, Berkeley who was not involved in the study.

3: Alarmists Threaten 'Worldwide Societal Breakdown' from Climate Crisis

A group of climate researchers warned this week that billions of people could find themselves in uninhabitable conditions by the year 2100 thanks to climate change.

"By the end of this century, an estimated 3 to 6 billion individuals — approximately one-third to one-half of the global population — might find themselves confined beyond the livable region, encountering severe heat, limited food availability, and elevated mortality rates because of the effects of climate change," the authors wrote in their "2023 state of the climate report" published in BioScience.

The researchers, led by Oregon-based climate activists William J. Ripple and Christopher Wolf, stated that the effects of global warming "are progressively more severe, and possibilities such as a worldwide societal breakdown are feasible and dangerously underexplored."

"Big problems need big solutions," the authors declared. "Therefore, we must shift our perspective on the climate emergency from being just an isolated environmental issue to a systemic, existential threat."

The paper decries the "overexploitation" of our planet and challenges "the prevailing notion of endless growth and overconsumption by rich countries and individuals as unsustainable

and unjust.”

It advocates “reducing resource overconsumption; reducing, reusing, and recycling waste in a more circular economy” while also calling for “climate justice and fair distribution of the costs and benefits of climate action, particularly for vulnerable communities.”

Predictably, the authors also call for population control, in an effort “to stabilize and gradually decrease the human population with gender justice through voluntary family planning and by supporting women’s and girls’ education and rights, which reduces fertility rates and raises the standard of living.”

The paper blames recent “major extreme weather events and disasters” at least in part to climate change, insisting that “climate extremes are threatening wider areas that have not typically been prone to such extremes” such as northern China, northern India, the United States, and Libya.

Fortunately, in the midst of the apocalyptic fearmongering of West Coast alarmists, sober voices from the scientific community are also growing stronger.

This summer, a group of more than 1,600 eminent scientists, including two Nobel Prize winners, issued the “World Climate Declaration,” in which they stated outright: “There is no climate emergency.”

“Climate science has degenerated into a discussion based on beliefs, not on sound self-critical science,” the scholars asserted, enumerating a number of reasons for their criticisms.

Among other things, the Declaration states that climate models have proven inadequate for predicting global warming, that carbon dioxide (CO₂) is not a pollutant, and that climate change has not increased natural disasters.

“The geological archive reveals that Earth’s climate has varied as long as the planet has existed, with natural cold and warm phases,” the Declaration notes. “The Little Ice Age ended as recently as 1850. Therefore, it is no surprise that we now are experiencing a period of warming.”

Moreover, the world has warmed “significantly less than predicted by IPCC on the basis of modeled anthropogenic forcing,” the text states, and the gap between the real world and the modeled world “tells us that we are far from understanding climate change.”

“There is no statistical evidence that global warming is intensifying hurricanes, floods, droughts and suchlike natural disasters, or making them more frequent,” it argues, whereas there is ample evidence “that CO₂-mitigation measures are as damaging as they are costly.”

Since there is no climate emergency, there is “no cause for panic and alarm,” the document contends. “We strongly oppose the harmful and unrealistic net-zero CO2 policy proposed for 2050.”

4: Corporate media relying on very recent history to claim global warming – but with a longer view of time, it's clear that human-caused climate change is a HOAX

The Washington Post had to put its foot in its mouth the other day after its journalists accidentally uncovered the truth about global warming: It isn't real when you look at all of the available historical data in context.

For years, corporate media outlets like WaPo have been trumpeting warmer-than-normal summers as proof that the planet is heating up and the oceans are boiling. The problem is that when you travel further back than just the past couple years, you find colder-than-average times of the year, too.

Taken in context, it becomes clear throughout the historical record that temperatures go up and down depending on the time of year. Some years are warmer than others while other years are cooler than others – it has always been this way.

WaPo, citing a recent study that claims to have gone back 485 million years, determined that the earth is actually cooler right now than average – check out this graph:

"Earth's average temperature reached 58.96 F (14.98 C), well below the average 96.8 degrees F (36 degrees Celsius) the study showed around 100 million years ago," the independent media reported, citing the study in question.

"The trend shows Earth's temperatures have been sliding for 50 million years."

(Related: Did you know that a recent study confirmed the fact that sunlight and clouds, not carbon dioxide as many mistakenly believe, is responsible for periodic changes in the climate?)

NOAA temperature station bias skews readings inaccurately hotter
Whether you believe in a young earth or an old earth, the point still stands that planetary

temperatures have been fluctuating wildly since the beginning of time. And it has absolutely nothing to do with people eating meat or driving cars like the globalists claim.

Only when you take very limited snapshots of carefully chosen time periods in recent years does the data skew warmer than normal. This is what is known as data cherry-picking, and the climate lunatics do it all the time to try to prove their conspiracy theories about global temperature changes.

It turns out that more than 90 percent of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA) temperature monitoring stations have a heat bias. This means their temperature readings are unreliable, often due to urbanization and the presence of concrete and buildings that make the thermometers show much warmer temperatures than they should.

"And with that large of a number, over 90 percent, the methods that NOAA employs to try to reduce this don't work because the bias is so overwhelming," said meteorologist Anthony Watts, a senior fellow for environment and climate at The Heartland Institute, to the independent media.

"The few stations that are left that are not biased because they are, for example, outside of town in a field and are an agricultural research station that's been around for 100 years ... their data gets completely swamped by the much larger set of biased data. There's no way you can adjust that out."

The following video shows using side-by-side visuals how the media and government have been fearmongering about a climate catastrophe for decades. Sometimes it was global warming they claimed was about to destroy the world while other times it was global cooling – see for yourself:

5: Media, stop blaming 'climate change' for hurricanes

After Hurricane Helene pummeled Florida and other states, I have no doubt that members of the media are making their own storm preparations. Climate alarmist journalists almost certainly have stories pre-written claiming that whatever impact the storm has is because of climate change, and propagandist attribution groups like World Weather Attribution are preparing to release rapid-attribution 'studies' to back up journalists' assertions. Even before the destruction is properly assessed, there will likely be dozens of articles in the mainstream news claiming that Helene was made more powerful, more likely, or more damaging because of climate change. Journalists will bring up insurance costs in Florida, or

the costs in general of the damage from the storm, as though this is proof of those claims. It's nonsense, of course. Obviously, storm damage is more costly as property values rise and development expands, and climate change seems to be an awfully convenient excuse for raising insurance rates when the data show that hurricanes are not becoming more frequent or intense in Florida. In fact, Florida recently went 11 years without a single landfalling hurricane, which was a real anomaly for the state. I am not going to focus on just hurricanes here, though, because the media do this for every kind of weather event, especially those that result in human deaths and property damage. However, often it is actually climate policy and the failure to properly maintain and improve infrastructure that causes the most problems. Sometimes the media even claim that climate change is making it harder for people to be safe in general from extreme weather. This is simply false. They will point out correctly that homeless people are more likely to become ill and die from exposure to extreme high temperatures because of a lack of shelter and air conditioning. This, however, is not because of climate change. 'Hottest year ever' claims are suspect, based on woefully incomplete data. The truth is that prior to satellites, there are few temperature records outside of the United States and Europe. We are thus forced to rely on proxy data, which are location-specific; but even so, many of them indicate there were several periods in just the past 10,000 years that were warmer than today. As importantly, the homeless are also more likely to die from exposure during cold weather, and many more do each year. The media ignore this as it doesn't fit the 'dangerous global warming' narrative. Overall, the frequency of people dying from those extreme-temperature conditions has declined rapidly around the world over the past hundred-plus years, largely due to a massive decrease in cold-related fatalities. Deaths from climate and weather-related disasters in general have also declined. What do we thank for these improving conditions? The very things climate alarmists would have us get rid of – namely, fossil fuels and their byproducts. Home air conditioning and heating are wildly undervalued in wealthier countries, where we take them for granted. But they really do prevent probably tens of thousands of unnecessary deaths due to exposure every year. These kinds of luxuries are gradually becoming more expensive, which makes it harder for poorer people to afford, because of the anti-energy policies that these same alarmists promote. Studies have found that U.S. Environmental Protection Agency rules and regulations pushed by the Biden-Harris administration targeting power plants are expected to cause instability in the electric grid and lead to massive blackouts. Wind and solar are not dispatchable power, and battery technology is not anywhere near scalable for what is needed. This causes higher prices and less power reliability, which won't help anyone trying to handle even modest weather events. As much as the political left likes to villainize plastics, they play a pivotal role in the sterility of medical facilities and have increased the survivability of major surgeries. The hurricane-resistant infrastructure in hurricane country also relies heavily on oil and gas refining byproducts and high-energy intensity manufacturing processes: acrylic and laminated glass windows, water-resistant underlayment materials on rooftops, flashing, insulation, high-performance concrete, anchoring systems and many more than I can reasonably list here. This kind of advanced infrastructure is expensive but well worth it. The problem is it becomes more expensive, sometimes prohibitively so, as climate policies

make using fossil fuels more difficult – policies that will do nothing to prevent hurricanes and heatwaves. Stay safe and stay smart when the weather looks bad, but know that our fears are being manipulated by the very people trying to promote policies that actually do put us in increasing danger.

6: Poilievre's indifference on 'climate change' triggers the media

While Trudeau's political rival focuses on issues that matter to Canadians, the left-wing media continues to cry hysterically. Conservative Party leader Pierre Poilievre has dominated the polls since 2022 by positioning himself as a common-sense, economically-smart alternative to Justin Trudeau. Poilievre's plan to remove the highly unpopular carbon tax and incentivize home-building has earned him and his party accolades in traditionally Liberal ridings, even in the city of Toronto. However, this hasn't stopped left-wing journalists and columnists from trying to take him down a peg. This includes National Observer columnist Max Fawcett. In Fawcett's latest column, he refers to Poilievre's climate policy as a "joke." The opinion piece starts off by claiming: 'There's a growing irony in the carbon tax increase falling on April Fools' Day every year, since it now offers an annual reminder of just what a joke the Conservative Party of Canada's approach to climate change has become.' Fawcett omits, perhaps intentionally, that Canadians are not concerned with complying with woke, green policies favoured by the radical left that do nothing but make life more expensive. Most Canadians are focused on making a decent living and getting their lives back on track, as recent polls indicate. However, the columnist is clearly biased against Poilievre, with many of his recent articles focusing on the CPC leader specifically. If one was to assume that the mainstream media, and many non-mainstream media outlets, have an anti-conservative slant, they would be correct. Toronto 99 has reported extensively on the anti-Poilievre and anti-conservative bias displayed in many prominent news outlets, including the CBC.

7: Bill Gates Plans to Chop Down BILLIONS of Trees to 'Radically Address Climate Change'

Billionaire eugenicist Bill Gates has devised a 'radical' plan to 'permanently address climate change': the destruction of billions of the world's trees. According to Gates, the solution to climate change is to chop down all the world's trees and bury them in order to stop 'global boiling'. Naturalnews.com reports: It's called "Breakthrough Energy," because Bill Gates always names his missions the opposite of what they accomplish, just like with his vaccine terrorization schemes. Talk about FAKE science. Where does Bill Gates find these poser scientists willing to shill for this insane scheme? Believe it or not, U.S. Forest Services is prepared to "thin out" 70 MILLION ACRES of Western forest, much of which is in California, over the next 10 years. Gates says this will reduce carbon dioxide in the air so we can all breathe better, which is the furthest thing from science, ever. Not one single human being will benefit from this. No homes will be built. No wood burned to keep people warm in the freezing winter. This is all about destroying the planet, reducing the world's population by several billion people, while injecting everyone with mRNA spike prions that help put everyone six feet underground soon, with all the trees. The Climate Change Cult is led by

Psychopathic Bill Gates who plans to chop down all the world's trees so we can ... breathe? Avoid drinking whatever Kool-Aid Bill Gates is drinking, because it makes you believe that chopping down all the forests and burying the trees will save earth from global warming and help all the humans breathe. Sure. This man needs to be locked up in prison and the key is what needs to be buried, not the trees. Bill Gates is investing millions of dollars in a system of chopping down and burying trees to supposedly reduce carbon dioxide in the air, which makes no sense at all. This is a so-called "business" because they are getting money for carbon offsets. Watch for the name Kadama systems to be running and promoting this psycho-biz. It's a simple plan: kill the trees and kill all the people and bury it all underground together. The cover story? Dead trees keep carbon dioxide out of the atmosphere for thousands of years if you just bury their remains underground. So do people. Kodama Systems, a forest management company based in the Sierra Nevada foothills town of Sonora, has been operating in stealth mode for years so nobody knows about this insanity. Now, Bill Gates and MIT Technology Review are now reporting the company has raised around \$6.6 million to wipe out all chances of human survival on earth, in so many words. To top it off, the payments processing company Stripe will provide a \$250,000 research grant as part of the insane carbon removal plan. The trees will be buried in the Nevada desert, where nobody can use the wood for anything, ever. This will help prevent the release of greenhouse gases, that along with cow farts, is destroying the planet, supposedly.

8: Groundbreaking Study Confirms Human Emissions Have 'Zero Impact' on Climate Change

Despite the endless barrage of propaganda by the mainstream media and global elites, it turns out that man-made fossil fuel emissions have "zero impact" on climate change. A groundbreaking new study challenges the belief that human emissions are the primary driver of increasing atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO₂) concentrations. The research, published in the Science of Climate Change, concludes that sea surface temperatures (SST) play a far more significant role than anthropogenic (human-caused) factors in determining annual changes in atmospheric CO₂ levels. Naturalnews.com reports: Using multivariate analysis and publicly available data from leading climate and energy organizations, Dao Ato's study compares the impacts of sea surface temperature and human emissions on atmospheric CO₂ concentrations. The analysis spanned from 1959 to 2022 and employed multiple linear regression techniques to evaluate the influence of sea surface temperature and human CO₂ emissions on the annual increase in atmospheric CO₂. The results reveal that sea surface temperature data, derived from NASA and the UK-HADLEY Centre datasets, was the most accurate predictor of CO₂ concentrations. The regression model incorporating sea surface temperature explained approximately 66% of the variance in annual CO₂ increases post-1959, with a remarkably high correlation between predicted and actual CO₂ levels. The study found a Pearson correlation coefficient of 0.9995 between the CO₂ concentrations predicted using sea surface temperature data from the UK-HADLEY Centre and actual measurements from NOAA, with a minimal prediction error of 1.45 ppm in 2022. In contrast, human CO₂ emissions showed no significant correlation with annual changes in

atmospheric CO₂. Ato's study also found that human methane emissions, despite rising dramatically in recent decades, have not contributed to rising methane concentrations in the atmosphere through the 21st century. Sea surface temperature data from NASA's GISS and the UK-HADLEY Centre similarly demonstrated strong correlations with atmospheric CO₂ levels, surpassing the much smaller, insignificant correlations between human emissions and atmospheric CO₂ levels. The study also challenges the accuracy of historical CO₂ records, noting discrepancies between ice core data and modern measurements. Multiple linear regression models revealed that sea surface temperature was a statistically significant explanatory factor for annual CO₂ increases, while human emissions were not. Specifically, sea surface temperature accounted for 57% to 66% of the variance in CO₂ levels, depending on the dataset used. The study's findings suggest that natural variations in sea surface temperature, rather than human activities, are the dominant factor influencing fluctuations in atmospheric CO₂. This study challenges the prevailing narrative that human emissions are the primary driver of climate change, and should call into question all global government narratives surrounding the climate change agenda. Growing body of research finds atmospheric CO₂ levels not dependent on fossil fuel emissions. This study builds upon previous research in 2013 by Wang et al., which assessed CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion and land use changes. The study found that these man-made activities only account for +0.1 to 0.3 PgC/yr of the annual change in CO₂ concentration, which is approximately only one tenth of the variance of oxygen on the CO₂ growth rate. Further back, in a 2005 study, researchers found that changes in atmospheric CO₂ changes were NOT associated with annual fossil fuel emissions and are unlikely to explain CO₂ growth rate anomalies. In addition, a 2009 study by Dr. Jari Ahlbeck evaluated the correlation between fossil fuel emissions and the increase in CO₂ growth rates, but found the correlation to be "clearly statistically insignificant." Fossil fuel emissions had such a negligible impact on atmospheric CO₂ that he ultimately excluded it from consideration in his analysis of the mechanisms of CO₂ variability. In other words, man-made activities have a negligible impact on the planet. Most of the temperature and weather changes on Earth are natural, and the level of CO₂ in the atmosphere is out of our control and should not be the concern of any global government or activist organization.

9: Nolte: Scientists Prove Man-Made Global Warming Is a Hoax

The far-left ThinkProgress reports that scientists have finally proven that the theory of man-made Global Warming is a total hoax. Of course, no one will admit it, but that is exactly what has happened. A new scientific study shows has revealed the following: Current CO₂ levels of 410 parts per million (ppm) were last seen on Earth three million years ago, according to the most detailed reconstruction of the Earth's climate by researchers at the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research (PIK) and published in Science Advances. Yes, you read that correctly, three million — million — years ago CO₂ levels on Earth were the same as they are today, but there is one major difference between three million years ago and today... Three million years ago, we humans were not driving cars or eating the meat that requires cow farts; we weren't barbecuing or refusing to recycle or building factories; there was no Industrial Age, no plastic, no air conditioning, no electricity,

no lumber mills, no consumerism, no aerosols. In fact, three million years ago, there were probably no human beings on Earth, at least not human in the way we use that term today. And yet...CO2 levels were the same then as they are now...Hmmm...? But I thought humans warmed the planet? That's the hustle we've been sold for three decades now — you know, that WE are the problem. We have also been told the problem is DEFINITELY NOT a billions-year-old planet running through cycles where the temperature might fluctuate a bit. Oh, no, that could never be it — so stop saying that could be, you Denier. Well, what about the Ice Age that occurred thousands and thousands of years before the Industrial Age. Shut up, Denier. And yet...According to the study, scientists also discovered that during this period of Global Warming “there were no ice sheets covering either Greenland or West Antarctica, and much of the East Antarctic ice sheet was gone.” How is this possible 2,999,971 years before Arnold Schwarzenegger bought his Hummer? It gets worse: Temperatures were up to 7 degrees Fahrenheit warmer globally, at least double that at the poles, and sea levels were some 20 meters (65 feet) higher. How is that possible 2,999,945 years before Americans moved to the suburbs and lit up the charcoal grills? Naturally, even in the face of a study that totally debunks the whole concept of man-made Global Warming, ThinkProgress is sticking with that hoax but is also forced to concede the following: The good news is that the Earth does not warm instantly, and mile-thick ice sheets melt even more slowly. So the temperature rise will take several decades, and tens of feet of sea level rise will take hundreds and hundreds of years. But-but-but-but Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez told me we only have 12 years! And then ThinkProgress drops this anti-science stink bomb: That means the choices we make now can affect the rate of rise and determine whether we blow past 65 feet of sea level rise to beyond 200 feet. Because, because, because Orange Man Bad: Even worse, the climate policy agenda President Donald Trump is pushing — actions that include rolling back U.S. laws that reduce carbon pollution and abandoning the Paris climate agreement — would lock us in to such high CO2 levels, sea levels would rise a foot per decade in just a few decades. No, actually, what this study proves is that there is nothing we can do to stop the Earth's naturally occurring climate cycles. Even the worst of the worst, even the most maniacal pushing the Global Warming Hoax admit that, at best, we can only cool the planet a couple of degrees, which will do next to nothing if the planet is determined to again warm itself by seven degrees, as we now know it did 2,999,998 years before the Bad Orange Man approved a couple of pipelines.

10: Climate models have accurately predicted global heating, study finds

Findings confirm reliability of projections of temperature changes over last 50 years. Climate models have accurately predicted global heating for the past 50 years, a study has found. The findings confirm that since as early as 1970, climate scientists have had a solid fundamental understanding of the Earth's climate system and the ability to project how it will respond to continued increases in the greenhouse effect. Since climate models have accurately anticipated global temperature changes so far, we can expect projections of future warming to be reliable as well. The research examines the accuracy of 17 models published over the past five decades, beginning with a 1970 study and including 1981 and 1988 models led by James Hansen, the former Nasa climatologist who testified to the US

Senate in 1988 about the impacts of anthropogenic global heating. The study also includes the first four reports by the UN's intergovernmental panel on climate change (IPCC). "We found that climate models – even those published back in the 1970s – did remarkably well, with 14 out of the 17 model projections indistinguishable from what actually occurred," said Zeke Hausfather, of the University of California, Berkeley, and lead author of the paper, published in the journal *Geophysical Research Letters*. Based on modern climate model projections, if countries follow through with current and pledged climate policies, the world is on track for about 3C of warming above pre-industrial temperatures by 2100 – a situation the IPCC and others predict would be catastrophic. The challenge in evaluating climate model accuracy lies in the fact that due to computing power limitations, simulations are only run for a few specific future greenhouse gas emissions scenarios. There are an infinite number of such possible scenarios, but real-world emissions will follow only one path, and it will never exactly match the few scenarios input into climate models. Thus, if Earth warms less than in a climate model projection, it does not necessarily mean the model was inaccurate. Put simply, climate scientists are not in the business of predicting human fossil fuel consumption but are attempting to accurately simulate how the climate will change in response to a given rise in greenhouse gas emissions. "Future emissions depend on human behaviour, not physical systems, and climate models should be evaluated on their physics rather than the future emission projections," said Hausfather. In nearly half of the model projections examined in the paper, the input scenarios were significantly different from the real-world changes in greenhouse gas emissions. As a result, projected temperature changes were only consistent with observed global warming in 10 of the 17 models, with four projecting more warming and three projecting less than subsequently occurred. However, the study authors addressed these inconsistencies by evaluating the change in temperature per change in "radiative forcing" – the global energy imbalance caused by the increased greenhouse effect and other factors – in models against what happened in the real world. This metric reveals whether the climate models are accurately producing the temperature response to a given emissions change – in essence, whether are accurately simulating the physical response of Earth's climate system. With this factored in, 14 of the 17 models were accurate. "The rate of warming we are experiencing today is pretty much exactly what past climate models projected it would be," said Hausfather. Those who oppose policies to limit the impacts of global heating have long sought to undermine the credibility of climate models. If the model projections are considered unreliable, they argue, then we do not know how urgent slowing global warming is. As a result, "climate models are unreliable" has become a popular myth propagated by climate deniers. The latest study adds to the body of evidence supporting the accuracy of climate models, and will be welcomed by those arguing that more aggressive climate policies are needed to avoid dangerous levels of global warming. The UN climate summit in Glasgow in 2020 will be crucial, as countries will be expected to commit to scaling up the emission reductions that were pledged in the 2015 Paris agreement on climate change.

11: Climate simulations are mostly accurate, study finds

WASHINGTON (AP) — The computer models used to simulate what heat-trapping gases will do to global temperatures have been pretty spot-on in their predictions, a new study found. After years of hearing critics blast the models' accuracy, climate scientist Zeke Hausfather decided to see just how good they have been. He tracked down 17 models used between 1970 and 2007 and found that the majority of them predicted results that were "indistinguishable from what actually occurred." "By and large our models have gotten it right, plus or minus a little bit," said Hausfather, a University of California, Berkeley scientist who is climate and energy director at the Breakthrough Institute. "If they get it wrong, it's slightly on the warm side, but I wouldn't read too much into that." Ten of the 17 were close to the temperatures that actually happened, said Hausfather, lead author of a study in Wednesday's journal *Geophysical Research Letters*. But scientists actually got the physics right even more than that, Hausfather said. That's because they make two main assumptions when they model what will happen in the future. One is the physics of the atmosphere and how it reacts to heat-trapping gases. The other is the amount of greenhouse gases put into the air. A few times, scientists were wrong in their predictions about the growth of carbon pollution, saying there would be more of the gases than there actually were, Hausfather said. If they got the amount of heat-trapping gases wrong, they then got the temperatures wrong. So Hausfather and colleagues, including NASA climate scientist Gavin Schmidt, looked at how well the models did on just the pure science, taking out the emissions factor. On that count, 14 of the 17 computer models accurately predicted the future. The scientists also gave each computer simulation a "skill score" that essentially gave a percentage grade to each one. The average grade was a 69%. One of the earliest computer models, made in 1970, got a 91%. What's so impressive about that is that at the time, climate change wasn't noticeable in the yearly temperature records like it is now, Hausfather said. Stanford University climate scientist Noah Diffenbaugh, who wasn't part of the study, called the work creative and the results striking. "Even without knowing what the current level of greenhouse gas concentrations would be, the climate models predicted the evolution of global temperature quite well," Diffenbaugh said in an email. It's crucial that these models are accurate because "we have one planet Earth, so we can't conduct controlled experiments on the actual climate system," Diffenbaugh said. The study was released as officials from almost 200 countries meet in Madrid for climate talks. University of Illinois climate scientist Donald Wuebbles, who also wasn't part of the study, said climate change "deniers do a lot of weird things to misrepresent models. None of those analyses have been valid and they should be ignored. We should no longer be debating the basic science of climate change."

12: Last decade was Earth's hottest ever as CO2 levels reach an 800,000-year high, says UN report

Last year was the hottest year on record, the top 10 hottest years were all in the past decade and planet-heating carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere are at an 800,000-year high, a report Wednesday said. In its annual State of the Climate report, the World Meteorological Organization laid bare all the markings of an increasingly warming world with oceans at

record high temperatures, sea levels rising and glaciers retreating at record speed. “Our planet is issuing more distress signals,” said António Guterres, United Nations Secretary-General. He noted that the report says the international goal of limiting warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius (2.8 Fahrenheit) since pre-industrial times is still possible. “Leaders must step up to make it happen — seizing the Benefits of cheap, clean renewables for their people and economies,” he said. The report attributed the heating to human activity — like the burning of coal, oil and gas — and in a smaller part to the naturally occurring El Nino weather phenomenon. An El Nino formed in June 2023 and dissipated a year later, adding extra heat and helping topple temperature records. In 2024, the world surpassed the 1.5 C limit for the first time — but just for a single year. Scientists measure breaching the climate goal as Earth staying above that level of warming over a longer time period. The report said global heating is contributing to more extreme weather events that have led the highest levels of displacement for 16 years, contributed to worsening food crises and caused massive economic losses. There were at least 151 “unprecedented” extreme weather events in 2024 alone, it said. “It is a wake-up call that we are increasing the risks to our lives, economies and to the planet,” said Celeste Saulo, WMO’s Secretary-General. The report’s warnings come as the United States President Donald Trump has issued a series of rollbacks on climate commitments and cast doubt on climate science. The U.S. is the world’s second biggest polluter currently and the largest emitter of greenhouse gases historically. It’s left some worried that other countries will also have less ambitious targets as a result. “The science is indisputable. Attempts to hide climate science from the public will not stop us from feeling the dire impacts of climate change,” said Brenda Ekwurzel of the U.S.-based not-for-profit, Union of Concerned Scientists. Vanessa Nakate, a Ugandan climate activist also warned that “the longer we delay emissions cuts, the worse it will get.” “Phasing out fossil fuels is not a choice—it is an emergency response to a crisis unfolding before our eyes,” she said.

13: Climate Change: The Hoax That Costs Us \$4 Billion A Day

“It is difficult to get a man to understand something, when his salary depends upon his not understanding it!” Upton Sinclair.

The global climate change industry is worth an annual \$1.5 trillion, according to Climate Change Business Journal. That’s the equivalent of \$4 billion a day spent on vital stuff like carbon trading, biofuels, and wind turbines. Or — as Jo Nova notes — it’s the same amount the world spends every year on online shopping.

But there’s a subtle difference between these two industries — the global warming one and the online shopping one. Can you guess what it is?

Well, it’s like this. When you go to, say, Charles Tyrwhitt to buy a nice, smart shirt, or Amazon to buy the box set of Game of Thrones, or Krazykrazysexttoy.com to replace your girlfriend’s worn out rabbit, no one is holding a gun to your head. You are buying these things of your own free volition either for yourself or for someone you love. You have paid

for them, out of your own money, because you have made the calculation that they will make your life that little bit better. Better than it would, say, if you'd kept the money in your bank account or spent it on something less desirable — a novelty dog poo ornament, say, or a handknitted sweater with Jimmy Savile's face on it and "I HEART paedos" picked out in gold lamé lettering.

When, on the other hand, you buy stuff from the climate change industry, you have no choice in the matter whatsoever. It's already priced into your taxes, your electricity bills, the cost of your petrol, the cost of your airfare, the cost of every product you buy and every service you use. It is utterly inescapable, this expenditure. Yet unlike your online shopping — which, remember, costs roughly the same as you spend each year on the climate change industry — you get precisely nothing in return.

No, it's worse than that. You get less than nothing. You get stuff forced on you that you really don't want: bat-chomping, bird-slicing eco-crucifixes looming on your horizon, keeping you awake, trashing your property values; fields of solar panels where they used to grow wheat or you used to walk your dog; prissy missives from your local council expecting you to be grateful for the fact that now you've got to separate your trash into seven different recycling bags rather than the previous five, and that they're only going to collect your rubbish once a fortnight instead of once a week; teachers filling your kids' heads with junk science propaganda; free parking slots for electric cars you don't own but which you subsidise for richer friends who do; feel-bad nature documentaries about how it's all your fault that this stuff "may" soon disappear; energy-saving lightbulbs that take your nocturnal home back to the kind of sepulchral gloom Western civilisation thought it had bade farewell to in the 1890s; the Prius, the car which recalls the style and comfort of the cars the fall of the Berlin Wall was supposed to have ended; yawning gaps where used to grow the woods which have been chopped down and chipped to create biomass for burning in power stations which used to run more cheaply and efficiently on coal...

Then there are the people who benefit financially from this \$1.5 trillion climate change industry: the carbon traders; the dodgy academics; the vulture capitalists pecking on the bloated carcass of renewable energy; the environmental NGOs; the environmental consultancies who specialise in giving "expert" testimony at planning appeals, arguing on the most spurious grounds that no the bats and birds in this area aren't going to be affected by this new wind turbine they're going to be happier than ever no really; the sustainability officers at every level of local government; the green advisers attached to every business who advise them how to reduce their CO2 count; the PR companies that specialise in green awareness; Dale Vince....

These people do not deserve your money. Not a penny, a cent, or a sou of it.

Look, I don't begrudge anyone the right to earn a living — just so long as they're providing someone, somewhere with something they actually need. Not a single person working in the

climate change industry fulfils this criterion. Not one. If you scrapped Michael Mann's job tomorrow the world would not suffer the slightest loss and science would be all the better for it.

Sure, you might argue, there's some kind of trickledown effect as the money we're forced to pay these shysters and bludgers and charlatans and scroungers via various taxes and tariffs feeds back into the economy. But you could make the same argument were these people paid the same amount of money by the government to dig holes in the ground and fill them up again — which would be a vastly preferable use of tax payer money because then these utterly useless parasites would be reminded every day how pointless the "work" they do actually is, whereas as things are, many of them suffer under the delusion that their green non-jobs are somehow virtuous and important.

In the headline I call the climate change industry a hoax. That's because, on any objective level it is. I don't mean that all the scientists and businesses and politicians promoting it are abject liars — just most of them, even if it means that in order to keep earning their living they have to be dishonest with themselves about something they know in their hearts not to be true.

Alex Epstein, author of the Moral Case For Fossil Fuels, sets out the fundamental problem with the climate change industry here:

"..Increasing the amount of CO2 in the atmosphere from 0.03 per cent to 0.04 per cent has not caused and is not causing catastrophic runaway global warming. Dishonest references to "97 per cent of scientists" equate a mild warming influence, which most scientists agree with and more importantly can demonstrate, with a catastrophic warming influence – which most don't agree with and none can demonstrate."

That's it. If you accept the validity of that statement — and how can you not: it is unimpeachably accurate and verifiable — then it follows that the \$1.5 trillion global warming industry represents the most grotesque misuse of manpower and scarce resources in the history of the world.

14: UK Gov't Deploys 'Behavioural Manipulation Teams' to Counter 'Anti Climate Change' Viewpoints

The British government has deployed 'behavioural manipulation teams' tasked with countering anti-climate change narratives online.

The Behavioural Insights Team, often referred to as the "nudge unit," was formed in 2010 to use manipulation and coercion to achieve totalitarian goals.

Naturalnews.com reports: Unpublished research from the Department for Energy reveals a paradox: individuals who believe they are well-informed about heat pumps are often more

resistant to adopting them, while those with a basic understanding are more receptive. This finding has led BIT to focus on reshaping public perceptions, framing skepticism as a product of misinformation rather than legitimate concerns.

Toby Park, BIT's head of climate, energy, and sustainability, acknowledged the complexity of the issue. "Heat pumps are a very efficient low-carbon system for keeping our homes warm, but negative perceptions remain a barrier to their widespread adoption," he said. "Sometimes skepticism is due to real market challenges, such as affordability, but doesn't take into account the whole picture, such as the availability of grants. In other cases, it can be due to myths such as the claim that heat pumps don't work well in cold weather."

UK government won't allow citizens or independent media to ask questions about their climate controls

The government contract with BIT singles out media coverage as a significant obstacle to heat pump adoption. Articles in outlets like the Daily Mail and Daily Telegraph have been criticized for amplifying negative or exaggerated claims, such as the belief that heat pumps are ineffective in cold weather or unsuitable for older homes.

While some criticisms—such as the high upfront costs of installation—are acknowledged as valid, others are dismissed as myths. The contract states, "Online information which is imbalanced or skewed towards incorrect and exaggerated claims could be considered an environment where misinformation is a problem."

This focus on media narratives has drawn criticism from those who argue that the government is attempting to control the conversation rather than address the root causes of public skepticism.

The push for heat pumps has also faced political opposition, particularly from Reform UK, a party that has leveraged anti-net-zero sentiment to gain traction. Nigel Farage, the party's leader, has openly criticized the technology on GB News, while Reform UK deputy leader Richard Tice has called heat pumps "useless in most homes." This dissent has further complicated the government's efforts to install a "Net Zero" agenda.

Despite this, the UK "Nudge Unit" has manipulated more people to install heat pumps, with installation reaching a record high last year, with 42,000 units installed since January. However, this figure falls far short of the 600,000 annual target. The government offers a £7,500 grant to offset the average installation cost of £12,500, but affordability remains a significant barrier for many households.

A troubling trend of governments using people's data for coercive ends

The government's reliance on behavioral nudges over transparent communication reflects a

broader trend of manipulation, coercion, and government bullying in public policy. Rather than fostering informed choice, these tactics risk alienating the public and suppressing valid concerns.

As BIT finalizes its survey on public attitudes and media coverage, the debate over heat pumps raises a critical question: Can a democratic society achieve its climate goals without resorting to psychological manipulation, taxpayer theft (subsidies), and government coercion?

In a world where data and likenesses are increasingly tracked, and technology is weaponized to influence behavior, the line between persuasion and coercion becomes ever more blurred. The UK's approach to widespread heat pump adoption may serve as a cautionary tale, highlighting the dangers of forcing populations to accept globalist ideals for the sake of "saving the planet."

15: Chemtrails no Longer a Conspiracy Theory, as Globalists Call it an Essential Part of Their Battle Against 'Climate Change'

The Communist-Democrat politicians in Washington DC and their globalist cohorts are engaged in a multi-faceted agenda rooted in profound deceit. Using extreme censorship of anyone who questions their agenda, they've (literally) gotten away with murder using schemes, plots and propaganda to further their goals of obtaining complete control of the populace, by any means.

One way the "powers that be" have manipulated and weakened the population is by having the military spray health-decimating toxins from airplanes flying over cities and farms on a regular basis. Independent media, for decades, has been calling this out and gave it the name "chem-trails" to signify that chemicals are being doused upon the people and the land in an insidious attempt to pollute food, discard hazardous waste, and sicken folks so they need expensive medical care.

This has been deemed as a conspiracy theory and anyone who speaks about it, posts information online about it, or blows the whistle on it has been labeled a "conspiracy theorist." Guess what?

Truth news was right and it's real, because now, the communists and globalists are outright admitting to it all, claiming it all has a bigger purpose with a positive outcome. Their reason for spraying horrific chemicals, heavy metal toxins, and hospital waste over the skies of America? To battle "climate change."

Globalists are willing to admit to chemtrails now because it serves a much larger, more powerful agenda that millions of brainwashed people believe in

There exists a political ideology (a.k.a. New World Order) where malicious agents,

sometimes called globalists, are attempting to create a world government, made up of only a few dozen billionaires, that decides the future and fate of all peoples, use of resources, utilization of all medicine and food, and so forth. One way to accomplish this is to keep the populace sick. This insidious agenda includes keeping toxic fluoride in the municipal tap water supply, injecting the masses with dirty vaccinations and gene therapy injections and spraying toxins, bacteria, and even viruses down from the skies.

This is very hard for most people to wrap their head around, that governments, especially the U.S. government, could be this evil and warped, but now they are admitting to it, to address a “greater good” concern, global warming. Supposedly, chemtrails are being used to block out the sun’s heat and save all humans from bursting into flames in the next decade or two. This will also keep all the glaciers from melting and the oceans from swallowing up all the continents, while further padding the pockets of the billionaire N.W.O. globalists. It’s all also part of the “Green New Deal” that Kommie Kamala wants to fully execute to destroy all farms, food and human health.

Why would the government admit to chemtrails now, after decades of calling it a conspiracy theory? It’s a gambit, which is a small sacrifice to gain a bigger advantage. In chess, a gambit is where a player sacrifices a pawn or piece of lesser value to capture a piece of great (or greater) value from their opponent. This requires careful thought.

So, what’s really in these chem-trails? Why are they so toxic to humanity, including humans, animals and agriculture? A woman who served 9 years in the U.S. Air Force has blown the whistle and told the world EXACTLY what most chemtrails contain, and it will blow your mind.

In an Instagram video that went viral, Kristen Meghan describes the contents of chemtrails, also termed “geoengineering” or “weather modification,” that the U.S. Air Force had her labeling as hazardous to even handle in small amounts, and now they’re being sprayed over our skies in massive portions.

Air Force veteran Kristen Meghan worked at a job entitled bio-environmental engineering where she was tasked with engineering these chemicals out of the workplace and substituting them with safer ones. They taught her how to pack, ship and dispose of these hazardous materials that they were spraying all over humanity. She says the chemicals being “injected” into our atmosphere include heavy metal toxins, barium, silver iodide, aluminum and much more. Got respiratory issues? Got dementia? No wonder why.

Do your own research and don’t use Google. Try the search engine Brave BETA and get more truth news and real information. Bookmark Censored.news to your favorite websites for truth news about the fake “climate change” agenda and what it means to your health and livelihood.

16: The great climate deception: How the environmental movement was hijacked by elites

The modern climate change narrative originated with the establishment of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in 1988. Despite the IPCC's influence on global climate policy, nearly 2,000 scientists and professionals have signed a declaration stating there is no climate emergency.

Critics argue that the climate has always been changing due to natural cycles, citing the end of the Little Ice Age in 1850 as an example. They point out that there is no statistical evidence linking global warming to intensifying natural disasters and that the IPCC's models have significantly over-predicted warming.

Policies like the UN's Agenda 2030 and the Paris Agreement, aimed at reducing CO2 emissions, are seen as potentially harmful to the global economy, particularly for developing nations. The push for a "green economy" is viewed as a means for central banks and mega-corporations to consolidate wealth and power.

The environmental movement, once focused on genuine issues like pollution and deforestation, is portrayed as having been co-opted by powerful elites. Whistleblowers and critics argue that figures with vested interests have used environmentalism as a cover to control the Earth's resources and redistribute global wealth, undermining the original goals of the movement.

For decades, the world has been told that human activity, specifically carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions, is driving catastrophic climate change. The United Nations has sounded the alarm, warning of impending doom unless drastic measures are taken to reduce CO2 levels. But what if the narrative we've been fed is not only exaggerated but fundamentally flawed? What if the real environmental movement has been hijacked by powerful interests with ulterior motives? According to a growing chorus of scientists and experts, this is precisely what has happened.

According to Mark Keenan, a former scientist, there is ample evidence and testimony from renowned scientists that there is no 'CO2-induced' Climate emergency and he shares some of it in his new book, titled "Climate CO2 Hoax – How Bankers Hijacked the Environment Movement."

The origins of the climate panic

The modern climate change narrative can be traced back to the establishment of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in 1988 by the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) and the World Meteorological Organization (WMO). The IPCC was tasked with providing scientific advice on climate change and formulating response strategies. Its first assessment report became the foundation for the United

Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), which has since shaped global climate policy.

However, not everyone agrees with the IPCC's conclusions. In fact, nearly 2,000 scientists and professionals from over 30 countries have signed a declaration stating that there is no climate emergency and that the UN's claims about man-made climate change are unfounded. Among these signatories is Marc Morano, a former scientist at the UK Department of Energy and Climate Change and a former staff member at United Nations Environment. Morano argues that while real pollution exists, CO₂ is not the problem. Instead, he points to industrial globalization, which has introduced thousands of new chemical compounds, toxins and genetically modified organisms (GMOs) into the environment.

The flawed science behind the hysteria

One of the key arguments against the mainstream climate narrative is that the climate has always been changing. The geological record shows that Earth has experienced natural cycles of warming and cooling for millions of years. The Little Ice Age, for example, ended as recently as 1850, and the current warming period is part of a natural cycle. According to the Climate Intelligence (CLINTEL) foundation, there is no statistical evidence that global warming is intensifying hurricanes, floods, or droughts. In fact, the world has warmed significantly less than predicted by the IPCC's models.

Dr. Nils-Axel Mörner, a former chairman of the UN IPCC's sea level committee, has been particularly vocal in his criticism. "Solar activity is the dominant factor in climate, not CO₂," he stated. "Something is basically sick in the blame-CO₂ hypothesis. It was launched more than 100 years ago, and almost immediately, excellent physicists demonstrated that the hypothesis did not work."

Dr. Mototaka Nakamura, a climate scientist with a doctorate from MIT, has also criticized the data underpinning global warming science. "Our models are mickey-mouse mockeries of the real world," he said. "Global mean temperatures before 1980 are based on untrustworthy data."

The hidden agenda: Control and profit

So, if the science is flawed, why has the climate change narrative gained such traction? According to Morano and other critics, the answer lies in the financial and political interests behind the movement. The UN's Agenda 2030 and the Paris Agreement aim to reduce CO₂ emissions by 7% annually until 2030. While this may sound noble, the reality is that such policies would cripple the global economy, particularly in developing nations that rely heavily on fossil fuels.

The financialization of the global economy is now based on a “net-zero” greenhouse gas emissions strategy. Central banks and mega-corporations are driving this agenda, with the Bank for International Settlements (BIS) creating the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosure (TCFD) in 2015. This task force represents \$118 trillion in assets and includes key players like JP Morgan Chase, BlackRock and HSBC. The push for a “green economy” is less about saving the planet and more about consolidating wealth and power.

Dr. Otmar Edenhofer, former co-chair of the IPCC’s Working Group III, admitted as much in a 2010 interview. “One must say clearly that we redistribute de facto the world’s wealth by climate policy,” he said. “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.”

The hijacking of the environmental movement

The environmental movement, once focused on real issues like pollution and deforestation, has been hijacked by powerful elites. Whistleblower George Hunt, who served as an official host at a key environmental meeting in 1987, revealed that figures like David Rockefeller and Baron Edmund de Rothschild were present. According to Hunt, the 1992 UN Earth Summit was less about environmental protection and more about consolidating control over the Earth’s resources.

“The same world order that tricked third-world countries to borrow funds and rack up enormous debts... and purposely creating war and debt to bring societies into their control,” Hunt said. “The world order crowd are not a nice group of people.”

A call for real environmentalism

The climate change narrative, as promoted by the UN and its allies, is not based on sound science but on flawed models and ulterior motives. The real environmental movement, which once sought to protect the planet from genuine threats, has been subverted by powerful interests seeking to control the global economy. It’s time to reject the climate hysteria and focus on real solutions to real problems. As Patrick Moore, co-founder of Greenpeace, aptly put it, “The whole climate crisis is not only fake news, it’s fake science.”

The truth is out there, but it’s up to us to seek it out and demand accountability from those who have hijacked the environmental movement for their own gain.

17: World’s top climate scientists expect global heating to blast past 1.5C target

Hundreds of the world’s leading climate scientists expect global temperatures to rise to at least 2.5C (4.5F) above preindustrial levels this century, blasting past internationally agreed targets and causing catastrophic consequences for humanity and the planet, an exclusive Guardian survey has revealed.

Almost 80% of the respondents, all from the authoritative Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), foresee at least 2.5C of global heating, while almost half anticipate at least 3C (5.4F). Only 6% thought the internationally agreed 1.5C (2.7F) limit would be met.

Many of the scientists envisage a “semi-dystopian” future, with famines, conflicts and mass migration, driven by heatwaves, wildfires, floods and storms of an intensity and frequency far beyond those that have already struck.

Numerous experts said they had been left feeling hopeless, infuriated and scared by the failure of governments to act despite the clear scientific evidence provided.

“I think we are headed for major societal disruption within the next five years,” said Greta Pecl, at the University of Tasmania. “[Authorities] will be overwhelmed by extreme event after extreme event, food production will be disrupted. I could not feel greater despair over the future.”

But many said the climate fight must continue, however high global temperature rose, because every fraction of a degree avoided would reduce human suffering.

Peter Cox, at the University of Exeter, UK, said: “Climate change will not suddenly become dangerous at 1.5C – it already is. And it will not be ‘game over’ if we pass 2C, which we might well do.”

The Guardian approached every contactable lead author or review editor of IPCC reports since 2018. Almost half replied, 380 of 843. The IPCC’s reports are the gold standard assessments of climate change, approved by all governments and produced by experts in physical and social sciences. The results show that many of the most knowledgeable people on the planet expect climate havoc to unfold in the coming decades.

The climate crisis is already causing profound damage to lives and livelihoods across the world, with only 1.2C (2.16F) of global heating on average over the past four years. Jesse Keenan, at Tulane University in the US, said: “This is just the beginning: buckle up.”

Nathalie Hilmi, at the Monaco Scientific Centre, who expects a rise of 3C, agreed: “We cannot stay below 1.5C.”

The experts said massive preparations to protect people from the worst of the coming climate disasters were now critical. Leticia Cotrim da Cunha, at the State University of Rio de Janeiro, said: “I am extremely worried about the costs in human lives.”

The 1.5C target was chosen to prevent the worst of the climate crisis and has been seen as an important guiding star for international negotiations. Current climate policies mean the

world is on track for about 2.7C, and the Guardian survey shows few IPCC experts expect the world to deliver the huge action required to reduce that.

Younger scientists were more pessimistic, with 52% of respondents under 50 expecting a rise of at least 3C, compared with 38% of those over 50. Female scientists were also more downbeat than male scientists, with 49% thinking global temperature would rise at least 3C, compared with 38%. There was little difference between scientists from different continents.

Dipak Dasgupta, at the Energy and Resources Institute in New Delhi, said: "If the world, unbelievably wealthy as it is, stands by and does little to address the plight of the poor, we will all lose eventually."

The experts were clear on why the world is failing to tackle the climate crisis. A lack of political will was cited by almost three-quarters of the respondents, while 60% also blamed vested corporate interests, such as the fossil fuel industry.

Many also mentioned inequality and a failure of the rich world to help the poor, who suffer most from climate impacts. "I expect a semi-dystopian future with substantial pain and suffering for the people of the global south," said a South African scientist, who chose not to be named. "The world's response to date is reprehensible – we live in an age of fools."

About a quarter of the IPCC experts who responded thought global temperature rise would be kept to 2C or below but even they tempered their hopes.

"I am convinced that we have all the solutions needed for a 1.5C path and that we will implement them in the coming 20 years," said Henry Neufeldt, at the UN's Copenhagen Climate Centre. "But I fear that our actions might come too late and we cross one or several tipping points."

Lisa Schipper, at University of Bonn in Germany, said: "My only source of hope is the fact that, as an educator, I can see the next generation being so smart and understanding the politics."

18: Climate change made LA fires worse, scientists say

Climate change was a major factor behind the hot, dry weather that gave rise to the devastating LA fires, a scientific study has confirmed.

It made those weather conditions about 35% more likely, according to World Weather Attribution - globally recognised for their studies linking extreme weather to climate change.

The authors noted that the LA wildfire season is getting longer while the rains that normally

put out the blazes have reduced.

The scientists highlight that these wildfires are highly complex with multiple factors playing a role, but they are confident that a warming climate is making LA more prone to intense fire events.

"Climate change increased the risk of the devastating LA wildfires," said Dr Clair Barnes, from Imperial College London, the study's lead author.

"Drought conditions are more frequently pushing into winter, increasing the chance a fire will break out during strong Santa Ana winds that can turn small ignitions into deadly infernos."

The Santa Ana winds are strong and gusty east or north-easterly winds that blow from inland California towards the coast.

Around 30 people have died and more than 10,000 homes have been destroyed in the fast-spreading, destructive fires that broke out in early January.

This new study looks at what are termed the fire-prone conditions that can lead to dangerous conflagrations.

It's been carried out by a team of researchers from World Weather Attribution (WWA), a global group that publishes rapid analyses of climate-related weather events.

They use climate models to simulate how the warming that has occurred since the middle of the 19th century is influencing heatwaves, droughts, floods and fires.

The widespread burning of coal, oil and gas in the wake of the industrial revolution has driven billions of tonnes of planet-warming gases into the atmosphere.

Acting like a blanket, these gases have driven up temperatures by around 1.2C since then.

By using climate models and statistical methods along with real world observations, the WWA group have been able to show how much of an influence climate warming has had on extreme events.

In the case of the LA fires, they found that the hot, dry conditions that drove them are expected to occur once every 17 years.

This is an increase in likelihood of around 35% compared to a world that hadn't experienced warming.

"We actually see that the models show very much the same results that the [real world] observations have," said Dr Friederike Otto, the head of World Weather Attribution.

"So there, in this combined index, we are quite confident about the result... we have actually a signal that we can say that we definitely can attribute that, also quantitatively."

The researchers also examined other important variables that can lead to wildfire including the length of the fire season.

By analysing weather observations, the scientists found that this has increased by around 23 days since the world began warming, around 1850.

The team say that this means the dry conditions and the Santa Ana winds that are crucial for the spread of fires, are increasingly overlapping.

Another key element is drought.

Dry conditions in the LA area over the October to December period are now about 2.4 times more likely than before humans starting using fossil fuels on a large scale.

The researchers are clear that climate change increased the probability of the hot, dry conditions that gave rise to the fires.

However, the authors are more cautious about the link between rising temperatures and the longer fire season or decreased rainfall, saying that the models did not show a significant connection.

Despite these reservations, the conclusion is that a warmer world increased the chances of the devastating wildfires occurring - as more fossil fuels continue to be burnt, those chances will continue to rise.

"Overall the paper finds that climate change has made the Los Angeles fires more likely despite some statistical uncertainty," said Prof Gabi Hegerl, from the University of Edinburgh, who was not part of the study team.

"This is a carefully researched result that should be taken seriously," she said in a statement.

The new work builds on research that was published while the fires were still burning fiercely.

That study linked the wildfires to what's termed "climate whiplash."

The idea is that very wet years are followed almost immediately by very dry ones, which increases the risk of fires.

This is what happened in LA, when two wet winters were followed by an extremely dry autumn and winter this year – the wet weather promoted the growth of grass and shrubs that became the fuel for the fires that took off in the gusting Santa Ana winds.

19: World's glaciers are losing record ice as global temperatures climb, U.N. says

Glaciers around the globe are disappearing faster than ever, with the last three-year period seeing the largest glacial mass loss on record, according to a UNESCO report released on Friday.

The 9,000 gigatons of ice lost from glaciers since 1975 are roughly equivalent to "an ice block the size of Germany with the thickness of 25 meters," Michael Zemp, director of the Switzerland-based World Glacier Monitoring Service, said during a press conference announcing the report at the UN headquarters in Geneva.

The dramatic ice loss, from the Arctic to the Alps, from South America to the Tibetan Plateau, is expected to accelerate as climate change, caused by the burning of fossil fuels, pushes global temperatures higher. This would likely exacerbate economic, environmental and social problems across the world as sea levels rise and these key water sources dwindle.

The report coincides with a UNESCO summit in Paris marking the first World Day for Glaciers, urging global action to protect glaciers around the world.

Zemp said that five of the last six years registered the largest losses, with glaciers losing 450 gigatons of mass in 2024 alone.

The accelerated loss has made mountain glaciers one of the largest contributors to sea level rise, putting millions at risk of devastating floods and damaging water routes that billions of people depend on for hydroelectric energy and agriculture.

Stefan Uhlenbrook, the director of water and cryosphere at the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), said that about 275,000 glaciers remain globally which, along with the Antarctic and Greenland ice sheets, comprise about 70% of the world's freshwater.

"We need to advance our scientific knowledge, we need to advance through better observing systems, through better forecasts and better early warning systems for the planet and the people," Uhlenbrook said.

About 1.1 billion people live in mountain communities, which suffer the most immediate

impacts of glacier loss, due to the increasing risks with natural hazards and unreliable water sources. The remote locations and difficult terrains also make cheap fixes difficult to come by.

Rising temperatures are expected to worsen droughts in areas that rely on snowpack for freshwater, while increasing both the severity and frequency of hazards like avalanches, landslides, flash floods and glacial lake outburst floods (GLOFs).

One Peruvian farmer living downstream of a retreating glacier has taken the issue to court, suing German energy giant RWE for a portion of the glacial lake's flood defenses proportionate to its historic global emissions.

"The changes we see in the field are literally heartbreaking," glaciologist Heidi Sevestre, secretariat at the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Program, told Reuters outside the UNESCO headquarters in Paris on Wednesday.

"Things in certain regions are happening actually much faster than we anticipated," Sevestre added, noting a recent trip to the Rwenzori Mountains, located in Uganda and the Democratic Republic of the Congo in East Africa, where glaciers are now expected to disappear by 2030.

Sevestre has worked with the region's indigenous Bakonzo communities who believe a deity called Kitasamba lives in the glaciers.

"Can you imagine the deep spiritual connection, this strong attachment they have towards the glaciers and what it might mean for them that their glaciers are disappearing?" Sevestre said.

Glacial melt in East Africa has led to increased local conflicts over water, according to the new UNESCO report, and while the impact on a global scale is minimal, the trickle of melting glaciers around the world is having a compounding impact.

Between 2000 and 2023, melting mountain glaciers have caused 18 millimeters of global sea level rise, about 1 mm per year. Every millimeter can expose up to 300,000 people to annual flooding, according to the World Glacier Monitoring Service.

"Billions of people are connected to glaciers, whether they know it or not, and that will require billions of people to protect them," Sevestre said.

20: Climate Change Is Making Airplane Turbulence More Common and Severe, Scientists Say

Passengers aboard a Singapore Airlines flight last week hit severe turbulence over the Indian Ocean—and in the span of just one second, the plane dropped by 178 feet. One

passenger, a 73-year-old man, died, and dozens of other people were injured. The plane, which was traveling from London to Singapore, made an emergency landing in Bangkok, and news of the incident has placed airplane turbulence—and the science behind it—back into national and international conversations.

And for good reason: Research suggests air turbulence has already become more common, and it is projected to grow even more frequent and severe because of climate change. Most of these in-flight disturbances are harmless, so long as safety procedures are adhered to. But more intense instances of turbulence could create more stressful or dangerous flight experiences for passengers and flight attendants alike.

“It is not that we’ll have to stop flying, or planes will start falling out of the sky,” Paul Williams, an atmospheric scientist at the University of Reading who has researched air turbulence, tells Nature News’ Carissa Wong. “I’m just saying that for every ten minutes you’ve spent in severe turbulence in the past, it could be 20 or 30 minutes in the future.”

Williams and others published a study in 2019, suggesting higher atmospheric temperatures, a result of global warming, have contributed significantly to more turbulence. Severe incidents of airplane turbulence increased by 55 percent from 1979 to 2020, per a study last year. And wind shear—the sudden change in wind strength or direction, over a short distance—at airplane cruising altitudes has increased by 15 percent since 1979, a trend expected to further increase by between 17 percent and 29 percent by the end of the century.

In the atmosphere, warmer air can hold more water vapor, giving rise to even warmer temperatures in turn. This can create differences in air temperature, the researchers write, making wind shear more common. Their findings suggest that turbulence strong enough to pose a risk of injury could become two or three times more likely over the North Atlantic between 2050 and 2080.

“It’s affecting the wind patterns, and one of those impacts that is being affected are jet streams,” Todd Lane, an atmospheric scientist at the University of Melbourne, tells the Australian Broadcasting Corporation’s Jo Lauder. “Those jet streams that are at aircraft flight levels are projected to intensify, which means that those regions will become more turbulent.”

Some turbulence is caused by thunderstorms, which are also projected to worsen with climate change. But other turbulence is not linked to storms, making it more difficult for pilots to predict. This clear-air turbulence, also called “invisible” turbulence, is also projected to increase—under some climate change scenarios, it could be four times more common by 2050 compared to historic levels.

Turbulence occurs all across the globe and is felt most often near mountain ranges and the

edges of jet streams. The world's three most turbulent flight paths are: Santiago, Chile, to Santa Cruz, Bolivia; Almaty, Kazakhstan, to Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan; and Lanzhou, China, to Chengdu, China.

But American travelers on domestic flights aren't exempt from the trend. U.S. pilots report 65,000 incidents of at least moderate turbulence and 5,500 incidents of severe or greater turbulence each year.

Sara Nelson, president of the Association of Flight Attendants-CWA, a union representing flight attendants, called turbulence a "serious workplace safety issue" last week, per the Washington Post's Hannah Sampson.

U.S. Secretary of Transportation Pete Buttigieg said on CBS News' "Face the Nation" program Sunday that turbulence is occurring more frequently, and climate change is a significant factor that will "affect American travelers, whether here or abroad."

"Our climate is evolving," Buttigieg said, according to CNBC's Sean Conlon. "Our policies and our technology and our infrastructure have to evolve accordingly, too."

Technologies for detecting turbulence are getting better, and new innovations are on the way. Pilots are currently able to use turbulence forecasts, which indicate the smoothest routes to take. And turbulence caused by stormy weather is often identified by weather centers, satellites and on-ground sensors and radars.

Clear-air turbulence, however, is still difficult to reliably predict. But developments in lidar technologies, though still expensive and too cumbersome to put into practice, have shown promise.

"I've seen some experimental flights, and you can indeed see clear-air turbulence 20 miles, for example, ahead of the aircraft," Williams tells Nature News.

21: More than 150 'unprecedented' climate disasters struck world in 2024, says UN

The devastating impacts of the climate crisis reached new heights in 2024, with scores of unprecedented heatwaves, floods and storms across the globe, according to the UN's World Meteorological Organization. The WMO's report on 2024, the hottest year on record, sets out a trail of destruction from extreme weather that took lives, demolished buildings and ravaged vital crops. More than 800,000 people were displaced and made homeless, the highest yearly number since records began in 2008. The report lists 151 unprecedented extreme weather events in 2024, meaning they were worse than any ever recorded in the region. Heatwaves in Japan left hundreds of thousands of people struck down by heatstroke. Soaring temperatures during heatwaves peaked at 49.9C at Carnarvon in Western Australia, 49.7C in the city of Tabas in Iran, and 48.5C in a nationwide heatwave in Mali. Record rains

in Italy led to floods, landslides and electricity blackouts; torrents destroyed thousands of homes in Senegal; and flash floods in Pakistan and Brazil caused major crop losses. Storms were also supercharged by global heating in 2024, with an unprecedented six typhoons in under a month hitting the Philippines. Hurricane Helene was the strongest ever recorded to strike the Big Bend region of Florida in the US, while Vietnam was hit by Super Typhoon Yagi, affecting 3.6 million people. Many more unprecedented events will have passed unrecorded. The world is already deep into the climate crisis, with the WMO report saying that for the first time, the 10 hottest years on record all occurred in the last decade. However, global carbon emissions have continued to rise, which will bring even worse impacts. Experts were particularly critical of the purge of climate scientists and programmes by the US president, Donald Trump, saying that ignoring reality left ordinary people paying the price. 'Leaders must step up - seizing the benefits of cheap, clean renewables for their people and economies - with new national climate plans due this year,' said the UN secretary general, António Guterres. Dr Luke Parsons, of the Nature Conservancy, said: 'Every year, we venture further into uncharted territory, with 2024 the hottest year modern human society has ever experienced. Yet the coming decade is expected to be even hotter, pushing us deeper into this unprecedented climate.' Previous research determining the role of the climate crisis in what are now unnatural disasters has shown that at least 550 heatwaves, floods, storms, droughts and wildfires had been made significantly more severe or more frequent by global heating. Dr Brenda Ekwurzel, of the Union of Concerned Scientists, condemned the Trump administration's deletion of online climate information. 'Attempts to hide climate science from the public will not stop us from feeling the dire impacts of climate change,' she said. 'This report underscores the urgency of world leaders meeting the moment, not slashing environmental protections and federal disaster aid, sacrificing public health for the fossil fuel industry's private profit, and gutting agencies that help form the scientific underpinnings of our global climate knowledge.' 'Global warming continues unabated, exactly as predicted correctly since the 1980s, [and] millions of people are increasingly suffering the consequences,' said Prof Stefan Rahmstorf, of the Potsdam Institute for Climate in Germany. 'We can only stop the warming trend by getting out of fossil fuels fast.' 'We have the solutions - but what stops us is the disinformation campaigns and lobby power of the fossil fuel industry,' Rahmstorf added. 'Ignoring reality, denying the laws of physics and silencing scientists can only lead to harm, and ordinary people will pay the price for that.' Dr Davide Faranda, from ClimaMeter, said: 'Every fraction of a degree matters. The choices we make today will determine the severity of climate impacts in the years to come.' The WMO secretary general, Prof Celeste Saulo, said the report was a wake-up call about the rising risks to lives and livelihoods. 'In response, WMO and the global community are intensifying efforts to strengthen early warning systems and climate services to help society be more resilient to extreme weather,' she said. 'Only half of all countries have adequate early warning systems - this must change.' She stressed that investment in weather, water and climate services was more important than ever. The Trump administration has sacked 1300 staff from the US National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, one of the world's leading weather and climate

watchdogs, and 1.000 more are threatened. Experts estimate that every \$1 spent on climate resilience saves \$13 in damages and clean-up costs.

22: Waking Up to the Green Dream Nightmare

This opinion piece criticizes green energy policies and frames them as ideologically driven, likening the climate movement to a cult focused on top-down control by elites. It argues that wind and solar are inferior to fossil fuels in reliability, cost, and output, and that demonizing fossil fuels has led to increased hardship for citizens, especially in Europe. The article contends that the push for renewables is not rooted in reason, science, or economics but in ideological zealotry. It suggests that fossil fuels are not only cheaper and more abundant but also potentially less harmful to the environment than renewables in some contexts. The Biden administration is accused of favoring green energy while undermining fossil fuel industries. The article promotes an 'all-of-the-above' energy strategy that includes renewables, nuclear, and fossil fuels. It concludes by stating that more Americans are recognizing the green agenda as a political tool rather than a scientific imperative and calls for policies based on energy abundance and affordability.

23: Cities face 'whiplash' of floods, droughts as temperatures rise, study warns

By David Stanway March 12, 2025 6:00 AM GMT+1 Updated 19 days ago Item 1 of 3 People walk through water at a flooded area affected by rising sea levels and land subsidence in North Jakarta, Indonesia, November 20, 2024. REUTERS/Willy Kurniawan/File Photo [1/3] People walk through water at a flooded area affected by rising sea levels and land subsidence in North Jakarta, Indonesia, November 20, 2024. REUTERS/Willy Kurniawan/File Photo Purchase Licensing Rights , opens new tab SINGAPORE, March 12 (Reuters) - The weather in some of the world's most densely populated cities is swinging from droughts to floods and back again as rising temperatures play havoc with the global water cycle, a study commissioned by the charity WaterAid showed on Wednesday. South and Southeast Asia face the strongest wetting trends, while Europe, the Middle East and North Africa are becoming ever drier, researchers found in a study of 42 years of weather data drawn from more than 100 of the world's most populous cities. Make sense of the latest ESG trends affecting companies and governments with the Reuters Sustainable Switch newsletter. Sign up here. Advertisement · Scroll to continue 'There will be winners and losers associated with climate change,' said Michael Singer of the Water Research Institute at Cardiff University, one of the authors of the study. 'It's already happening.' China's eastern city of Hangzhou and Indonesia's capital of Jakarta topped the list of cities suffering from 'climate whiplash', or a rapid succession of prolonged floods and droughts, the study showed. As much as 15% of the cities surveyed also faced the worst of both worlds, with extreme flood and drought risks rising at the same time, among them the Texan city of Dallas, the Chinese commercial hub of Shanghai and Baghdad, the capital of Iraq. Advertisement · Scroll to continue 'You can't just assume that every place can have a similar response to atmospheric warming,' added Singer. 'It doesn't care who you are, whether you're wealthy or poor or you have great infrastructure or not.' China's coastal city of Hangzhou set a record with more than 60 days of extreme high temperatures last year, and was also hit by severe floods that forced tens of thousands to evacuate. A fifth of the cities

have seen a reversal in climate extremes, with the Sri Lankan capital of Colombo and the Indian financial hub of Mumbai 'flipping' to become far wetter, while the Egyptian capital of Cairo and Hong Kong are steadily drier. Many cities that built infrastructure either to maximise scarce water supplies or mitigate flood damage are now facing entirely different circumstances, and will need to invest to adapt, Singer warned. The few experiencing favourable changes include the Japanese capital of Tokyo, London and China's southern Guangzhou, which had significantly fewer wet and dry months over the period from 2002 to 2023 than in the two prior decades.

24: EPA head says he'll roll back dozens of environmental regulations, including rules on climate change

WASHINGTON (AP) — In what he called the “most consequential day of deregulation in American history,” the head of the Environmental Protection Agency announced a series of actions Wednesday to roll back landmark environmental regulations, including rules on pollution from coal-fired power plants, climate change and electric vehicles. “We are driving a dagger through the heart of climate-change religion and ushering in America’s Golden Age,” EPA Administrator Lee Zeldin said in an essay in *The Wall Street Journal*. If approved after a lengthy process that includes public comment, the Trump administration’s actions will eliminate trillions of dollars in regulatory costs and “hidden taxes,” Zeldin said, lowering the cost of living for American families and reducing prices for such essentials such as buying a car, heating your home and operating a business. “Our actions will also reignite American manufacturing, spreading economic benefits to communities,” he wrote. “Energy dominance stands at the center of America’s resurgence.” In all, Zeldin said he is rolling back 31 environmental rules, including a scientific finding that has long been the central basis for U.S. action against climate change. Related Stories EPA offers industrial polluters a way to avoid rules on toxic chemicals EPA offers industrial polluters a way to avoid rules on toxic chemicals EPA head urges Trump to reconsider scientific finding that underpins climate action, AP sources say EPA head urges Trump to reconsider scientific finding that underpins climate action, AP sources say Trump environmental rollbacks would boost pollution and endanger lives, former EPA heads say Trump environmental rollbacks would boost pollution and endanger lives, former EPA heads say Former Rep. Lee Zeldin, R-N.Y., President-elect Donald Trump's pick to head the Environmental Protection Agency, appears before the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee on Capitol Hill, Jan. 16, 2025, in Washington. (AP Photo/Mark Schiefelbein, File) Former Rep. Lee Zeldin, R-N.Y., President-elect Donald Trump's pick to head the Environmental Protection Agency, appears before the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee on Capitol Hill, Jan. 16, 2025, in Washington. (AP Photo/Mark Schiefelbein, File) Zeldin said he and President Donald Trump support rewriting the agency’s 2009 finding that planet-warming greenhouse gases endanger public health and welfare. The Obama-era determination under the Clean Air Act is the legal underpinning of a host of climate regulations for motor vehicles, power plants and other pollution sources. Environmentalists and climate scientists call the endangerment finding a bedrock of U.S. law and say any attempt to undo it will have little chance of success. “In the face of overwhelming science, it’s impossible to

think that the EPA could develop a contradictory finding that would stand up in court,” said David Doniger, a climate expert at the Natural Resources Defense Council, an environmental group. In a related action, Zeldin said EPA will rewrite a rule restricting air pollution from fossil-fuel fired power plants and a separate measure restricting emissions from cars and trucks. Zeldin and the Republican president incorrectly label the car rule as an electric vehicle “mandate.” President Joe Biden’s Democratic administration had said the power plant rules would reduce pollution and improve public health while supporting the reliable, long-term supply of electricity that America needs. Biden, who made fighting climate change a hallmark of his presidency, cited the car rule as a key factor in what he called “historic progress” on his pledge that half of all new cars and trucks sold in the U.S. will be zero-emission by 2030. The EPA also will take aim at rules restricting industrial pollution of mercury and other air toxins, soot pollution and a “good neighbor” rule intended to restrict smokestack emissions that burden downwind areas with smog. The EPA also targeted a clean water law that provides federal protections for rivers, streams and wetlands. None of the changes take effect immediately, and nearly all will require a long rulemaking process. Environmental groups vowed to oppose the actions, which one said would result in “the greatest increase in pollution in decades” in the U.S. Amanda Leland, executive director of the Environmental Defense Fund, made the claim as she denounced Zeldin’s “unlawful attack on the public health of the American people.” The EPA has also terminated its diversity, equity and inclusion programs and will shutter parts of the agency focused on environmental justice, Zeldin said. The effort strived to improve conditions in areas heavily burdened by industrial pollution, mostly in low-income and majority-Black or Hispanic communities. “This isn’t about abandoning environmental protection — it’s about achieving it through innovation and not strangulation,” Zeldin wrote. “By reconsidering rules that throttled oil and gas production and unfairly targeted coal-fired power plants, we are ensuring that American energy remains clean, affordable and reliable.” University of Pennsylvania climate scientist Michael Mann called the EPA’s action “just the latest form of Republican climate denial. They can no longer deny climate change is happening, so instead they’re pretending it’s not a threat, despite the overwhelming scientific evidence that it is, perhaps, the greatest threat that we face today.” The directive to reconsider the endangerment finding and other EPA rules was a recommendation of Project 2025, a conservative blueprint for Trump’s second term. Russell Vought, director of the White House Office of Management and Budget and co-author of Project 2025, called the actions long overdue. “EPA’s regulation of the climate affects the entire national economy — jobs, wages and family budgets,” Vought said Wednesday. “The Trump administration’s ignorance is trumped only by its malice toward the planet,” countered Jason Rylander, legal director at the Center for Biological Diversity’s Climate Law Institute. “Come hell and high water, raging fires and deadly heatwaves, Trump and his cronies are bent on putting polluter profits ahead of people’s lives.”

Residences destroyed by the Eaton Fire line a neighborhood in Altadena, Calif., on Tuesday, Jan. 21, 2025. (AP Photo/Noah Berger, File)

Residences destroyed by the Eaton Fire line a neighborhood in Altadena, Calif., on Tuesday, Jan. 21, 2025. (AP Photo/Noah Berger, File)

Reconsidering the endangerment finding and other actions “won’t stand up in court,” Rylander said. “We’re going to fight it every step of

the way.” The United States is the second largest carbon polluter in the world, after China, and the largest historical emitter of greenhouse gases. The moves to terminate environmental justice staff follows an action last week to drop a case against a Louisiana petrochemical plant accused of increasing cancer risk in a majority-Black community. Zeldin called environmental justice a term that “has been used primarily as an excuse to fund left-wing activists instead of actually spending those dollars to directly remediate environmental issues for those communities.” Matthew Tejada, who once led EPA’s environmental justice office, said Trump and Zeldin were “taking us back to a time of unfettered pollution across the nation, leaving every American exposed to toxic chemicals, dirty air and contaminated water.” Tejada now works at the NRDC. Anne Bradbury, CEO of the American Exploration & Production Council, an oil industry group, hailed Zeldin’s actions and said the U.S. is “stronger and more secure when we are energy dominant.” Her group has long called for changes to EPA rules so they are “workable, effective and build on the significant emissions reductions” made by oil and gas producers, Bradbury said. “We support updating these rules so the American people can continue to benefit from affordable, reliable and clean American energy.” New Jersey Rep. Frank Pallone, the top Democrat on the House Energy and Commerce Committee, called Zeldin’s actions “a despicable betrayal of the American people.” Every day, more Americans lose their jobs, homes and even their lives to worsening climate disasters, Pallone said. Trump and Zeldin “are making a mockery of those people’s pain,” Pallone said, adding that “will have swift and catastrophic ramifications for the environment and health of all Americans.” Louise Hamlin visits her home ravaged by the Eaton Fire in Altadena, Calif., Thursday, Jan. 30, 2025. (AP Photo/Jae C. Hong, File)

25: Physicist to Tucker Carlson: Climate change is ‘fiction of the media’

According to data from the U.S. government, Koonin explained, ‘there are no detectable human influences’ on natural disasters like hurricanes for more than a century, and today’s heatwaves in the U.S. are just as common as they were back in 1900. ‘The warmest temperatures have not gone up in the last 60 years,’ he noted. **TUCKER CARLSON CALLS OUT FAUCI’S ‘BIZARRE’ CLAIM THAT HIS CRITICS ARE AGAINST SCIENCE** The physicist pointed out that politicians love to throw around the term ‘existential threat’ when it comes to the topic of climate, but he argued that government officials like Transportation Secretary Pete Buttigieg are unqualified to raise the issue to such an extreme. **What Climate Science Knows--and Doesn't Know Video** ‘I don't think the science says what... Secretary Pete thinks it says,’ he said. ‘In fact, I can guarantee you he's never read the science. Fact, I can guarantee you that Sen. Sanders, President Biden, Ambassador Kerry, Secretary Granholm have never read the science - because you need to be a scientist in order to do that. And in fact, when you read it, there's very little in terms of extreme weather that's changed over the last many decades.’ Koonin encouraged other scientists to stand up to politicians who are pushing an exaggerated narrative of climate change in order to support the community’s credibility. ‘It is a failure of the scientific community not to stand up and say, ‘Guys, you know, you have over-egged the custard. You really need to be much more

circumspect in how you talk about this,' he said. 'And, of course, that gets then picked up by the politicians, and the media love to talk about catastrophes.'

26: Simple Facts Expose The Climate Change Hoax

To believe in the climate change hoax, you must believe 5 (palpably untrue) things: CO₂ is the “control knob” for the climate. This has been proven to be ridiculous. CO₂ makes up only about 0.04% of the atmosphere, while 96–99% of the atmosphere is oxygen and nitrogen. Water vapor, a much larger determinant of temperature, varies from 1-4%. But what determines temperature more than anything else? Changes in the Earth’s solar orbit (obviously). NASA has admitted this. CO₂ is harmful. Wrong! CO₂ is plant food. Humans inhale oxygen and exhale CO₂. Plants do the reverse. It is scientific fact that higher levels of CO₂ lead to greater plant growth. This is essential if we are going to continue to be able to feed an increasing world population and one of the reasons why the planet now supports 8 billion humans. We are at historically high levels of CO₂ in the atmosphere. Again, not true. We are actually at historically low levels of CO₂. Before the Industrial Revolution, the seminal starting point for climate hysteria (often cited by climate hysterics), the amount of CO₂ in the atmosphere was approximately 290 ppm (parts per million). Plant life begins to succumb (it dies) around 150ppm. The amount of CO₂ currently in the atmosphere is roughly 420ppm. Image by AI. But is this historically high? Hardly. During the period of the dinosaurs, cold-blooded reptiles that required warm climates, consumed massive volumes of vegetation, and perished when the earth cooled, CO₂ levels were roughly 3600ppm, creating the Jurassic conditions that enabled the dinosaurs to flourish, roaming the earth for millions of years. Were the dinosaurs driving larger SUVs than Americans now drive? What caused CO₂ levels to reach such heights then? It certainly wasn’t humans. It occurred, as it always does and has, due to solar cycles, which NASA has admitted. Sponsored What You Need to Know About Car Loans Access Low-interest HELOC Funds for Your Home Renovation Take on a Challenge: Make Pasta Al Limone at Home Tired of Cleaning out Your Gutters? Get a Quote Today! Image. Oak Ridge National Lab. Public domain. As the linked article states, The data clearly establishes that there has always been a cycle to CO₂ long before man’s industrial age. This is data government wants to hide. As long as they can pretend CO₂ has never risen in the past before 1950, then they can tax the air and pretend it’s to prevent climate change. Moreover, while we can clean the air with regulation as we have done, under global warming, they allow “credits” to pollute as long as you pay the government. It is the ultimate scam where they get to tax pollution and people cheer rather than clean up anything. The more accurate way to describe our current CO₂ situation is that we are experiencing a CO₂ famine that could lead to the disappearance of plant life: It’s nonsensical to create government policies based on future hypotheticals about natural processes. Does it make sense that anybody would base policy (and spend money) on predicting what could happen in the future? Are there not infinite possibilities as to what could happen? The odds of predicting correctly are far worse than winning Powerball. Who in his right mind believes that any person or computer model can predict the future? Anybody that does should be asked if he (or she) is willing to place a meaningful amount of their personal wealth on the line. Furthermore, if somebody really were able to predict the

future, would they be predicting the weather, or would they be predicting perhaps stock market and individual equity moves, or perhaps lottery numbers? The conclusion: Any attempt to predict the future is a guess. Models that are, and have been, wildly inaccurate are not science; they are science fiction. Neither anybody nor anything can predict even next week's weather accurately due to the millions of atmospheric and stellar variables. This is so obvious that we still must GUESS as to the path and severity of a hurricane—even after it's formed. If we can't even predict the weather, how can we control it? If you still have arrived at a point where you believe that CO2 is the weather control knob, it's harmful, we're at historically high levels of it, and that the US government (or any other entity on earth, perhaps maybe the UN) can predict the weather, then how would they go about controlling it? If the US government could control the weather, then why didn't it stop Helene (September 26, 2024) or Milton (October 7, 2024) before all that destruction and save FEMA from the bother of having to clean up? Why didn't the National Weather Service or NASA stop it? Well, it's because the US government, which can't even stop illegals at the Southern border, can't do anything to stop modest changes in atmospheric CO2 levels. And let's say at this point that you're still a "believer." Do you really even believe that the pathological liars in the US government can control enough of the weather on our side of the planet that it can offset activity in the rest of the world? What if a volcano erupts? What then? And how do you factor into all this the fact that China is building a new coal-fired power plant each week (52 per year)? "The greatest folly is to believe in the palpably untrue. It is the chief occupation of mankind." – HL Mencken Jonathan Gault is a pseudonym.

27: Study confirms that man-made climate change is completely fake (so much for consensus...)

Just how much of a threat to the subsistence of our planet is man-made climate change, according to the latest scientific data? It's not actually a threat at all, it turns out, because man-made climate change doesn't exist. This is the conclusion of a new study out of Finland, in which researchers from the University of Turku determined that the contribution of humans to global temperature increases over the past century is negligible, at best. While planetary temperatures are said to have risen by about 0.1 degrees Celsius over the past 100 years, human activity contributed only about 0.01 degrees Celsius of this, or about 10 percent. Entitled, "No experimental evidence for the significant anthropogenic climate change," the paper reiterates that global temperature fluctuations are primarily influenced by things like cloud cover that have absolutely nothing to do with humans eating meat, driving cars, or raising livestock that fart. "Only a small part," write authors Jyrki Kauppinen and Pekka Malmi, the study's two primary authors, of rising carbon dioxide (CO2) levels is anthropogenic – which means that all of the fear-mongering by leftists about humans supposedly "destroying the planet" is nothing but fake news. These conclusions directly contradict the official positions of the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), which insists that human activity is the primary contributor to fluctuating climate conditions around the world. "While the methods and results of the study can be debated, this once again illustrates how there is no overwhelming consensus

on man-made global warming as the media often claims,” writes Paul Joseph Watson for Infowars. Brighteon.TV “In reality, there are dozens of prominent scientists who believe that climate change is driven by natural forces or that the United Nations’ climate projections are unreliable,” he adds. For more related news, be sure to check out ClimateScienceNews.com. No, the science is NOT settled on climate change. These latest findings certainly challenge the erroneous notion that the “science is settled” on climate change, or that a “consensus” has somehow been reached on the matter. In truth, there’s never been a scientific consensus on climate change because even the climate community itself can’t say for sure what specifically, if anything, humans are doing to most severely impact our planet’s weather patterns. What climate fanatics routinely ignore are natural phenomena like volcanoes and coronal mass ejections (CMEs) that “warm” the planet far more than cattle and driving combustion engine vehicles. This isn’t to say that humans shouldn’t try to better innovate in order to minimize the negative impact we all have on our collective home. But what we don’t need is governments spreading pseudoscientific fear and hysteria about the need for things like carbon credits, the Paris Climate Accord, and other money-grabbing scams that are intended purely to create a system of global governance, and that have nothing to do with conserving and protecting the globe itself. “The sun dictates climate change on earth,” writes one Infowars commenter, illustrating the fact that humans have a negligible, at best, impact on earth’s climate patterns. “Anyone can check the ice core data from the poles for the last 10,000 years. Best evidence. All of humanity can throw trillions of dollars at climate change and the sun will continue doing its thing. We are alive at the mercy of the sun, comets, and the environment in the solar system that encompasses us. Spending money won’t change anything.” To keep up with the latest climate madness coming from the left, be sure to check out Climate.news. You can also learn more about the deep state’s plan to use climate change as a catalyst to force everyone into tightly-packed surveillance cities at Agenda21.news.

28: Delingpole: Study Disputes That Earth Is in a ‘Climate Emergency’

Almost everywhere you look, climate change is having only small, and often benign, impacts. The impact of extreme weather events — hurricanes, tornadoes, floods and droughts — are, if anything, declining...

29: Human-caused carbon emissions have no discernible effect on climate, study finds

There is no 'climate emergency,' nor are humans responsible for destroying the earth with industry...

30: New Data Shows Climate Change Hysteria Isn’t Grounded In Science

As natural bio-systems are dynamic, ever-evolving, and adapting over the long-term, determining longevity timeframes is currently impossible...

31: Extreme heat could double impacts of heart disease by 2050, study finds

It predicts that if greenhouse gas emissions continue to rise, impacts from cardiovascular disease could double by 2050...

32: Cold Winters Mean Global Warming? In What World?

Baby, It's Cold Outside is a popular Christmas song from another era, long before the MeToo virus infected society. The virus turned harmless flirting into a crime against humanity, disqualifying perpetrators from employment, government service, or polite society. Today, we sing, ma'am, sir, they, or ze, it's cold outside. How cold? "With an average temperature running 3.6 degrees below normal, this is currently the coldest January nationally (lower 48) since 1994", says Kevin Williams, meteorologist and President of Weather-Track, Inc. Another meteorologist, Joe Bastardi, agrees. "The nation for Jan is now the coldest max temps since 1988 at - 4.2." Logic suggests that cold winters, especially record-setting ones, mean that the planet may not be warming, as global warming alarmists insist. In response, these Chicken Littles merely changed the name from "global warming" to "climate change" to mask the obvious contradiction of a warming planet causing colder winters. This is similar to how illegal aliens became illegal migrants, then undocumented individuals, and finally just immigrants or visitors, making no distinction between law-abiding and border-crashing "visitors" to America. Corporate media overlooks the irony in these contradictions. From the BBC: "Climate change: Arctic warming linked to colder winters." How convenient. Anything happening in the Arctic, whether warming, cooling, or raining cats and dogs, can be "linked" to climate change. Last winter, PBS asked, "Already missing winter? Here's what we lose when the season warms up." Less than a year later, PBS noted the opposite, "Weekend of Arctic storms could break low-temperature records in U.S. heartland." No wonder President Trump is threatening to defund PBS and NPR. They are not practicing journalism but instead propaganda, magical thinking, or both. What about the myriad failed predictions? In 1970, the Boston Globe wrote, "Scientists predict a new ice age by the 21st century." Well, here we are, and Chicago isn't buried under a mile of ice as it was in the last ice age. In 2019, Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez warned, "The world is gonna end in 12 years if we don't address climate change." We are almost halfway to 2031, and the world is alive and well. Government incompetence and malfeasance threaten the world more than cold winters in Alabama and Mississippi. In 1967, Stanford biologist Paul Ehrlich said, "The time of famines is upon us" and will be most disastrous by 1975. Instead of starving Americans, we have an epidemic of obesity. Predictions are like a\$\$holes; everyone has one. Betting on who will win the Super Bowl or guessing the winning lottery number involves one's own money and does not hurt anyone else. But these climate prognostications are costly, involving laws, rules, regulations, taxes, and prosecutions, which cost billions of dollars that could be better spent elsewhere. These hair-on-fire screeds about climate change have consequences. Are we cooling or warming? Deaths from cold are ten times more common than deaths from heat. Recent news bears this out, "At least 11 dead after record-breaking snowstorm swept across the South." So here we are, with confident assertions that global warming—now climate change—is the world's biggest problem. Former President Joe Biden claimed, "Climate change is an existential threat to humanity." Do the American

people agree? One would think not, as there is growing skepticism over the “follow the science” diktats from government health and science agencies. Most of the COVID “science” was manufactured or based on political, not medical, science. Rasmussen Reports, however, threw water on the idea that Americans were waking up and reintroduced to common sense. What used to be called “global warming” has been renamed climate change, and nearly two-thirds of Americans suspect it's making winter worse. Sixty-four percent (64%) believe it's likely that climate change is causing more extreme weather, including severe snow storms in winter, including 41% who think it's very likely. Not only is the Rasmussen Reports sample embracing climate change, but Pew Research has also found similar results. A majority of Americans support prioritizing the development of renewable energy sources. Americans are reluctant to phase out fossil fuels altogether, but younger adults are more open to it. The public supports the federal government incentivizing wind and solar energy production. Prioritizing over what? Federal funding is a zero-sum game, meaning that if they fund something more, something else will be funded less. Should it be entitlement services? Defense? Border security? It's all tradeoffs, and Americans should decide and vote accordingly. Young Americans are not driving. USA Today reported that “Gen Z is less likely to have a driver's license.” Phasing out fossil fuels won't phase them, as they are little concerned about where their Uber car gets its gas or where their Lyft EV gets its electricity. Incentives are fine up to a point, but they should be focused on emerging technologies. Wind and solar energy are well-established technologies that shouldn't be subsidized. If they are as beneficial as the government claims, they should sell themselves and not need taxpayer subsidies. As the Mercatus Center of George Mason University pointed out, “When the government subsidizes businesses, it weakens profit-and-loss signals in the economy and undermines market-based entrepreneurship.” Wind and solar energy are fine but an honest analysis of the environmental impact of building, maintaining, and disposal of wind turbines and solar panels is warranted. And what happens when the wind doesn't blow? As the UK Telegraph reported, “Wind power has collapsed to less than 1pc of Britain's electricity supply.” Why? The wind stopped blowing. Advanced societies cannot function with a fickle and unreliable energy supply. The larger problem is that Rasmussen Reports found that almost two-thirds of American adults believe climate change is causing more extreme weather. This ignores the fact that extreme weather today receives far more coverage on legacy and new media, including social media, where there are endless videos of every snowstorm or hurricane, compared to a few decades ago when news came from the three major networks and local print newspapers. Many may not realize that history did not begin when they were born, a very short timeframe for assessing weather trends. It's evident that many Americans still buy into the climate doomsday prophecies. Hopefully, President Trump and his new team can guide the climate narrative toward one of common sense and reason when taking a break from dismantling the national and international deep states.

33: 'Climate Intelligence Group' Says Climate Emergency Is Over

The Climate Intelligence Group (Clintel), composed of European and North American researchers and scientists, declared in a communique last week that the “imagined and imaginary ‘climate emergency’ is at an end.” The group met at the International Scientific

Conference in Prague, Czech Republic, even as the UN's COP29 climate conference was talking place in Baku, Azerbaijan. Clintel in August of 2023 had boldly declared "there is no climate emergency." Seventeen scientists and researchers, including CO2 Coalition Executive Director Gregory Wrightstone, signed the communique, which was a rhetorical poke in the eye to the COP29 gathering. Warming Is Good. While acknowledging some warming since the Little Ice Age ended, the group noted that the warming and the increased CO2 in the atmosphere were a good thing for the planet: "The modest increase in the atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide that has taken place since the end of the Little Ice Age has been net-beneficial to humanity." In addition, they found that "foreseeable future increases in greenhouse gases in the air will probably also prove net-beneficial." Clintel further claimed that the Sun, not greenhouse gasses, was the main reason for any warming of the atmosphere: "The Sun, and not greenhouse gases, has contributed and will continue to contribute the overwhelming majority of global temperature." Despite all the fearmongering over extreme weather events such as hurricanes, there is no reason to believe that an apocalyptic climate collapse is imminent, the signatories claim. According to the document, "There is broad agreement among the scientific community that extreme weather events have not increased in frequency, intensity or duration and are in future unlikely to do so." Wasted Effort. In addition, the scientists declared that the obscene amount of global wealth being spent on the so-called climate crisis is wasteful and unnecessary and won't do much, if anything, to lower global temperatures. "Even if all nations, rather than chiefly western nations, were to move directly and together from the current trajectory to net zero emissions by the official target year of 2050, the global warming prevented by that year would be no more than 0.05 to 0.1 Celsius," the communique states. Wind and solar power are not only incapable of meeting global power needs, but also potentially environmentally hazardous: "Since wind and solar power are costly, intermittent and more environmentally destructive per TWh generated than any other energy source, governments should cease to subsidize or to prioritize them, and should instead expand coal, gas and, above, all nuclear generation." The scientists further declared the UN's International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) an unfit agency to oversee scientific inquiry into climate change and called for its dismantling: The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, which excludes participants and published papers disagreeing with its narrative, fails to comply with its own error-reporting protocol and draws conclusions some of which are dishonest, should be forthwith dismantled. As COP29 attendees demand that the nations of the world devote more treasure and time to solve the imaginary climate crisis, it's good to know there are still honest scientists and researchers out there who are willing to reject those fanciful notions and state facts instead of propaganda.

34: Climate Change Is Speeding Toward Catastrophe. The Next Decade Is Crucial, U.N. Panel Says.

Earth is likely to cross a critical threshold for global warming within the next decade, and nations will need to make an immediate and drastic shift away from fossil fuels to prevent the planet from overheating dangerously beyond that level, according to a major new report

released on Monday. The report, by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, a body of experts convened by the United Nations, offers the most comprehensive understanding to date of ways in which the planet is changing. It says that global average temperatures are estimated to rise 1.5 degrees Celsius (2.7 degrees Fahrenheit) above preindustrial levels sometime around “the first half of the 2030s,” as humans continue to burn coal, oil and natural gas. That number holds a special significance in global climate politics: Under the 2015 Paris climate agreement, virtually every nation agreed to “pursue efforts” to hold global warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius. Beyond that point, scientists say, the impacts of catastrophic heat waves, flooding, drought, crop failures and species extinction become significantly harder for humanity to handle. But Earth has already warmed an average of 1.1 degrees Celsius since the industrial age, and, with global fossil-fuel emissions setting records last year, that goal is quickly slipping out of reach. There is still one last chance to shift course, the new report says. But it would require industrialized nations to join together immediately to slash greenhouse gases roughly in half by 2030 and then stop adding carbon dioxide to the atmosphere altogether by the early 2050s. If those two steps were taken, the world would have about a 50 percent chance of limiting warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius. Delays of even a few years would most likely make that goal unattainable, guaranteeing a hotter, more perilous future. “The pace and scale of what has been done so far and current plans are insufficient to tackle climate change,” said Hoesung Lee, the chair of the climate panel. “We are walking when we should be sprinting.” The report comes as the world’s two biggest polluters, China and the United States, continue to approve new fossil fuel projects. Last year, China issued permits for 168 coal-fired power plants of various sizes, according to the Centre for Research on Energy and Clean Air in Finland. Last week, the Biden administration approved an enormous oil drilling project known as Willow that will take place on pristine federal land in Alaska. The report, which was approved by 195 governments, says that existing and currently planned fossil fuel infrastructure — coal-fired power plants, oil wells, factories, cars and trucks across the globe — will already produce enough carbon dioxide to warm the planet roughly 2 degrees Celsius this century. To keep warming below that level, many of those projects would need to be canceled, retired early or otherwise cleaned up. “The 1.5 degree limit is achievable, but it will take a quantum leap in climate action,” António Guterres, the United Nations secretary general, said. In response to the report, Mr. Guterres called on countries to stop building new coal plants and to stop approving new oil and gas projects. Many scientists have pointed out that surpassing the 1.5 degree threshold will not mean humanity is doomed. But every fraction of a degree of additional warming is expected to increase the severity of dangers that people around the world face, such as water scarcity, malnutrition and deadly heat waves. The difference between 1.5 degrees of warming and 2 degrees might mean that tens of millions more people worldwide experience life-threatening heat waves, water shortages and coastal flooding. A 1.5-degree world might still have coral reefs and summer Arctic sea ice, while a 2-degree world most likely would not. “It’s not that if we go past 1.5 degrees everything is lost,” said Joeri Rogelj, director of research at the Grantham Institute for Climate Change and the Environment at Imperial College London. “But there’s clear evidence that 1.5 is better than 1.6, which is better than 1.7, and so on. The point is we need to do everything we can to

keep warming as low as possible.” Scientists say that warming will largely halt once humans stop adding heat-trapping gases to the atmosphere, a concept known as “net zero” emissions. How quickly nations reach net zero will determine how hot the planet ultimately becomes. Under the current policies of national governments, Earth is on pace to heat up by 2.1 to 2.9 degrees Celsius this century, analysts have estimated. Both the United States and European Union have set goals of reaching net zero emissions by 2050, while China has set a 2060 goal and India is aiming for 2070. But in light of the report's findings, Mr. Guterres said, all countries should move faster and wealthy countries should aim to reach net zero by 2040. The new report is a synthesis of six previous landmark reports on climate change issued by the U.N. panel since 2018, each one compiled by hundreds of experts across the globe, approved by 195 countries and based on thousands of scientific studies. Taken together, the reports represent the most comprehensive look to date at the causes of global warming, the impacts that rising temperatures are having on people and ecosystems across the world and the strategies that countries can pursue to halt global warming. The report makes clear that humanity's actions today have the potential to fundamentally reshape the planet for thousands of years. Many of the most dire climate scenarios once feared by scientists, such as those forecasting warming of 4 degrees Celsius or more, now look unlikely, as nations have invested more heavily in clean energy. At least 18 countries, including the United States, have managed to reduce their emissions for more than a decade, the report finds, while the costs of solar panels, wind turbines and lithium-ion batteries for electric vehicles have plummeted. At the same time, even relatively modest increases in global temperature are now expected to be more disruptive than previously thought, the report concludes. At current levels of warming, for instance, food production is starting to come under strain. The world is still producing more food each year, thanks to improvements in farming and crop technology, but climate change has slowed the rate of growth, the report says. It's an ominous trend that puts food security at risk as the world's population soars past eight billion people. Today, the world is seeing record-shattering storms in California and catastrophic drought in places like East Africa. But by the 2030s, as temperatures rise, climate hazards are expected to increase all over the globe as different countries face more crippling heat waves, worsening coastal flooding and crop failures, the report says. At the same time, mosquitoes carrying diseases like malaria and dengue will spread into new areas, it adds. Nations have made some strides in preparing for the dangers of global warming, the report says, for instance by building coastal barriers against rising oceans or establishing early-warning systems for future storms. But many of those adaptation efforts are “incremental” and lack sufficient funding, particularly in poorer countries, the report finds. And if temperatures keep rising, many parts of the world may soon face limits in how much they can adapt. Beyond 1.5 degrees Celsius of warming, low-lying island nations and communities that depend on glaciers may face severe freshwater shortages. To stave off a chaotic future, the report recommends that nations move away from the fossil fuels that have underpinned economies for more than 180 years. Governments and companies would need to invest three to six times the roughly \$600 billion they now spend annually on encouraging clean energy in order to hold global warming at 1.5 or 2 degrees, the report says. While there is currently enough global capital

to do so, much of it is difficult for developing countries to acquire. The question of what wealthy, industrialized nations owe to poor, developing countries has been divisive at global climate negotiations. A wide array of strategies are available for reducing fossil-fuel emissions, such as scaling up wind and solar power, shifting to electric vehicles and electric heat pumps in buildings, curbing methane emissions from oil and gas operations, and protecting forests. But that may not be enough: Countries may also have to remove billions of tons of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere each year, relying on technology that barely exists today. The report acknowledges the enormous challenges ahead. Winding down coal, oil and gas projects would mean job losses and economic dislocation. Some climate solutions come with difficult trade-offs: Protecting forests, for instance, means less land for agriculture; manufacturing electric vehicles requires mining metals for use in their batteries. And because nations have waited so long to cut emissions, they will have to spend hundreds of billions of dollars to adapt to climate risks that are now unavoidable. The new report is expected to inform the next round of United Nations climate talks this December in Dubai, where world leaders will gather to assess their progress in tackling global warming. At last year's climate talks in Sharm el Sheik, language calling for an end to fossil fuels was struck from the final agreement after pressure from several oil-producing nations. "Without a radical shift away from fossil fuels over the next few years, the world is certain to blow past the 1.5 C goal," said Ani Dasgupta, president of the World Resources Institute, an environmental group. "The I.P.C.C. makes plain that continuing to build new unabated fossil fuel power plants would seal that fate," he added, using the abbreviation for the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. The American Petroleum Institute, an industry trade group, responded by saying that oil and gas companies were working on technologies to curb emissions such as carbon capture, but that policymakers "must also consider the importance of adequate, affordable and reliable energy to meet growing global needs," said Christina Noel, a spokesperson for the institute. While the next decade is almost certain to be hotter, scientists said the main takeaway from the report should be that nations still have enormous influence over the climate for the rest of the century. The report "is quite clear that whatever future we end up with is within our control," said Piers Forster, a climate scientist at the University of Leeds who helped write one of the panel's earlier reports. "It is up to humanity," he added, "to determine what we end up with."

35: 2024 first year to pass 1.5C global warming limit

The planet has moved a major step closer to warming more than 1.5C, new data shows, despite world leaders vowing a decade ago they would try to avoid this. The European Copernicus climate service, one of the main global data providers, said on Friday that 2024 was the first calendar year to pass the symbolic threshold, as well as the world's hottest on record. This does not mean the international 1.5C target has been broken, because that refers to a long-term average over decades, but does bring us nearer to doing so as fossil fuel emissions continue to heat the atmosphere. Last week UN chief António Guterres described the recent run of temperature records as 'climate breakdown'. 'We must exit this road to ruin - and we have no time to lose,' he said in his New Year message, calling for countries to slash emissions of planet-warming gases in 2025. Bar chart of global average

annual temperatures between 1940 and 2024. There is a rising trend, and 2024 shows the highest global average temperature of 1.6C, according to the European climate service. The hotter the year, the darker shade of red for the bars. Global average temperatures for 2024 were around 1.6C above those of the pre-industrial period - the time before humans started burning large amounts of fossil fuels - according to Copernicus data. This breaks the record set in 2023 by just over 0.1C, and means the last 10 years are now the 10 warmest years on record. The Met Office, Nasa and other climate groups are due to release their own data later on Friday. All are expected to agree that 2024 was the warmest on record, although precise figures vary slightly. Last year's heat is predominantly due to humanity's emissions of planet-warming gases, such as carbon dioxide, which are still at record highs. Natural weather patterns such as El Niño - where surface waters in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean become unusually warm - played a smaller role. 'By far and away the largest contribution impacting our climate is greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere,' Samantha Burgess, deputy director of Copernicus, tells the BBC. A simple guide to climate change Why does keeping global warming to 1.5C matter? What is El Niño and how does it change the weather? The 1.5C figure has become a powerful symbol in international climate negotiations ever since it was agreed in Paris in 2015, with many of the most vulnerable countries considering it a matter of survival. The risks from climate change, such as intense heatwaves, rising sea-levels and loss of wildlife, would be much higher at 2C of warming than at 1.5C, according to a landmark UN report from 2018. Yet the world has been moving closer and closer to breaching the 1.5C barrier. 'When exactly we will cross the long-term 1.5C threshold is hard to predict, but we're obviously very close now,' says Myles Allen of the Department of Physics at the University of Oxford, and an author of the UN report. Maps for each year since 1970, showing average air temperatures around the world compared with the 1991-2020 reference period. Further down the chart, the maps are covered by increasingly dark shades of red, denoting warmer temperatures. The current trajectory would likely see the world pass 1.5C of long-term warming by the early 2030s. This would be politically significant, but it wouldn't mean game over for climate action. 'It's not like 1.49C is fine, and 1.51C is the apocalypse - every tenth of a degree matters and climate impacts get progressively worse the more warming we have,' explains Zeke Hausfather, a climate scientist at Berkeley Earth, a research group in the US. Even fractions of a degree of global warming can bring more frequent and intense extreme weather, such as heatwaves and heavy rainfall. In 2024, the world saw blistering temperatures in west Africa, prolonged drought in parts of South America, intense rainfall in central Europe and some particularly strong tropical storms hitting north America and south Asia. These events were just some of those made more intense by climate change over the last year, according to the World Weather Attribution group. Even this week, as the new figures are released, Los Angeles has been overwhelmed with destructive wildfires fuelled by high winds and a lack of rain. While there are many contributing factors to this week's events, experts say conditions conducive to fires in California are becoming more likely in a warming world. Graphic showing the distribution of global daily air temperature differences from the 1991-2020 average, for every year between 1940 and 2024. Each individual year resembles a hill, shaded in a darker shade of red and further to the right for warmer years. The trend is clearly towards

warmer days. It wasn't only air temperatures that set new marks in 2024. The world's sea surface also reached a new daily high, while the total amount of moisture in the atmosphere reached record levels. That the world is breaking new records is not a surprise: 2024 was always expected to be hot, because of the effect of the El Niño weather pattern - which ended around April last year - on top of human-caused warming. But the margin of several records in recent years has been less expected, with some scientists fearing it could represent an acceleration of warming. 'I think it's safe to say that both 2023 and 2024 temperatures surprised most climate scientists - we didn't think we'd be seeing a year above 1.5C this early,' says Dr Hausfather. 'Since 2023 we've had around 0.2C of extra warming that we can't fully explain, on top of what we had expected from climate change and El Niño,' agrees Helge Gößling, a climate physicist at the Alfred Wegener Institute in Germany. AFP A person looks down while wearing a sunhat with taps pouring water into containers (out of frame) with a blue sky in the background, in Morocco in June 2024 AFP The extreme temperatures during the Mediterranean heatwave affecting Morocco in July 2024 would have been 'virtually impossible' without human-caused climate change, according to the World Weather Attribution group. Various theories have been suggested to explain this 'extra' warmth, such as an apparent reduction in the low-level cloud cover that tends to cool the planet, and prolonged ocean heat following the end of El Niño. 'The question is whether this acceleration is something persistent linked to human activities that means we will have steeper warming in the future, or whether it is a part of natural variability,' Dr Gößling adds. 'At the moment it's very hard to say.' Despite this uncertainty, scientists stress that humans still have control over the future climate, and sharp reductions in emissions can lessen the consequences of warming. 'Even if 1.5 degrees is out the window, we still can probably limit warming to 1.6C, 1.7C or 1.8C this century,' says Dr Hausfather. 'That's going to be far, far better than if we keep burning coal, oil and gas unabated and end up at 3C or 4C - it still really matters.'

36: Biodiversity loss in all species and every ecosystem linked to humans - report

Humans are driving biodiversity loss among all species across the planet, according to a synthesis ...

37: Global land temperatures have plummeted by one degree Celsius since the middle of this year - the biggest and steepest fall on record.

But the news has been greeted with an eerie silence by the world's alarmist community. You'd almost ...

38: No Significant Warming in One of the Most Climate-Sensitive Parts of the Planet, Ice Core Data Show

There has been no significant warming in one of the most climate-sensitive parts of the planet, analysis of Greenland ice core data shows, casting further doubt on the alarmist climate narrative...

39: Seas Are Rising at Fastest Rate in Last 28 Centuries

Worldwide, the average level of the ocean is rising at a rate of about a foot per century, a consequence of the warming of the planet caused by ...

40: Flooding of Coast, Caused by Global Warming, Has Already Begun

Global warming and rising seas are increasing the amount of tidal flooding on the Atlantic and Gulf Coasts. In many of the worst-hit cities, ...

41: Global Warming Is Driving Polar Bears Toward Extinction, Researchers Say

Polar bears could become nearly extinct by the end of the century as a result of shrinking sea ice in the Arctic if global warming continues unabated, ...

42: Climate change: World in worse situation because of inaction, says UN climate science panel chief

Climate impacts are unfolding faster than expected and scientists have been surprised by the speed of temperature rise, the chief of the United Nations' climate science panel has said.

In an interview with PTI on the sidelines of TERI's World Sustainable Development Summit, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Chair Jim Skea said the world is in a worse situation than three years ago due to inaction on climate change.

"If you look back over the last, say, five years or so, I think scientists have been surprised by the speed at which temperatures have risen globally and by the very obvious nature of climate impacts we have already seen... wildfires in some parts of the world, floods and more extreme events.

"So things do appear to be happening, perhaps more quickly than people expected," he told PTI.

The year 2024 was the hottest year on record and the first with a global average temperature of 1.5 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels. According to the World Meteorological Organisation, the past decade (2015-2024) was the 10 warmest years on record.

Skea said scientists are now focusing on attribution science to determine how much human activity has influenced specific climate events, with growing evidence that many would not have occurred without greenhouse gas emissions.

He said the IPCC's target of a 43 per cent emission reduction by 2030 from 2019 levels is now outdated due to inaction, meaning the actual reduction needed is even higher.

"The 43 per cent figure is now about three years old and because we have not acted in the

interim, it may have changed. If you were to recalculate it using new information but the same methods, the number would likely be different. So, we really are in a worse situation than we were three years ago when that number was produced," Skea said.

The IPCC's Sixth Assessment Report (AR6) – Working Group III, published in 2022, said global greenhouse gas emissions must be reduced by 43 per cent by 2030 (compared to 2019 levels) to limit the average global temperature increase to 1.5 degrees Celsius since the start of the Industrial Revolution.

Asked why governments are not acting with urgency, Skea said scientists have made the urgency of climate action clear, but it is up to policymakers to implement solutions.

"Scientists can sometimes say things in ways that are incomprehensible or difficult to understand. I think our messages have been absolutely clear.

"We have pointed out the available measures, the options (including) renewable energy, changes in land use patterns, all of these things could contribute to constraining the increase in emissions. I think you can even blame scientists for many things, but not for actions not taking place," the IPCC chief said.

The problem, he said, is not scientific messaging but broader social and political factors that influence public and policy decisions.

Asked whether scientists have failed to convince people that climate change is real, Skea said many resist climate policies because they feel imposed on them.

"I don't think we have failed in actually doing the job... Climate action takes place in the context of other social changes, other things that are going on. And one of the messages that we have put across in the reports that probably doesn't get so much attention is that we need to take societies and people with us in climate change action," he asserted.

"Climate change action should not be something that's forced on people from above and some of the reaction we are getting to climate change policies comes because it appears to ordinary people that they are being forced to do things, forced to change," Skea added.

On allegations of bias against the Global South in IPCC reports, he said scientific literature is increasingly shifting towards developing countries.

"(While) we have historically had strong scientific institutions in the North, that picture is changing. Climate-related publications increase by about 10 per cent per year in every IPCC cycle and the amount of literature we assess is roughly doubling. Much of this growth is occurring in developing countries, with Europe and China among the largest sources of new published research on climate change," he said.

Skea added that the United States is declining as a proportion of total publications, even though the absolute number is growing.

43: Top scientists warn France will have to spend more to deal with climate change

A French brains trust has warned that the country is not spending enough money to deal with global rising temperatures just days after the government published its third national plan for adaptation to climate change (NCCP3).

The High Council for the Climate (HCC), a body comprising an array of leading economists, agronomists and scientists, says that there is a gap between the cash allotted to the transition and the real cost of implementing the changes.

"Funding for adaptation in the NCCP3 remains highly inadequate," says the HCC report which was published on Thursday.

"The actions in NCCP3 that require immediate investment must be identified as quickly as possible," it adds. "Part of the public funding earmarked for risk prevention and the ecological transition towards adaptation is provided for in the PNACC3 but much of the funding has yet to be defined, and the funding available at this stage is inadequate."

The HCC report suggests the publication of a detailed multi-year financing plan following a 1.35 billion euro cut to a budget for the transition.

"Funding dedicated to adaptation by the agencies appear in the PNACC3 as budgetary support for a number of actions. The budget breakdown of these actions is not specified. The worsening impacts of climate change will require increased funding for adaptation."

Report

PNACC3 outlined some 50 measures, from increased protection for workers to various studies to better prepare transport systems and farming.

Launching the document, Agnès Pannier-Runacher, the minister for ecological transition, said: "There is the scientific fact that climate change is already affecting the whole of France. Five thousand kilometres of French coastline - i.e. 20 percent of our coastline is already affected by coastal erosion. One and a half million people are at risk of marine submersion.

"There is an economic observation: if France does not adapt to climate disruption, the consequences will be severe. Faced with these facts, my line is clear: prepare, anticipate, act."

HCC chairman Jean-François Soussana told the French news agency AFP that the PNACC3 was an important step towards adaptation but the government could not carry the load.

"The state will not be able to do everything," he said. "You can also ask for efforts to be made by tightening up standards. For example, the introduction of summer comfort standards for buildings and the cost of that would fall mainly on private players."

As well as highlighting the financial cracks in the PNACC3, the body, which was established by President Emmanuel Macron in 2018, recommends more focus on the adaptation.

"Given the multitude of areas sensitive to climate change, interministerial coordination of its implementation is important," adds the HCC report.

The experts warn that more monitoring is needed.

"Despite the efforts made, not all the lessons learned from the first two NCCAPs have been fully applied. PNACC3 does not provide any feedback on the effectiveness of the measures proposed in previous plans (PNACC1, PNACC2) and does not propose any evaluation criteria to assess the progress made in PNACC3."

44: Why the maple syrup industry is under threat from climate change

Sebago, Maine — You know you're in Maine when the pancakes come hot off a 100-year-old wood stove. But drill into Alan Greene's eighth-generation maple syrup operation in the town of Sebago, and you'll find it doesn't run as smoothly as it used to.

"The last 10 years, we are definitely becoming warmer earlier," said Greene, who runs Greene Maple Farms. "We're not getting the cold and the gradual warm-up. We're getting warm-up, warm-up, warm-up, with deep freezes in between."

It's been a cold winter in Maine so far this year. But across the country, over time, climate change has warmed winters by an average of 4 degrees Fahrenheit, according to the nonprofit Climate Central.

The coldest parts of the country are warming the fastest. Portland, Maine, now experiences 22 more warm winter days — classified as temperatures above normal — than it did in 1970, per Climate Central.

This means the sap flows much earlier, and gets boiled earlier, than what Greene's father recorded in his annual syrup log when he ran operations.

"So in 1971, the year I was born...the first time he boiled, was March 21st," Greene explained. "We've finished our season on March 21st some years now...he was just starting."

Maple syrup is America's original sweetener. European settlers learned to collect it from Native Americans. It's a practice that goes back centuries. But now, within a span of decades, it's all changing for the \$1.5 billion industry.

Projections show the prime range of sugar maple habitat shifting northward, where it is cooler. Jason Lilley, a professor of sustainable agriculture at the University of Maine, says the state's maple trees are "absolutely" under stress from climate change.

"I just don't want producers to be going out of business, and to see this industry start to decline," Lilley said. "We can't just sit around and watch this happen."

Instead, Lilley says, some producers are exploring different varieties of trees and actively thinning their forests, which gives trees more space to grow. They are also using plastic tubing and vacuum systems that are always on standby for early flowing sap.

Producers, like Greene, agree using technology to adapt to the ongoing changes might help maple syrup production to continue in the state.

"The technology has come about while climate change has been pushing us, and they're a good blend," Greene said. "They're working together. I think we need to be paying attention and be prepared for it. For those who aren't, I think it's gonna cost them down the road."

45: Will Planting Trees Reduce Global Warming?

"The Earth is an unimaginably intricate system comprised of countless subsystems – many of which are poorly understood and some, probably, still unknown. The science that purports to explain those systems is unsettled and, well..., complicated."

It's complicated. Trees are natural carbon sinks, absorbing carbon dioxide from the atmosphere. But they also emit volatile chemicals that can form methane and ozone, both powerful greenhouse gases. A 2014 study suggests that deforestation between 1850 and 2000 may have reduced volatile chemical emissions enough to "slightly offset the warming from greenhouse gas emissions."

But it's more complicated than that. Trees' chemical emissions can also form aerosols that impact the climate in different ways. For instance, they can create a haze that reflects sunlight back into space. Aerosol particles may also "act as seeds for cloud droplets," which similarly reflect sunlight away from the Earth.

But wait, it gets even more complicated. Research suggests that arboreal aerosol emissions may decline as atmospheric CO₂ concentrations increase.

Complicating the picture still further, land covered with trees tends to be darker than land covered with grass, sand, or snow. Dark surfaces trap more of the sun's heat, warming the local climate. Does the CO₂ that trees absorb offset the heat they absorb? It depends.

According to a 2007 study, planting trees in the tropics – where they grow quickly and trap a lot of CO₂ – has a net cooling effect. However, planting them in temperate areas between latitudes 50° and 60° (roughly between the U.S.-Canadian border and Fairbanks, Alaska)

has either no impact, or, according to a 2022 study, a net warming effect.

The United Kingdom, all of which lies between 50o and 60o latitude, is planning to spend some £750 million (\$975 million) to reforest the country by 2025. Net Zero Watch, the Global Warming Policy Forum's website, reports that the 2022 study "suggests that the Government's plans are not only wasteful – and often detrimental to the environment and food security – but may actually increase global temperature, the opposite of the intended effect of the Net Zero project." [1]

If global warming truly is an existential crisis, our solutions should, at the very least, not make it worse. Moreover, costly solutions that have little, no, or negative impacts will quickly sour the public on further ventures. An expensive misstep may be the last step a government can take in the face of angry voters.

Suppose, however, that after due research and consideration, we determine that planting trees in a certain location is beneficial. What types of trees should we plant? According to one British tree specialist,

Broadleaved species – such as oak, beech and maple – are best because they have a larger surface area of leaves which generates more photosynthesis, whereas conifers absorb more heat.

Planting a diverse mix of species will maximise the benefits of trees, as well as helping with conservation efforts such as insect and wildlife initiatives, and ensuring the landscape is better prepared for pests or diseases which could wipe out an entire species of tree in one area.

But trees absorb large amounts of groundwater, which could place an unsustainable burden on a region's water supply. Species that can survive on little water may be the best choice.

On the other hand, elevated levels of CO₂ in the atmosphere improve plant water-use efficiency, which will reduce, if not eliminate, the impact on groundwater. In addition, once established, trees can affect the water cycle and increase area rainfall. On yet another hand, while "overall, the impact of trees on rainfall is expected to be positive... it can have complex ramifications."

As Nadine Unger a professor of atmospheric chemistry and climate modeling at the UK's University of Exeter admitted:

The mutual relationships between forests and climate are actually really rather more complex and not fully understood.

The Earth is an unimaginably intricate system comprised of countless subsystems – many of which are poorly understood and some, probably, still unknown. The science that purports to explain those systems is unsettled and, well..., complicated.

46: Climate Scientists Now Claiming Global Warming Causes Freezing Winters and Cold Blasts

Global warming making winters colder? That's the outlandish claim the Associated Press and its climate propagandist Seth Borenstein want you to accept. "Frigid air that normally stays trapped in the Arctic has escaped, plunging deep into the United States for an extended visit that is expected to provoke teeth-chattering but not be record-shattering,"

wrote Borenstein, whose AP story archive is littered with the typical left-wing climate candy you've come to expect from liberal journalists. "It's a cold air outbreak that some experts say is happening more frequently, and paradoxically, because of a warming world," Seth continues. The claim that colder winters and frequent cold weather blasts are a result of global warming is not just counterintuitive—it's downright absurd and unscientific. That hasn't stopped Borenstein writing the same story, blaming global warming every time the US experiences a colder than average winter. The climate cabal are desperate to make this Orwellian narrative stick, so let's cut through the alarmist spin and take a closer look at why this narrative falls apart under even the slightest scrutiny.

1. Polar Vortex Events Are Not Linked to Emissions or Warming
The concept of the polar vortex—a large area of low pressure and cold air surrounding the poles—has been well-documented for decades. While disruptions to the polar vortex can cause extreme cold weather in certain regions, these events are not a byproduct of human emissions or global warming. As JunkScience points out, there is no clear scientific evidence connecting these phenomena to rising global temperatures. The attempt to link them is simply scaremongering by the mainstream media on behalf of their paymasters.
2. The Historical Flip-Flop: Cooling in the 1970s, Warming Today
In 1978, the New York Times reported that the polar vortex would cause extreme global cooling. In the late 70s, the mainstream media were conditioning their audience to fear an incoming ice age. This stands in stark contrast to today's narrative, where the same phenomenon is used as evidence for global warming. Such flip flops reveal how climate discourse has shifted over time to fit narratives and agendas, rather than adhering to rigorous scientific standards.
3. Financial Ties Between Globalist Foundations and the AP
The AP's climate reporting is heavily funded by left-wing and globalist foundations that pour millions into promoting alarmist narratives. These financial incentives call into question the objectivity of the AP's climate coverage. When journalism is underwritten by organizations with a clear ideological agenda, it becomes difficult to separate fact from lucrative narrative.

Convenient Alarmism or Science? The claim that global warming causes more frequent cold weather defies common sense and scientific consistency. It reflects a broader trend where any extreme weather event—hot or cold—is attributed to climate change, creating a narrative that is unfalsifiable and, therefore, unscientific. True science demands rigorous evidence and an openness to debate, not convenient explanations that shift with the political winds. Skepticism is a cornerstone of scientific inquiry, and it's essential when addressing complex topics like climate change. The AP's reporting on this issue serves as a reminder that we must critically evaluate the narratives presented to us, especially when they appear to be driven by ideological or financial motivations rather than hard evidence.

47: Massive Cover-up Launched by U.K. Met Office to Hide its 103 Non-Existent Temperature Measuring Stations

Last month, the Daily Sceptic highlighted the practice at the U.K. Met Office of inventing temperature averages from over 100 non-existent measuring stations. Helpfully, the Met Office went so far as to supply coordinates, elevations and purposes of the imaginary sites. Following massive interest across social media and frequent reposting of the Daily Sceptic article, the Met Office has amended its ludicrous claims. The move has not been announced

in public, needless to say, since drawing attention to this would open a Pandora's box and run the risk of subjecting all the Met Office temperature claims to wider scrutiny. Instead, the Met Office has discreetly renamed its "U.K. climate averages" page as "Location-specific long-term averages". Significant modifications have been made to the new page, designed no doubt to quash suspicions that the Met Office has been making the figures up as it went along. The original suggestion that selecting a climate station can provide a 30-year average from 1991-2020 has been replaced with the explanation that the page "is designed to display locations that provide even geographical coverage of the U.K., but it is not reflective of every weather station that has existed or the current Met Office observation network". Under the new page the locations are still referred to as "climate stations" but the details of where they are, exactly, have been omitted. The cynical might note that the Met Office has solved its problem of inventing data from non-existing stations by suggesting that they now arise from "locations" which may or may not bear any relation to stations that once existed, or indeed exist today. If this is a reasonable interpretation of the matter, it might suggest that the affair is far from closed. Again we are obliged to the diligent citizen journalist Ray Sanders for drawing our attention to the unannounced Met Office changes and providing a link to the previous averages page on the Wayback Machine. The sleuthing Sanders has been on the case for some time, having discovered that three named stations near where he lives, namely Dungeness, Folkestone and Dover, did not exist. The claimed co-ordinates for Dover placed the station in the water on the local beach as shown by the Google Earth photo below. As a result, Sanders discovered from a freedom of information request that 103 of the 302 sites marked on the climate averages listing – over a third of the total – no longer existed. Subsequently, Sanders sought further information about the methodology used to supply data for both Folkestone and Dover. In reply, the Met Office said it was unable to supply details of the observing sites requested "as this is not recorded information". It did however disclose that for non-existent stations "we use regression analysis to create a model of the relationship between each station and others in the network". This generates an estimate for each month when the station is not operating. Each "estimate" is said to be based on data from six other stations, chosen because they are "well correlated" with the target station. In the case of Dover, the nearest 'station' is seven miles away at non-existent Folkestone followed by Manston which is 15 miles distant. By "well correlated" perhaps the Met Office means they are in the same county of Kent. No matter, computer models are on hand to guide the way. Ray Sanders had sent details of his findings to the new Labour science minister Peter Kyle MP and the recent Met Office changes may have been promoted by a discreet political push. At the time, Sanders asked: "How would any reasonable observer know that the data was not real and was simply 'made up' by a Government agency?" He called for an open declaration of likely inaccuracies of existing published data "to avoid other institutions and researchers using unreliable data and reaching erroneous conclusions". The Met Office also runs an historical data section where a number of sites with long records of temperature are identified. Lowestoft closed in 2010 and since then the figures have been estimated. The stations at Nairn Druim, Paisley and Newton Rigg have also closed but are still reporting estimated monthly data. "Why would any scientific organisation feel the need to publish what can only be described as fiction?" asks Sanders.

The original Braemar station in Aberdeenshire has recorded temperature data since Victorian times. Due to its interesting topography surrounded by high mountains, it recorded the U.K.'s coldest temperature of -27.2°C in both 1895 and 1982. In summer, the temperature can soar as the heat stays trapped. A new site, some distance from the original, was set up in 2005 and in common with Met Office procedure was labelled Braemar 2 to reflect both distance and climatological differences. In the historical data section of the Met's website, Braemar 2 is shown supplying data back to 1959. "For reasons I find difficult to understand, the Met Office has chosen to highlight a spurious merging of two notably different data sets for an illogically defined period that fails to represent either site," observes Sanders. The recent changes made by the Met Office to its climate average pages shows that the state-funded operation is fully aware of the growing interest in its entire temperature recording business. This interest has grown because the Met Office is fully committed to using its data to promote the Net Zero political fantasy. But it is silent on the biggest concern that has been raised of late, namely the promotion of temperatures, accurate to one hundredth of a degree centigrade, obtained from a nationwide network where nearly eight out of 10 stations are so poorly sited they have internationally-recognised 'uncertainties' as high as 5°C. Chris Morrison is the Daily Sceptic's Environment Editor.

48: 1,200 Scientists and Professionals Declare: "There is No Climate Emergency"

The political fiction that humans cause most or all climate change and the claim that the science behind this notion is 'settled', has been dealt a savage blow by the publication of a 'World Climate Declaration (WCD)' signed by over 1,100 scientists and professionals. There is no climate emergency, say the authors, who are drawn from across the world and led by the Norwegian physics Nobel Prize laureate Professor Ivar Giaever. Climate science is said to have degenerated into a discussion based on beliefs, not on sound self-critical science. The scale of the opposition to modern day 'settled' climate science is remarkable, given how difficult it is in academia to raise grants for any climate research that departs from the political orthodoxy. (A full list of the signatories is available [here](#).) Another lead author of the declaration, Professor Richard Lindzen, has called the current climate narrative "absurd", but acknowledged that trillions of dollars and the relentless propaganda from grant-dependent academics and agenda-driven journalists currently says it is not absurd. Particular ire in the WCD is reserved for climate models. To believe in the outcome of a climate model is to believe what the model makers have put in. Climate models are now central to today's climate discussion and the scientists see this as a problem. "We should free ourselves from the naïve belief in immature climate models," says the WCD. "In future, climate research must give significantly more emphasis to empirical science." Since emerging from the 'Little Ice Age' in around 1850, the world has warmed significantly less than predicted by the IPCC on the basis of modelled human influences. "The gap between the real world and the modelled world tells us that we are far from understanding climate change," the WCD notes. The Declaration is an event of enormous importance, although it will be ignored by the mainstream media. But it is not the first time distinguished scientists have petitioned for more realism in climate science. In Italy, the discoverer of nuclear anti-

matter Emeritus Professor Antonino Zichichi recently led 48 local science professors in stating that human responsibility for climate change is “unjustifiably exaggerated and catastrophic predictions are not realistic”. In their scientific view, “natural variation explains a substantial part of global warming observed since 1850”. Professor Zichichi has signed the WCD. The Declaration notes that the Earth’s climate has varied for as long as the planet has existed, with natural cold and warm periods. “It is no surprise that we are experiencing a period of warming,” it continues. Climate models have many shortcomings, it says, “and are not remotely plausible as global policy tools”. They blow up the effect of greenhouse gases, such as carbon dioxide, but ignore any beneficial effects. “CO2 is not a pollutant,” it says. “It is essential to all life on Earth. Photosynthesis is a blessing. More CO2 is beneficial for nature, greening the Earth; additional CO2 in the air has promoted growth in global plant biomass. It is also good for agriculture, increasing the yield of crops worldwide.” In addition, the scientists declare that there is no statistical evidence that global warming is intensifying hurricanes, floods, droughts and such-like natural disasters, or making them more frequent. “There is no climate emergency,” the Declaration goes on. “We strongly oppose the harmful and unrealistic net-zero CO2 policy proposed for 2050,” it says, adding that the aim of global policy should be “prosperity for all” by providing reliable and affordable energy at all times. “In a prosperous society, men and women are well educated, birth rates are low and people care about their environment,” it concludes. The WCD is the latest sign that the ‘settled’ fantasy surrounding climate change science is rapidly breaking down. Last year, Steven Koonin, an Under-Secretary of Science in the Obama Administration, published a book titled *Unsettled* in which he noted that, “The science is insufficient to make useful projections about how the climate will change over the coming decades, much less what our actions will be.” He also noted that rigidly promulgating the idea that climate change is settled demeans and chills the scientific enterprise, “retarding its progress in these important matters”. In 2020, the long-time green activist Michael Shellenberger wrote a book called *Apocalypse Never* in which he said he believed the conversation about climate change and the environment had in the last few years “spiralled out of control”. Much of what people are told about the environment, including the climate, is wrong, he wrote. Of course, green extremists in academia, politics and journalism will continue to argue for the command-and-control they crave through a Net Zero policy. In the end, their warped view of the scientific process will fade, leaving a trail of ludicrous Armageddon forecasts, and yet more failed experiments in hard-left economic and societal control. Chris Morrison is the Daily Sceptic’s Environment Editor.

Postscript: When we posted this article on the Daily Sceptic Facebook page, it was labelled “False Information”, a conclusion reached after it was “checked by independent fact-checkers”. If you then click on “See Why”, you’re taken to this page on a website called Climate Feedback. It takes issue with this sentence in the Petition on Anthropogenic Global Warming started by Professor Antonino Zichichi: “Natural variation explains a substantial part of global warming observed since 1850.” This is “incorrect” for the following reason: “Natural (non-human) drivers of climate change have been mostly stable since the onset of modern warming and all the available scientific evidence implicates human greenhouse gas emissions as the primary culprit. Scientific evidence also indicates that climate change is

contributing to intensified or more frequent natural disasters such as heatwaves, drought and heavy rainfall.” To claim “all the available scientific evidence” supports the view that human activity is the “primary culprit” when it comes to climate change is a bit misleading, surely? In fact, Professor Zichichi refers to at least some scientific evidence that the anthropogenic responsibility for the climate change observed during the last century has been exaggerated on page 1 of his petition. Indeed, Climate Feedback’s labelling of the central claims made in the World Climate Declaration as “incorrect” is a step up from its previous analysis of the Declaration, which concluded that the scientific credibility of the Declaration was “very low”. Chris Morrison responded to some of the criticisms to the above piece here and specifically to the Climate Feedback fact check here.

49: Alarmists Predict 246,082 Deaths in Barcelona from Climate Change

ROME — Climate change will result in an estimated 2.3 million additional temperature-related deaths in Europe by 2099, according to researchers led by a London-based climate-modeling group. The 16-person team hailing from diverse backgrounds has suggested that recent data showing a significant decrease in overall weather-related deaths thanks to a warming planet will be reversed in the coming 75 years. Among the cities destined to experience the highest climate-change-fueled mortality, Barcelona is projected to suffer 246,082 heat-related deaths by the end of the century, the authors propose. Two Italian cities, namely Rome and Naples, are projected to experience 147,738 and 147,248 climate-related deaths respectively over the same time period. “This study provides compelling evidence that the steep rise in heat-related deaths will far exceed any drop related to cold, resulting in a net increase in mortality across Europe,” stated Antonio Gasparrini, lead author of the article and head of the Environment & Health Modelling (EHM) Lab at the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine (LSHTM). “These results debunk proposed theories of ‘beneficial’ effects of climate change, often proposed in opposition to vital mitigation policies that should be implemented as soon as possible,” he asserted. What Gasparrini calls “compelling evidence,” however, are actually a series of forecasts and predictions made from notoriously fallible climate-modeling algorithms. As good scientists are aware, it is impossible to collect “evidence” on future events. The team’s projections purport to challenge recent studies showing that over the last decades, people are almost 10 times more likely to die from cold weather than from heat, meaning that fewer people die from the weather as the world warms. In point of fact, over 165,000 people die every single day around the world from numerous causes, including cancer, heart disease, respiratory diseases, suicide, and accidents. Of these 165,000 people, however, not one has yet died from climate change. Of those who die from weather-related causes each year, however, many more people die from cold weather than from heat, and many more die during the winter than during the summer. According to data published by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), over the past twenty years annual heat-related deaths in the United States have ranged between 0.9 and 3.6 per million people, whereas cold-related deaths have ranged between 3.6 and 5.9 per million people. The prevalence of cold- over heat-based deaths becomes even more apparent when looking at the global scenario, where deaths from cold dwarf heat-related deaths by nearly ten to one. The UK-based Lancet

medical journal published a study in 2021, which found that 5,083,173 deaths worldwide were associated with “non-optimal temperatures per year,” and then went on to explain that the vast majority of these were “cold-related” rather than “heat-related.” According to the Lancet, people around the world are 9.4 times more likely to die from the cold than from the heat. While 155,000 people die each year from extremely high temperatures, 4.5 million people die from the cold, the Lancet reported. It added that over the past 20 years, the death rate from heat has slightly increased due to global warming (+0.21 percent), but that the death rate from the cold decreased by more than twice as much (-0.51 percent) during the same period. As global temperatures have risen, heat deaths have increased but deaths from cold have simultaneously decreased by more than twice as much, producing a significant net drop in weather-related deaths, a welcome trend that seems bound to continue.

50: Climate Doomers Shift Tactics to Local Level After Trump’s Victory

Climate doomers appear to understand their alarmist message did not resonate on the national level during the 2024 election. “Climate change” ranked dead last among the most important issues of the 2024 cycle, according to Pew Research. Climate doomers are searching for a new way to impress their anti-capitalistic ideas on the American economy, the New York Times reported Tuesday. Their newest strategy is to focus on pressuring local organizations, state agencies, and state commissions to change rules and laws, thereby effecting change on the local level where conservationists may be unsuspecting. “This time around the resistance will be local,” climate activist Jamie Henn told the Times. “We can’t survive heading into 2030 without bold leadership on climate back in D.C.” The Times’s Austyn Gaffney reported the change in tactics: But the climate movement also plans to spend the next four years hunkering down at the local level. McKibben’s newest organization, Third Act, a nonprofit group for climate activists older than 60 that he started about three years ago, is highlighting the push for change at the community and state level. Over the past 18 months, they’ve begun a new strategy: attending the meetings of obscure state agencies or commissions that hold a lot of power over the energy transition. ... The effort will focus on community and regional-scale clean energy projects, and laying the groundwork for a big push to bring climate issues into the 2028 presidential campaign. ... While some parts of the movement are refining their economic arguments, other climate leaders hope to center their message on people that have been disproportionately affected by environmental harms or climate disasters. As I reported today, the youth climate movement has largely reframed itself as the youth climate justice movement.

51: Glacier meltdown risks food and water supply of 2 billion people, says UN

Unesco report highlights ‘unprecedented’ glacier loss driven by climate crisis, threatening ecosystems, agriculture and water sources. Retreating glaciers threaten the food and water supply of 2 billion people around the world, the UN has warned, as current “unprecedented” rates of melting will have unpredictable consequences. Two-thirds of all irrigated agriculture in the world is likely to be affected in some way by receding glaciers and dwindling snowfall in mountain regions, driven by the climate crisis, according to a Unesco report. More than 1 billion people live in mountainous regions and, of those in developing countries, up to half are already experiencing food insecurity. That is likely to worsen, as

food production in such regions is dependent on mountain waters, melting snow and glaciers, according to the World Water Development Report 2025. Developed countries are also at risk: in the US, for example, the Colorado River basin has been in drought since 2000, and higher temperatures mean more of the precipitation is falling as rain, which runs off more quickly than mountain snow, exacerbating drought conditions. Audrey Azoulay, the director general of Unesco, said: “Regardless of where we live, we all depend in some way on mountains and glaciers. But these natural water towers are facing imminent peril. This report demonstrates the urgent need for action.” The rate of change of glaciers is the worst on record, according to separate research from the World Meteorological Organisation, which published its annual State of the Climate report this week. The largest three-year loss of glacier mass on record occurred in the past three years, the study found, with Norway, Sweden, Svalbard and the tropical Andes among the worst-affected areas. Eastern Africa has lost 80% of its glaciers in places and, in the Andes, between a third and a half of glaciers have melted since 1998. Glaciers in the Alps and the Pyrenees, the worst affected in Europe, have shrunk by about 40% over roughly the same period. The decline of glaciers has had a further impact, added Abou Amani, director of water sciences at Unesco, in that the loss of ice replaces a reflective surface with dark soil that absorbs heat. “Glaciers melting have an impact on the reflectivity of [solar] radiation and that will impact the whole climate system,” he warned. More avalanches will also result, as rain falling on snow is a major factor behind avalanche formation. Pooling water from melting glaciers can also be released, causing sudden floods in valleys or to people living further down the slopes. Permafrost is also melting, releasing methane from the mountain soils that melting glaciers are uncovering. A previous study, published last month in the peer-reviewed journal Nature, found that half of global glacier mass would be lost by the end of the century, if global heating was not halted. Alex Brisbourne, a glacier geophysicist at the British Antarctic Survey, said: “Mountain glaciers contain some of the largest freshwater reservoirs on Earth. Meltwater released in the summer provides the water supply to a billion people and sustains an enormous amount of industry and agriculture. The impact [of such melting] will be felt way beyond those immediately downstream of the glaciers.” These impacts are coming at a time when many food sources are already under strain. Alvaro Lario, president of the International Fund for Agricultural Development (Ifad) and chair of UN-Water, called for more support for people who live in afflicted mountain regions. “Water flows downhill, but food insecurity rises uphill. Mountains provide 60% of our freshwater, but the communities that safeguard these vital resources are among the most food insecure,” he said. “We must invest in their resilience to protect glaciers, rivers, and a shared future for all of us.”

52: This year 'virtually certain' to be hottest on record, finds EU space programme

Copernicus Climate Change Service says 2024 marks ‘a new milestone’ and should raise ambitions at Cop29 summit.

It is “virtually certain” that 2024 will be the hottest year on record, the European Union’s

space programme has found.

The prognosis comes the week before diplomats meet at the Cop29 climate summit and a day after a majority of voters in the US, the biggest historical polluter of planet-heating gas, chose to make Donald Trump president.

Trump has described climate change as a “hoax” and promised to roll back policies to clean up the economy.

The report found 2024 is likely to be the first year more than 1.5C (2.7F) hotter than before the Industrial Revolution, a level of warming that has alarmed scientists.

“This marks a new milestone in global temperature records and should serve as a catalyst to raise ambition for the upcoming climate change conference,” said Dr Samantha Burgess, deputy director of the Copernicus Climate Change Service.

The scientists found global temperatures for the past 12 months were 1.62C greater than the 1850-1900 average, when humanity started to burn vast volumes of coal, oil and gas.

In their monthly climate bulletin, they said October 2024 was the second-warmest October on record, behind only October 2023, with temperatures 1.65C greater than preindustrial levels. It was the 15th month in the past 16 to be higher than the 1.5C mark.

World leaders promised to stop the planet from heating 1.5C by the end of the century but are on track to heat it by roughly double that.

Scientists say a single year above the threshold does not mean they have missed the target, as temperature rise is measured over decades rather than years, but warn that it will force more people and ecosystems to the brink of survival.

“Our civilisation never had to cope with a climate as warm as the current one,” said Carlo Buontempo, the director of Copernicus. “This inevitably pushes our ability to respond to extreme events – and adapt to a warmer world – to the absolute limit.”

The Copernicus findings are based on billions of weather measurements from satellites, ships, aircraft and weather stations. The temperature analyses in the ERA5 dataset on which the bulletin relies differ slightly from other prominent datasets used by climate scientists in the US and Japan.

The scientists also found that Arctic sea ice had reached its fourth-lowest monthly level for October, at 19% below average, while Antarctic sea ice extent hit its second-lowest for October, at 8% below average.

They pointed to heavier-than-normal rains that hit large parts of Europe, including Spain, where flash floods killed more than 200 people as they ripped through villages and swamped homes with mud.

Last week, the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) found the concentration of planet-heating pollutants clogging the atmosphere had hit record levels in 2023. It found carbon dioxide was accumulating faster than at any time in human history, with concentrations having risen by more than 10% in just two decades, heating the planet and making extreme weather more violent.

“The most effective solution to address the climate challenges is a global commitment on emissions,” said Buontempo.

53: Today's 'Climate Crisis' Is a Fairy Tale

For the past 35 years, the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has warned us that emissions from the burning of fossil fuels, predominantly carbon dioxide (CO₂), are causing dangerous global warming. This myth is blindly accepted — even by many of my science colleagues who know virtually nothing about climate. As a scientist, my purpose here is to help expose this fairy tale.

The global warming story is not a benign fantasy. It is seriously damaging Western economies. In January 2021, the White House ridiculously declared that “climate change is the most serious existential threat to humanity.” From there, America went from energy independence back to energy dependence. Another consequence has been the appearance of numerous companies whose goal is to “sequester CO₂” as well as “sequester carbon” from our atmosphere. However, this so-called “solution” is scientifically impossible. Life on Earth is based on carbon! CO₂ is plant food, not a pollutant!

Generations have been brainwashed for decades into believing this imaginary “climate crisis,” from kindergarten through college, and in mainstream media and social media. Indoctrinated young teachers feel comfortable teaching this misinformation to students. Dishonest climate scientists feel justified in spreading disinformation because they need governmental support for salaries and research.

The evidence contradicting the climate apocalypse is vast. Some comes from analysis of Greenland and Antarctica ice, in which air trapped at various depths reveals CO₂ levels of past climate. Proxy records from marine sediment, dust (from erosion, wind-blown deposition of sediments), and ice cores provide a record of past sea levels, ice volume, seawater temperature, and global atmospheric temperatures.

From his seminal work while a prisoner of war during WWI, Serbian mathematician Milutin Milankovitch explained how climate is influenced by variations in the Earth's asymmetric orbit, axial tilt, and rotational wobble — each going through cycles lasting as long as

120,000 years.

It is widely recognized that Glacial Periods of about 95,000 years, interspersed with Interglacial Periods of approximately 25,000 years, correspond with Milankovitch Cycles. Multiple incursions of glaciers occurred during the Pleistocene, an epoch lasting from about 2.6 million to 11,700 years ago, when Earth's last Glacial Period ended. Around 24,000 years ago, present-day Lake Erie was covered with ice a mile thick.

Within each Interglacial Period, there've been warming periods, or "Mini-Summers." For example, within the current Holocene Interglacial, there have been warmer periods known as the Minoan (1500–1200 B.C.), Roman (250 B.C.–A.D. 400), and Medieval (A.D. 900–1300). Our Modern Warming Period began with the waning of the Little Ice Age (1300–1850). Today's Mini-Summer is colder so far than all previous Mini-Summers of the last 8,500 years.

How did CO₂ get blamed for global warming? French physicist Joseph Fourier (1820s) proposed that energy from sunlight must be balanced by energy radiated back into space. Irish physicist John Tyndall (1850s) performed laboratory experiments on "greenhouse gases" (GHGs), including water vapor; he proposed that CO₂ elicited an important effect on temperature. However, it's impossible to do appropriate experiments — unless the roof of your laboratory is at least six miles high. Swedish chemist Svante Arrhenius (1896) proposed that "warming is proportional to the logarithm of CO₂ concentration." Columbia University geochemist Wallace Broecker (1975) and Columbia University adjunct professor James Hansen (1981) wrote oft-cited articles in *Science* magazine, both overstating the perils of CO₂ causing dangerous global warming — without providing scientific proof.

Most of Earth's energy comes from the sun. Absorption of sunlight causes molecules of objects or surfaces to vibrate faster, increasing their temperature. This energy is then re-radiated by land and oceans as longwave, infrared radiation (heat). Princeton University physicist Will Happer defines a GHG as that which absorbs negligible incoming sunlight but captures a substantial fraction of thermal radiation as it is re-radiated from Earth's surface and atmospheric GHGs back into space.

The gases of nitrogen, oxygen and argon — constituting 78%, 21%, and 0.93%, respectively, of the atmosphere — show negligible absorption of thermal radiation and therefore are not GHGs. Important GHGs include water (as high as 7% in humid tropics and as little as 1% in frigid climates), CO₂ (0.042%, or 420 parts per million [ppm] by volume), methane (0.00017%), and nitrous oxide (0.0000334%, or 334 ppm). Water vapor (clouds) has at least a hundred times greater warming effect on Earth's temperature than all other GHGs combined.

As atmospheric CO₂ increases, its GHG effect decreases: CO₂'s warming effect is 1.5°C between zero and 20 ppm, 0.3°C between 20 and 40 ppm, and 0.15°C between 40 and 60

ppm. Every doubling of atmospheric CO₂ from today's levels decreases radiation back into space by a mere 1%. For most of the past 800,000 years, Earth's atmospheric CO₂ has ranged between about 180 ppm and 320 ppm; below 150 ppm, Earth's plants could not exist, and all life would be extinguished.

Today's global atmospheric CO₂ levels are ~420 ppm. Even at these levels, plants are "partially CO₂-starved." In fact, standard procedures for commercial greenhouse growers include elevating CO₂ to 800--1200 ppm; this enhances growth and crop yield ~20--50%. As shown by satellite since 1978, increased atmospheric CO₂ has helped "green" the Earth by more than 15 percent, substantially enhancing crop production.

If global atmospheric CO₂ was ~280 ppm in 1750, and it's ~420 ppm today, what's the source of this 140-ppm increase? Scientists estimate that human-associated industrial emissions might have contributed 135 ppm — with "natural causes" accounting for the remaining 5 ppm.

In Earth's history, the highest levels of atmospheric CO₂ (6,000--9,000 ppm) occurred about 550--450 million years ago, which caused plant life to flourish. CO₂ levels in older nuclear submarines routinely operated at 7,000 ppm, whereas newer subs keep CO₂ in the 2,000- to 5,000-ppm range. Meanwhile, ice core data over the last 800,000 years show no correlation between global warming or cooling cycles and atmospheric CO₂ levels.

CO₂ in our lungs reaches 40,000--50,000 ppm, which induces us to take our next breath. Each human exhales about 2.3 pounds of CO₂ per day, which means Earth's 8 billion people produce daily 18.4 billion pounds of CO₂. But humans represent only 1/40 of all CO₂-excreting life on Earth. Multiplying 18.4 billion pounds by 40 gives us 736 billion pounds of CO₂ per day. This approximates the overall CO₂ excreted by the total animal and fungal biomass on the planet.

Daily emissions from worldwide industry in 2020 were estimated to be 16 million metric tons of CO₂ equivalents. If one metric ton is 2,200 pounds, then "total industrial emissions" amount to 35,200,000,000 (35.2 billion) pounds of CO₂ per day. This means that the entire animal and fungal biomass (736 billion pounds) puts out more than 20 times as much CO₂ as all industrial emissions (35.2 billion pounds)!

Can any clear-thinking person comprehend the facts above and still create a company with idiotic plans to "sequester CO₂" or "sequester carbon"? Scientifically, "net zero" and "carbon footprint" are meaningless terms. There is no "climate crisis."

If you try to find these facts on the web, good luck! Out of every 10 hits on any climate topic, you'll be lucky to find one or two sites with truthful scientific data.

The door of a nearby classroom displays a poster of Abraham Lincoln with the caption:

“Don’t believe everything you read on the internet.” It is advice that our 16th president surely would have offered — had he lived to see the rise of this global warming quasi-religion.

54: Climate change added 41 days of dangerous heat around world in 2024

People around the world suffered an average of 41 extra days of dangerous heat this year because of human-caused climate change, according to a group of scientists who also said that climate change worsened much of the world’s damaging weather throughout 2024. The analysis from World Weather Attribution and Climate Central researchers comes at the end of a year that shattered climate record after climate record as heat across the globe made 2024 likely to be its hottest ever measured and a slew of other fatal weather events spared few. “The finding is devastating but utterly unsurprising: Climate change did play a role, and often a major role in most of the events we studied, making heat, droughts, tropical cyclones and heavy rainfall more likely and more intense across the world, destroying lives and livelihoods of millions and often uncounted numbers of people,” Friederike Otto, the lead of World Weather Attribution and an Imperial College climate scientist, said during a media briefing on the scientists’ findings. “As long as the world keeps burning fossil fuels, this will only get worse.” Millions of people endured stifling heat this year. Northern California and Death Valley baked. Sizzling daytime temperatures scorched Mexico and Central America. Heat endangered already vulnerable children in West Africa. Skyrocketing southern European temperatures forced Greece to close the Acropolis. In South and Southeast Asian countries, heat forced school closures. Earth experienced some of the hottest days ever measured and its hottest-yet summer, with a 13-month heat streak that just barely broke. To do its heat analysis, the team of volunteer international scientists compared daily temperatures around the globe in 2024 to the temperatures that would have been expected in a world without climate change. The results are not yet peer-reviewed, but researchers use peer-reviewed methods. Some areas saw 150 days or more of extreme heat due to climate change. “The poorest, least developed countries on the planet are the places that are experiencing even higher numbers,” said Kristina Dahl, vice president of climate science at Climate Central. What’s worse, heat-related deaths are often underreported. “People don’t have to die in heat waves. But if we can’t communicate convincingly, ‘but actually a lot of people are dying,’ it’s much harder to raise this awareness,” Otto said. “Heat waves are by far the deadliest extreme event, and they are the extreme events where climate change is a real game changer.” This year was a warning that the planet is getting dangerously close to the Paris Agreement’s 1.5 degrees Celsius (2.7 degrees Fahrenheit) warming limit compared to the pre-industrial average, according to the scientists. Earth is expected to soon edge past that threshold, although it’s not considered to have been breached until that warming is sustained over decades. The researchers closely examined 29 extreme weather events this year that killed at least 3,700 people and displaced millions, and found that 26 of them had clear links to climate change. The El Niño weather pattern, which naturally warms the Pacific Ocean and changes weather around the world, made some of this weather more likely earlier in the year. But the researchers said most of their studies found that climate change played a bigger role than that phenomenon in fueling 2024’s events. Warm ocean

waters and warmer air fueled more destructive storms, according to the researchers, while temperatures led to many record-breaking downpours. Jennifer Francis, a climate scientist at the Woodwell Climate Research Center in Cape Cod who wasn't involved in the research, said the science and findings were sound. "Extreme weather will continue to become more frequent, intense, destructive, costly, and deadly, until we can lower the concentration of heat-trapping gases in the atmosphere," she said. Significantly more climate extremes could be expected without action, the United Nations Environment Programme said in the fall, as more planet-warming carbon dioxide has been sent into the air this year by burning fossil fuels than last year. But the deaths and damages from extreme weather events aren't inevitable, said Julie Arrighi, director of programmes at the Red Cross Red Crescent Climate Centre and part of the research. "Countries can reduce those impacts by preparing for climate change and adapting for climate change, and while the challenges faced by individual countries or systems or places vary around the world, we do see that every country has a role to play," she said.

55: Climate change goosed hurricane wind strength by 18 mph since 2019, study says

Human-caused climate change made Atlantic hurricanes about 18 miles per hour (29 kilometers per hour) stronger in the last six years, a new scientific study found Wednesday. For most of the storms — 40 of them — the extra oomph from warmer oceans made the storms jump an entire hurricane category, according to the study published in the journal, *Environmental Research: Climate*. A Category 5 storm causes more than 400 times the damage of a minimal Category 1 hurricane, more than 140 times the damage of a minimal Category 3 hurricane and more than five times the damage of a minimal Category 4 storm, according to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. For three storms, including this month's Rafael, the climate change factor goosed wind speed so much that the winds increased by two storm categories. This isn't about more storms, but increasing power from the worst ones, authors said. "We know that the intensity of these storms is causing a lot more catastrophic damage in general," lead study author Daniel Gilford, a climate scientist at Climate Central, which does research on global warming. "Damages do scale (up) with the intensity." The effect was especially noticeable in stronger storms, including those that made it to the top of the Saffir-Simpson scale of storm intensity: Category Five, study authors said. The study looked at 2019 to 2023, but the authors then did a quick addition for the named storms this year, all of which had a bump up due to climate change. "We had two Category Five storms here in 2024," Gilford said. "Our analysis shows that we would have had zero Category Five storms without human-caused climate change." This year's three most devastating storms — Beryl, Helene and Milton — increased by 18 mph (29 kph), 16 mph (26 kph) and 24 mph (39 mph) respectively because of climate change, the authors said. A different study by World Weather Attribution had deadly Helene's wind speed increase by about 13 mph, which is close, said Imperial College London climate scientist Friederike Otto, who coordinates the WWA team and praised the Climate Central work. "It absolutely makes sense from a fundamental standpoint that what's going on is we've added more energy to the system," National Oceanic and Atmospheric

Administration chief Rick Spinrad said at United Nations climate talks in Baku, Azerbaijan. “The change is going to manifest in terms of what we’re already seeing. You look at Hurricane Helene which was massive, 500 miles across. We’re going to see changes in terms of the velocity of these storms. We’re going to see changes in terms of Hurricane Milton spawning so many tornadoes.” Since 2019, eight storms — 2019’s Humberto, 2020’s Zeta, 2021’s Sam and Larry, 2022’s Earl, 2023’s Franklin and 2024’s Isaac and Rafael — increased by at least 25 mph (40 kph) in wind speed. Humberto and Zeta gained the most: 31 miles per hour (50 kph). In 85% of the storms studied in the last six years, the authors saw a fingerprint of climate change in storm strength, Gilford said. Warm water is the main fuel of hurricanes. The warmer the Atlantic, Caribbean and Gulf of Mexico get, the more potential energy goes into storms. Other factors — such as high level crosswinds and dry air — can act to weaken hurricanes. The waters in the hurricane area have increased by 2 to 3 degrees Fahrenheit (1.1 to 1.6 Celsius) in general and as much as 4 degrees (2.2 C) due to climate change, Gilford said. They know this because Climate Central has used scientifically accepted techniques to regularly track how much warmer oceans are because of the burning of coal, oil and natural gas. That technique basically uses computer simulations to create a fictional world with no human-caused warming and then compares it to current reality, with the difference being caused by greenhouse gases. They account for other factors, such as the lessening amount of sulfate pollution from marine shipping which had been counteracting a bit of the warming before the skies cleared up more. To go from warmer waters to stronger storms, the authors looked at a calculation called potential intensity, which is essentially the speed limit for any given storm based on the environmental conditions around it, Gilford said. MIT hurricane expert and meteorology professor Kerry Emanuel, who pioneered potential intensity measurements, wasn’t part of the study but said it makes sense. It shows the increase in storm strength that he predicted would happen 37 years ago, he said. Past studies have shown that climate change has made hurricanes intensify quicker, and slower moving, which causes even more rain to be dumped.

56: Sunlight & Clouds, Not Greenhouse Gasses, are Responsible for Climate Change — Study

A study published in August documented how real climate change is caused by the sunlight and clouds, not greenhouse gasses nor people having cars and air conditioning like former President Barack Obama has insinuated. “Our analysis revealed that the observed decrease of planetary albedo along with reported variations of the Total Solar Irradiance (TSI) explain 100% of the global warming trend and 83% of the Global Surface Air Temperature (GSAT) interannual variability as documented by six satellite- and ground-based monitoring systems over the past 24 years,” the study said in the ‘Abstract’ section. “Changes in Earth’s cloud albedo emerged as the dominant driver of GSAT, while TSI only played a marginal role. The new climate sensitivity model also helped us analyze the physical nature of the Earth’s Energy Imbalance (EEI) calculated as a difference between absorbed shortwave and outgoing longwave radiation at the top of the atmosphere.” Notably, ‘albedo’ refers to the effect of light reflection that a surface has, chiefly in this case, sunlight. The albedo factor of

clouds is the main factor in global surface air temperatures. The researchers also found that the 'heat trapping' effect of greenhouse gasses such as CO₂ (the source of climate hysteria) is misinterpreted as a source of global warming. "Observations and model calculations revealed that EEI results from a quasi-adiabatic attenuation of surface energy fluxes traveling through a field of decreasing air pressure with altitude. In other words, the adiabatic dissipation of thermal kinetic energy in ascending air parcels gives rise to an apparent EEI, which does not represent "heat trapping" by increasing atmospheric greenhouse gases as currently assumed. We provide numerical evidence that the observed EEI has been misinterpreted as a source of energy gain by the Earth system on multidecadal time scales," the study said in the 'Abstract' section. In the 'Results' section, the study has a chart that shows how global surface air temperatures (GSAT) are controlled by changes in sunlight absorption, a factor that changes with cloud's albedo factor, not from greenhouse gas emissions. The researchers also described how if greenhouse gases were warming the earth, the temperature data would reflect that, yet it does not. "...if we use the IPCC's Equilibrium Climate Sensitivity (ECS) of 0.76 K/(W m⁻²) calculated from the projected average global warming of 3.0 K by climate models in response to an effective radiative forcing of 3.93 W m⁻² due to a CO₂ doubling [2], then we should have witnessed an extra warming of 0.89 K over the period 2000–2023," the study said in the 'Results' section. "The fact that no warming has been observed above and beyond the amount expected from the measured solar forcing alone suggests a lack of physical reality to the theoretical greenhouse-gas radiative forcing." Lastly, the researchers called out the life ending measures the climate cult is trying to impose with their fake science. "These findings call for a fundamental reconsideration of the current paradigm of understanding about climate change and related socio-economic initiatives aimed at drastic reductions of industrial carbon emissions at all costs. An important aspect of this paradigm shift should be the prioritized allocation of funds to support large-scale interdisciplinary research into the physical mechanisms controlling the Earth's albedo and cloud physics, for these are the real drivers of climate on multidecadal time scales," the study said in the 'Conclusions' section.

57: Global Temperatures Plunge. Icy Silence from Climate Alarmists

Global land temperatures have plummeted by one degree Celsius since the middle of this year – the biggest and steepest fall on record. But the news has been greeted with an eerie silence by the world's alarmist community. You'd almost imagine that when temperatures shoot up it's catastrophic climate change which requires dramatic headlines across the mainstream media and demands for urgent action. But that when they fall even more precipitously it's just a case of "nothing to see here". The cause of the fall is a La Nina event following in the wake of an unusual strong El Nino. As David Rose reports: Big El Ninos always have an immense impact on world weather, triggering higher than normal temperatures over huge swathes of the world. The 2015-16 El Nino was probably the strongest since accurate measurements began, with the water up to 3C warmer than usual. It has now been replaced by a La Nina event – when the water in the same Pacific region turns colder than normal. This also has worldwide impacts, driving temperatures down rather than up. The satellite measurements over land respond quickly to El Nino and La

Nina. Temperatures over the sea are also falling, but not as fast, because the sea retains heat for longer. This means it is possible that by some yardsticks, 2016 will be declared as hot as 2015 or even slightly hotter – because El Nino did not vanish until the middle of the year. But it is almost certain that next year, large falls will also be measured over the oceans, and by weather station thermometers on the surface of the planet – exactly as happened after the end of the last very strong El Nino in 1998. If so, some experts will be forced to eat their words. Yes indeed. I recommend this sober assessment of the situation written earlier this month by Dr. David Whitehouse, science editor of the Global Warming Policy Foundation. With 2016 being predicted as a record warm year it is interesting to speculate on what the El Nino's contribution will be, which is, in a word, everything. It can be argued that without the El Nino (and the so-called "Pacific Blob") 2014-2016 would not have been record warm years. He calls the cooling a "reality check", noting: Many think that 2017 will be cooler than previous years. Myles Allen of Oxford University says that by the time of the next big United Nations climate conference global temperatures are likely to be no warmer than the Paris COP in 2015. This would be a strange thing to happen if, as some climate scientists have claimed, recent years would have been a record even without the El Nino. The last three years may eventually come to be seen as the final death rattle of the global warming scare. Thanks what's now recognised as an unusually strong El Nino, global temperatures were driven to sufficiently high levels to revive the alarmist narrative – after an unhelpful pause period of nearly 20 years – that the world had got hotter than ever before. It resulted in a slew of "Hottest Year Evah" stories from the usual suspects. As I patiently explained at the time – here, here, and here – this wasn't science but propaganda. If you're a reader of Breitbart or one of the sceptical websites this will hardly have come as news to you. But, of course, across much of the mainstream media – and, of course, on all the left-leaning websites – these "Hottest Year Evah" stories were relayed as fact. And, inevitably, were often cited by a host of experts on Twitter as proof that evil deniers are, like, anti-science and totally evil and really should be thrown in prison for sacrificing the future of the world's children by promoting Big-Oil-funded denialism. This is why there is such an ideological divide regarding climate change between those on the left and those on the right. The lefties get their climate information from unreliable fake news sites like BuzzFeed. Just recently, I had to school my former Telegraph colleague Tom Chivers, now of BuzzFeed, with a piece titled Debunked: Another BuzzFeed 'Hottest Year Evah' Story. Perhaps I'm wrong: I don't actually look at BuzzFeed, except when they're doing something worthwhile like "Five Deadliest Killer Sharks" or "Ten Cutest Kitten Photos". But I've a strong suspicion they haven't yet covered this 1 degree C temperature fall because, well why would they? It just wouldn't suit their alarmist narrative.

58: February Was Third Warmest on Record But Temperatures Still 'Anomalously High' For El Niño Aftermath

Last month was the first time a month has not been the warmest or second warmest on record since June 2023, climatologist Zeke Hausfather said on Tuesday. — Global temperatures in February were the third-highest ever recorded for the month, breaking a 20-month streak of record-breaking or near-record temperatures. At 1.59C, the average

global surface temperature last month came in third after February 2024 and 2016, climate researcher Zeke Hausfather said in a post on social media X (formerly Twitter). Hausfather, who calculated the result using data from the European Union's Copernicus Climate Change Service, also noted that it was the first time a month has not been the warmest or second warmest on record since June 2023. Following a record-breaking January, scientists were startled by the unexpected persistence of high temperatures despite the anticipated arrival of a short-term cooling weather pattern known as La Niña. But last month's temperatures might be a sign that La Niña conditions are finally kicking in, said Hausfather. The weather pattern, which typically occurs every three to five years, is associated with the periodic cooling of ocean surface temperatures in the central and east-central equatorial Pacific. It came after El Niño pushed temperatures "off the chart" in 2023 and 2024, the hottest year on record. Yet Hausfather warned that global temperatures remain "anomalously high" compared to prior El Niño aftermath events in the historical record. 1.5C Is 'Dead' Last month also marked the 19th month in the last 20 months for which the global-average surface air temperature was higher than 1.5C above the pre-industrial level. 2024 was the first year on record to surpass the 1.5C mark. The critical threshold was established at the 2015 COP21 climate summit, when 196 parties signed the legally binding Paris Agreement. They agreed to keep limiting global warming to below 1.5C or "well below 2C" above pre-industrial levels by the end of the century. Beyond this limit, experts warn that critical tipping points will be breached, leading to devastating and potentially irreversible consequences for several vital Earth systems that sustain a hospitable planet. While recent developments do not signal a permanent breach of the critical limit, which scientists say is measured over decades, it sends a clear warning to humanity that we are approaching the point of no return much faster than expected. In fact, the United Nations estimates that current emissions reduction pledges put the planet on track for a temperature increase of 2.6-3.1C over the course of this century. Scientists are not optimistic either. A survey of 380 IPCC scientists conducted by the Guardian last May revealed that 77% of them believe humanity is headed for at least 2.5C of warming. And last month, renowned climatologist James Hansen said even the 2C target "is dead" after his latest paper concluded that Earth's climate is more sensitive to rising greenhouse gas emissions than previously thought. The former top NASA climate scientist famously announced to the US Congress in 1988 that global warming was underway.☐

59: Trump's USAid cuts will have huge impact on global climate finance, data shows

Campaigners say funding halt is a 'staggering blow' to vulnerable nations and to efforts to keep heating below 1.5C Donald Trump's withdrawal of US overseas aid will almost decimate global climate finance from the developed world, data shows, with potentially devastating impacts on vulnerable nations. The US was responsible last year for about \$8 in every \$100 that flowed from the rich world to developing countries, to help them cut greenhouse gas emissions and cope with the impacts of extreme weather, according to data from the analyst organisation Carbon Brief. About \$11bn was spent last year, and a similar amount would have been spent by the US on climate finance this year under a continuation

of Joe Biden's plans, the analysis found. But among the first actions of Trump on resuming the US presidency, in a turbulent two months, have been to withdraw the US from the Paris climate agreement, and to eviscerate overseas aid efforts, of which climate finance is a part. The White House has halted much of the funding to USAid, the government's overseas aid agency that provides about a third of US climate finance, and contributions to the international Green Climate Fund and the Fund for Responding to Loss and Damage. Trump has also taken the US out of a Just Transition Energy Partnership with Indonesia, a programme worth tens of billions of dollars that was intended to end the use of coal. The White House has also begun a purge of climate references from government websites. Campaigners told the Guardian these actions would have a major impact on the ability of poor countries to cope with extreme weather. Anne Jellema, the executive director of 350.org, told the Guardian: "The US retreat from its global climate finance commitments is a staggering blow to the chances of keeping global temperature rise to 1.5C [above preindustrial levels]. By abruptly axing nearly a tenth of the limited funds for climate protection in developing countries, it is effectively abandoning millions of communities who have done nothing to cause global heating but who are losing homes, livelihoods and lives because of it." She called on other countries to step up. "Now is the moment for wealthy nations to rise above politics and show real leadership. The world is watching, and the stakes have never been higher. We must act together to keep hope alive for a livable future." Trump's newly formed "department of government efficiency", headed by Elon Musk, has been firing USAid staff and ending shipments. Though some have been reinstated after controversy and court orders, Trump is likely to continue his efforts to cut all forms of aid, with climate a key target. Under Trump's last presidency, climate finance also fell sharply. This time, it is likely to fall further under the onslaught on all forms of government spending. The US has long contributed far less to climate finance, proportionate to its status as the world's biggest economy and biggest carbon emitter, than other developed countries. Though Joe Biden markedly increased the funds during his term, he faced a struggle with the Republican-dominated Congress to do so. Climate finance is needed to help poor countries cope with the already evident impacts of the climate crisis, such as droughts, floods, heatwaves and storms. The developing world is sustaining hundreds of billions of dollars in damage as a result, with the effects expected to intensify further. These countries are already spending large chunks of their existing domestic budgets patching up the damage and trying to improve their resilience, depriving them of funds needed for health, education and economic development. Rich governments carry an obligation under the Paris agreement to provide funds to poor nations, which have done little to contribute to greenhouse gas emissions but bear the brunt of the damage. Last November, at the annual conference of the parties (COP) of the UNFCCC, all countries agreed that climate finance should reach \$1.3tn a year by 2035. The bulk of this will come from the private sector, some is likely to come from charges on high-carbon activities such as shipping and aviation, and at least \$300bn is to come from the developed world. Without sizeable contributions from the US, the world's biggest economy, those numbers are likely to be much harder to reach. Harjeet Singh, founding director of the Satat Sampada Climate Foundation, said: "As the largest historical emitter, the US bears a significant share of the blame for the climate

adversities affecting vulnerable populations worldwide. We must hold them accountable and ensure they contribute their fair share towards global climate reparations.” Countries with rapidly growing economies that are still classed as developing under the UN, such as China, the United Arab Emirates, and other oil states, also contribute to climate finance. Pressure on those emerging economies to contribute more is also likely to grow, from developed areas such as the EU, as the US steps away and they face increasing demands for defence spending. The US state department was approached for comment.

60: U.S. Warming Over Last 50 Years Exaggerated by Up to 50%, New Evidence Shows

The widespread use of regularly adjusted global and local surface temperature datasets showing increasingly implausible rates of warming has been dealt a further blow with new groundbreaking research that shows 50% less warming over 50 years across the eastern United States. The research attempts to remove distortions caused by increasing urban heat and uses human-made structure density data over 50 years supplied by the Landsat satellites. The 50% reduction in the warming trend is by comparison with the official National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) homogenised surface temperature dataset. The research was compiled by two atmospheric scientists at the University of Alabama in Huntsville, Dr. Roy Spencer and Professor John Christy. They used a dataset of urbanisation changes called ‘Built-Up’ to determine the average effect that urbanisation has had on surface temperatures. Urbanisation differences were compared to temperature differences from closely spaced weather stations. The temperature plotted was in the morning during the summertime. A full methodology of the project is shown here in a posting on Dr. Spencer’s blog. Dr. Spencer believes that the ‘Built-Up’ dataset, which extends back to the 1970s, will be useful in ‘de-urbanising’ land-based surface temperature measurements in the U.S. as well as other countries. All the major global datasets use temperature measurements from the Integrated Surface Database (ISD), and all have undertaken retrospective upward adjustments in the recent past. In the U.K., the Met Office removed a ‘pause’ in global temperatures from 1998 to around 2010 by two significant adjustments to its HadCRUT database over the last 10 years. The adjustments added about 30% warming to the recent record. Removing the recent adjustments would bring the surface datasets more into line with the accurate measurements made by satellites and meteorological balloons. Of course, if the objective is to promote a command-and-control Net Zero project, using widespread fear of rising temperatures to mandate huge societal and economic changes, a little extra warming would appear useful. But warming on a global scale started to run out of steam over 20 years ago, and the stunt can only be pulled for so long before the disconnect with reality becomes too obvious. There is a danger that the integrity of the surface measurements will be put on the line. Earlier this year, two top atmospheric scientists, Emeritus Professors William Happer and Richard Lindzen, told a U.S. Government enquiry that “climate science is awash with manipulated data, which provides no reliable scientific evidence”. As regular readers will recall, this is not the first time that the NOAA U.S. surface database has been under fire. The U.S. meteorologist Anthony Watts recently published a critical report calling it “fatally flawed”. He found that

96% of U.S. temperature stations failed to meet what NOAA itself considered to be acceptable and uncorrupted placement standards. Watts defined 'corruption' as being caused by the localised effects of urbanisation. His report also drew attention to a rarely-publicised NOAA database compiled from 114 nationwide stations designed to provide continuous recordings away from urban heat distortions. The measurements started in 2005, and to date show little if any warming. Below is the graph plotted by Dr. Spencer showing the 'raw' measurements taken from the ISD compared with his de-urbanised figures over 37 eastern states. It can be seen that there is a dramatic fall in the warming trend over the last 50 years, down to only 0.12°C a decade. But the NOAA adjusted figures are even higher than the raw data. The official NOAA average is actually 0.24°C warming a decade, meaning the de-urbanised measurement is 50% lower than this. Airports are a favourite measuring place since they offer regular and accurate readings. Of course it has been noted that they are prone to enormous urban heat effects. Three of the top four temperature records during the last summer in the U.K. were set at airports. Here is why Heathrow airport should never again be used by the Met Office as a poster story for global warming. The raw data for Orlando International Airport in Florida show a massive 0.3°C warming per decade, but this falls to a de-urbanised figure of just 0.07°C. It is early days for Spencer's work in this field, and he reports that the 50% figure is likely to be the upper limit of de-urbanisation adjustments. Other times and months may be lower. But he notes that all CMIP6 climate models produce U.S. summertime temperature trends greater than NOAA observations, which means the "discrepancy between climate models and observations is even larger than currently suspected by many of us". Spencer ends by stating that John Christy and he, "believe it is time for a new surface temperature dataset, and the method outlined... looks like a viable approach to that end". Meanwhile, COP27 starts at the weekend. It is a fair bet that every warning of future temperature rise will reference the politically-correct surface datasets, and every forecast of climate thermogeddon will incant the authority of climate models.

61: 40% of Apparent Global Warming Since 1850 is Due to Urban Heat Corruptions, Major Study Finds

A major new study involving 37 scientists from 18 countries has concluded that global temperature estimates since 1850 have been heavily contaminated by the growth of urban heat where the thermometers are sited. The UN-backed Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) claims that urban heat accounts for less than 10% of recorded global warming, but the scientists found that figure is nearer 40%. They observe that a rural-and-urban blend of temperatures indicates a long-term warming trend of 0.89°C per century, while a rural-only collection shows only a rise of 0.55°C in the same time period. The IPCC bets the ranch on humans causing all or most global warming in the modern age. It promotes the idea that temperatures have risen since 1850 by 1.09°C, with natural influences contributing only -0.1°C to +0.1°C – statistical-speak for zero. As I argued in the Daily Sceptic on Sunday, this is a political construction designed to promote Net Zero. Given our current state of scientific knowledge, it is impossible to calculate how much of the recent warming is due to the small amount of carbon dioxide humans produce by burning

fossil fuel compared to natural climatic variations. It is perhaps not generally known that the IPCC's position that humans cause all global warming is mainly based on a comparison of global temperature estimates, with 'hindcasts' produced by computer models. The authors of the new study explain that these are retrospective 'forecasts' of past climate produced by CMIP6 model simulations. They argue that these simulations are contaminated by urban heat distortions, and the use of a "low solar variability" estimate. Both problems could significantly affect the IPCC anthropogenic attributions made in the fifth assessment report (AR5), and repeated in the latest edition known as AR6. The charge is that the IPCC downplays the effect of solar irradiance (sunshine) which can explain a great deal of the warming since the late 19th century. The graphs above demonstrate the two different estimates of Northern Hemisphere land air temperatures from 1850-2018. Both series were generated from the Global Historical Climatology Network (GHCN), a database of temperature records from 180 countries compiled by the U.S. weather service NOAA. They show clearly that in rural areas away from heat generated by humans, the warming is much less, particularly in recent times during a period of large urban expansion. It is obvious that temperatures avoiding any human corruption provide the best guide to any long-term climate trend. This latest paper, published in the scientific journal *Climate*, is one of a series of academic warnings that global temperature datasets are severely contaminated by unadjusted urban heat effects. The IPCC continues to hide its head in the sand, stating that no recent findings have emerged to alter its view that any uncorrected effects from urbanisation, or from changes in land use or cover, have raised land surface air temperature trends by more than 10%. The IPCC was set up in 1988 only to look at human influences on the climate, so it is not hard to understand why it doesn't seem to try very hard to investigate the problem. No such reticence holds back Dr. Roy Spencer and Professor John Christy of the University of Alabama in Huntsville. They looked at the GHCN and found that up to a fifth of all global warming reported by 20,000 weather stations was invalid due to corruptions from non-climatic data. Worse, they found that NOAA, far from removing urban heat distortions, was on average "spuriously warming station temperature data trends when it should be cooling them". The U.S. meteorologist Anthony Watts has spent the last decade highlighting the numerous flaws built into global temperature datasets. Data are collected by Government bodies from a weather station network "that was never intended to detect a global warming signal", he notes. His seminal work recently found that 96% of U.S. weather stations are "corrupted" by the localised effects of urbanisation. The American temperature data form an important part of the over-heating global record. In Watt's view, there is only one weather station network accurate enough to detect a climate change signal. It was set up in 2005 by NOAA as a state-of-the art system using 114 stations across the States specifically located away from any non-climatic effects like urban heating. The network is called the U.S. Climate Reference Network and its findings over the last 18 years can be seen in the graph above. It shows little warming over this period, a fact that leads Watt to conclude that its findings are "buried" by the U.S. Government. Far from correcting global warming figures, the main temperature datasets have a habit of retrospectively adjusting upwards many of their past results. Recently, Professor Ole Humlum noted that since January 2008, NASA had boosted warming identified at its GISS service by 49%

between 1910-2000, a rise in temperature from 0.45°C to 0.67°C. Similar retrospective rises were also spotted by the recently-published report from Clintel, noting that the state-funded U.K. Met Office had boosted temperature by 38%, or 0.2°C, in the previously pause-ridden period from 2000-2020. The Met Office's HadCRUT5 is also said to have cooled the period 1850-1900 by 37%, although why it took so long to get around to this last task is a bit of a mystery. It does however improve the 'hockey stick' temperature look, and that is most helpful to political promoters of Net Zero collectivisation. The current state of play is well summed up by the 37 scientists who noted in their recently published paper: "The scientific community is not yet in a position to confidently establish whether the warming since 1850 is mostly human-caused, mostly natural, or some combination."

62: 2023 is a Year of Record Cold Temperatures – But the Media Are Silent

In 2022, United Nations Secretary-General Antonio Guterres warned us it was "code red for humanity" due to supposed global warming caused by CO2 emissions from human activities. This year, Mr. Guterres upped the rhetoric when he claimed: "The era of global warming has ended; the era of global boiling has arrived." This summer we've been told that July was the hottest on record and we've been deluged with reports of 'apocalyptic' wildfires in the Mediterranean (Spain, Greece and Italy), the U.S., Hawaii and Canada. So, perhaps Mr. Guterres and the climate catastrophists are right? Perhaps we are all destined to die in a planetary fireball caused by our selfish use of CO2-emitting fossil fuels? However, if you were to Google '2023 record cold', you could get a quite different picture of this year's weather: An astonishing -62.4°C was recorded in Tongulakh, Siberia on January 14th. In addition to becoming Earth's coldest temperature recorded in 2023, the all-time station record was broken in Tongulakh. On February 4th 2023, the Halifax airport in Nova Scotia saw its coldest wind chills ever recorded, with temperature plummeted to -43°C (-45.4°F). This tops its previous record of -41°C that was set on February 13th 1967 for wind chill. Many other places across Canada also set new daily records, with temperatures lower than -40°C. On February 19th, temperatures in Shepherd Bay, Nunavut dropped to -49.6°C (-57.3°F). The United Kingdom on Tuesday March 7th braved its coldest night of 2023 with the temperatures dropping to below -15 Celsius in several regions. According to the Independent, a U.K. news portal, the British Met Office revealed that the temperature at Kinbrace in the Scottish Highlands was recorded at -15.2 Celsius, making it the coldest March in the country since 2010. In February, the summit of Mount Washington in New Hampshire reported a wind-chill low of -78 Celsius (-108 Fahrenheit) — the coldest temperature ever recorded in the United States. Meanwhile, the National Weather Service (NWS) in Caribou, Maine, said it received reports of "frostquakes". "Just like earthquakes, [they] generate tremors, thundering sensations. These are caused by sudden cracks in frozen soil or underground water when it's very cold." In Boston, where officials closed down the public school system due to the impending freeze, the low temperature hit -23°C (-10°F), shattering the day's record set more than a century ago, the National Weather Service (NWS) said. In Providence, Rhode Island, the mercury dropped to -23°C (-9°F), well below the previous all-time low of -19°C (-2°F), set in 1918. The Arctic blast flowing into the U.S. from eastern Canada also brought record lows to Albany, New York; Augusta,

Maine; Rochester, New York; and Worcester, Massachusetts, among other places. Sydney experienced its coldest June morning on record on Monday, with a minimum temperature of 1.8°C at Olympic Park, according to Miriam Bradbury, a senior meteorologist at the Bureau of Meteorology. In fact, more than 100 weather stations across Australia registered their coldest May minimum temperatures on record – with regular frosts, snowfall, and below-average rainfall to boot. Thursday June 1st saw potentially the lowest June temperature on record in Finland. A weather station in Lapland, Enontekiö Kilpisjärvi Saana, reached –7.7°C. This may not seem that cold for northern Finland, where winter temperatures reach as low as –51.5°C, but the last time Lapland saw a minimum temperature of –7°C in June was on June 3rd 1962. Extreme cold arrived abnormally early in Antarctica, with temperatures dropping to below –75°C from the beginning of May. Following the onset of polar night, winter has started at the South Pole, and with it glacial cold at the Russian research station of Vostok. As early as May 5th a low of –75°C was recorded, while just days ago this fell further to –76.4°C. This marks a new record for the early winter. Daily highs are also plummeting, often just below –70°C on the Earth's coldest continent. A sudden and unexpected surge of cold Arctic air engulfed several regions of South America, shattering numerous cold records in its wake. Although it is currently summer in the southern hemisphere, including parts of South America such as Argentina, Chile, Uruguay and parts of Brazil, some areas have experienced a drastic and rapid shift in weather, going from a heat wave to frost in less than a week. On February 18th 2023, most of the cities in Paraguay experienced a sharp drop in temperature, breaking their previous records for minimum temperatures. The temperatures ranged between 7° and 16°C (44.6- 60.8°F) across the country, with the lowest readings recorded in the southeast. The lowest temperature was 7.7°C (45.9 °F), which is just 0.7°C (1.2°F) from the national record low for the month of February. The extreme cold weather caused at least 30 cities in Argentina to break their monthly cold records on the same day. So, in spite of the warnings of planetary overheating from Mr. Guterres and the climate alarmists, it seems that this year record cold temperatures have been recorded on every continent. Our rulers and their obedient mainstream media hyperventilate and panic, bombarding us with their many stories of this year's supposed 'record hot temperatures' and 'Earth on fire' apparently caused by man-made global warming. Yet there is always somewhere on Earth which has experienced its coldest ever temperature record. However, our rulers and their compliant media don't like to mention these record cold temperatures as they don't fit in with the 'Earth is boiling' narrative. And our rulers are desperate to convince us that our planet is overheating, so we need to accept energy insecurity, de-industrialisation, mass unemployment and national impoverishment in order to achieve the totally unnecessary and economically suicidal 'Net Zero'. Meanwhile, countries like China, India and Indonesia hugely increase their national CO2 emissions as they take our industries and jobs while laughing at our stupidity.

63: Met Office Records Hottest Day of the Year at a Weather Station Next to a Massive Heat-Generating Electricity Sub-Station

Earlier this month the Met Office declared the hottest day of the year so far in the U.K. with the temperature reaching 34.8°C in Cambridge. The Met Office claimed it was only the

eleventh time since 1961 that the temperature had reached that level, with six of these occasions having been recorded in the last 10 years. Needless to say, missing from the account was a note that the station in Cambridge's National Institute for Agricultural Botany (NIAB) is located just metres from a massive heat-generating electricity sub-station complex. Electricity sub-stations give off so much heat into the surrounding atmosphere there are even plans to trap it for commercial use. The Cambridge station at Histon has recently benefitted from a £5 million upgrade including the installation of a third heat-pumping transformer. It is difficult to think of a worse place to locate an instrument to accurately measure nearby uncorrupted air temperatures, other than favoured Met sites at international airports and solar farms. Cambridge NIAB crops up regularly in the Met Office's local daily 'records'. Last year it claimed a recording at this site was the highest measured in the eastern region during September since 1949. The World Meteorological Office (WMO) rates Met Office sites from class 1 to 5 and Cambridge NIAB is said to have a pristine class 1 designation with no temperature 'uncertainties' due to local natural and unnatural influences. But how reliable is this superior rating? The view from Google Earth suggests that questions about its validity can legitimately be asked. WMO guidelines state that any heat source in class 1 sites must be at least 100 metres away. But the google map above suggests that 100m is a very generous distance between the Histon grid and the red Met station marker. An even nearer straight line path or road might also not be considered helpful in taking an uncorrupted measurement. Recent expansion at Histon has added a third heat-pumping transformer to help increase capacity. Electricity sub-stations release huge amounts of heat into the nearby surroundings. There have even been plans to capture the output from these 'boilers' for commercial use. In 2021, SSE Energy Solutions and the National Grid unveiled plans to use the heat generated to produce hot water and space heating for domestic and industrial premises. As Nathan Sanders, managing director at SSE, noted: "Electric power transformers generate huge amounts of heat as a by-product when electricity flows through them. At the moment, this heat is just vented directly into the atmosphere and wasted." Not entirely wasted, the cynical might observe. It serves to boost temperatures – highly useful for spreading political Net Zero panic and alarm – across the entire U.K. Met Office measuring network. As regular readers will know, this network is composed of largely junk stations in class 4 with WMO 'uncertainties' of 2°C, and super-junk class 5 with possible errors up to 5°C. Almost eight in 10 stations across the 380-strong network are labelled class 4 and 5. Many of these stations, such as the urban heat furnace that is Heathrow airport, produce regular daily 'records'. Incredibly, the overall data is used by the Met to claim it can measure air temperature across the four countries of the U.K. down to one hundredth of a degree centigrade. The Daily Sceptic is obliged to citizen journalist Ray Sanders for drawing our attention to the obvious corruptions at Cambridge NIAB. Ray is a frequent contributor to Paul Homewood's blog, an excellent online publication that has long drawn attention to the obvious and widespread problems at the Met Office sites. Earlier this year, the Daily Sceptic broke the story that revealed most of the stations are junk following a freedom of information request. Interest in this scientific scandal is now widespread on social media, but it remains of little concern to mainstream media. Most writers captured by the lazy Net Zero narrative continue to tout the heat

corrupted figures and 'records'. To date, the Met Office has failed to respond to the growing critical interest in its obviously flawed temperature readings. Heat corruptions caused by electricity sub-stations can be found at other locations used by the Met Office. Ray has also drawn our attention to the 'notorious' Bingley No 2 site, in use since 1972. Again, it is just metres away from a major city sub-station. Unsurprisingly, in this case it has a class 4 junk designation. The final meteorological horror show can be seen at Amersham where temperatures at this class 4 site are again taken just a few metres away from the area's main sub-station. This site is a new one, having been established in 2015. It begs the question why the Met Office continues to locate scientific measuring stations in such unsuitable places. Another recent FOI request has revealed that over eight out of 10 of the 113 stations opened in the last 30 years are in classes 4 and 5. Worse, 81% of the stations started in the last 10 years, including Amersham, are junk, as are eight of the 13 new sites in the last five years.

64: World falling miles short of emissions goals to curb climate change, U.N. says, sounding the alarm

Paris — Greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere reached record highs in 2023, the United Nations warned on Monday, saying countries are falling miles short of what's needed to curb devastating global warming. Levels of the three main greenhouse gases — heat-trapping carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxide — all increased yet again last year, said the World Meteorological Organization, the U.N.'s weather and climate agency. Carbon dioxide was accumulating in the atmosphere faster than ever, up more than 10% in two decades, it added. And a separate U.N. report found that barely a dent is being made in the 43% emissions cut needed by 2030 to avert the worst of global warming. Action as it stands would only lead to a 2.6% reduction this decade from 2019 levels. The two reports come just weeks before the United Nations COP29 climate summit in Azerbaijan and as nations prepare to submit updated national climate plans in early 2025. Bolder plans to slash the pollution that drives warming will now have to be drawn up, Stiell said, calling for the end of the era of inadequacy. Under the 2015 Paris Agreement, countries said they would cap global warming at well below 2 degrees Celsius above average levels measured between 1850 and 1900 — and 1.5 degree C if possible. But so far, their actions have failed to meet that challenge. Existing national commitments would see 51.5 billion tons of CO2 and its equivalent in other greenhouse gases emitted in 2030 — levels that would 'guarantee a human and economic trainwreck for every country, without exception,' Stiell said. As long as emissions continue, greenhouse gases will keep accumulating in the atmosphere, raising global temperatures, WMO said. Last year, global temperatures on land and sea were the highest in records dating as far back as 1850, it added. WMO chief Celeste Saulo said the world was clearly off track to meet the Paris Agreement goal, adding that record greenhouse gas concentrations should set alarm bells ringing among decision-makers. 'CO2 is accumulating in the atmosphere faster than at any time during human existence,' the report said, adding that the current atmospheric CO2 level was 51% above that of the pre-industrial era. The last time the Earth experienced a comparable concentration of CO2 was 3 to 5 million years ago, when the temperature was two to three

degrees Centigrade warmer and the sea level was 65 feet higher than now, it said. Given how long CO₂ lasts in the atmosphere, current temperature levels will continue for decades, even if emissions rapidly shrink to net zero. In 2023, CO₂ concentrations were at 420 parts per million (ppm), methane at 1,934 parts per billion, and nitrous oxide at 336 parts per billion. CO₂ accounts for about 64% of the warming effect on the climate. Its annual increase of 2.3 ppm marked the 12th consecutive year with an increase greater than two ppm — a streak caused by ‘historically large fossil fuel CO₂ emissions in the 2010s and 2020s,’ the report said. Just under half of CO₂ emissions remain in the atmosphere, while the rest are absorbed by the ocean and land ecosystems. Climate change itself could soon ‘cause ecosystems to become larger sources of greenhouse gases’ WMO deputy chief Ko Barrett warned. ‘Wildfires could release more carbon emissions into the atmosphere, whilst the warmer ocean might absorb less CO₂. Consequently, more CO₂ could stay in the atmosphere to accelerate global warming.

65: Bizarre ‘Fact Check’ of World Climate Declaration Claims No Natural Climate Change For Almost 200 Years

Inevitable really, but the Daily Sceptic’s recent article on the World Climate Declaration (WCD) has attracted a green-activist ‘fact check’, and on that flimsy basis has been labelled “false information” by Facebook. On August 18th we published an article reporting that scientists across the world had declared there was no climate emergency. We added that the assertions that humans cause most or all climate change and that the science behind this claim is ‘settled’ have been dealt a savage blow by the WCD. The lead signatory is the Norwegian physics Nobel Prize laureate Professor Ivar Giaever, and he is followed by over 1,100 scientists and professionals. No fewer than 235 professors have signed the Declaration. Our story on the WCD went viral on social media, and is one of the most widely read articles we have ever published. The article and the WCD have now been branded “incorrect” by the green activist blog Climate Feedback. The blog’s author writes: “Natural (non-human) drivers of climate change have been mostly stable since the onset of modern warming and all the available scientific evidence implicates human greenhouse gas emissions as the primary culprit.” To claim that the climate has not undergone any natural change for almost 200 years is nonsense. Not a scrap of evidence can be submitted to back up this proposition, and it flies in the face of all climate science. The climate has changed on Earth since gas first made an appearance in the atmosphere. Climate Feedback’s claim is in fact a denial of climate change. The second part of the charge sheet runs: “Scientific evidence also indicates that climate change is contributing to intensified or more frequent natural disasters such as heatwaves, drought and heavy rainfall.” Again show us the evidence for this outlandish claim. Not a single scientific paper, not a scintilla of scientific proof, can attribute a one off bad (extreme) weather event to a change in long-term climate caused by humans burning fossil fuel. Any evidence supplied arises from climate models – evidence being a polite term for fanciful and wishful thinking. A great deal of social media criticism of the WCD is reserved for the signatories. Their skills and interests range over many disciplines including pure science, such as chemistry and physics, along with useful related fields such as geology and paleoclimatology. The Climate Feedback review highlights the

involvement of lead signatory Professor Antonino Zichichi, who is said to have links to the influential libertarian U.S. Heartland think tank. Furthermore, it is said he does not have a background in climate science. The attempted slur is interesting since Climate Feedback provides a link that does nothing more than present the professor's impressive scientific and academic credentials. Zichichi "does not have a background in climate science", it is said. In fact, Professor Zichichi is a physicist of immense international standing. He is credited with a number of scientific discoveries including nuclear anti-matter, served as President of the World Federation of Scientists and was awarded Italy's highest honour, the Knight Grand Cross of the Order of Merit of the Italian Republic. But, obviously, when dealing with the settled science of climate change, Zichichi has spent a lifetime studying the wrong sort of physics. Timothy Osborn, a climate professor at the University of East Anglia, claims that all natural warming stopped by the late 1800s, although, confusingly, he adds that natural factors, "would have caused a slight cooling over the last 70 years". Such certitude of course doesn't arise from the scientific evidence – there isn't any to back up this absurd claim. Osborn continues with his tale: Scientists estimate the effects of various potential climate drivers [influences] by running model simulations, mathematical representations of the climate system. The effectiveness of climate models is evaluated by their ability to capture real world climate trends. Models used by the IPCC have been faithfully predicting climate since the 1970s, which gives researchers confidence in their performance. In fact, as the above graph shows, "real world climate trends" haven't got a great track record when it comes to accurately forecasting future temperatures. The thick green line above shows the satellite record, the other lines the predications of climate models. From the turn of the century, when green activists went to war on fossil fuel, the predictions of thermogeddon have become increasingly detached from reality. Finally, the 'fact check' disputes the statement in the WCD that there is no statistical evidence that global warming is intensifying weather events. This is said to be at odds with the most recent IPCC report, which states in its "Summary for Policymakers" that "human-induced climate change is already affecting many weather and climate extremes in every region across the globe". As the Daily Sceptic has noted, these 'attribution' claims are mostly the product of climate models, slammed by the WCD as "not remotely plausible as global policy tools". Meanwhile, the IPCC summary for policymakers has recently been criticised as "government-dictated findings". Professors William Happer and Richard Lindzen of Princeton and MIT respectively, laid that charge, noting that an IPCC rule states that all summaries must be approved by governments. "Climate science is awash with manipulated data, which provides no reliable scientific evidence," they said. Academics around the world are becoming increasingly frustrated and angry at the politicisation of science in the interest of promoting the command-and-control Net Zero agenda. The science is not settled – far from it. The WCD is a powerful fightback and is attracting worldwide interest and debate. This latest so-called fact check from Climate Feedback is just a recitation of a political narrative.

66: BBC Claims Climate Change is Behind Increased Lightning Deaths in Bangladesh – But It's Utter Nonsense

Will 2024 bring any respite from the BBC's relentless climate propaganda? It doesn't look like it. As if to set the tone for the next twelve months, on New Year's Eve it published a real gem. The central claim its article makes contains a very big but easily debunked falsehood. Even when the evidence is sparse or non-existent, the corporation is always eager to tell us that every wildfire, flood, storm or drought is a sign that the planet is doomed and we must all submit to Net Zero. The BBC seems unconcerned that it has now racked up an ever-growing litany of examples of climate misinformation, while it regularly accuses others of doing the same. In its attempt to drill into its readers the idea that we are on the brink of disaster, the BBC usually uses what its reporters think is a tried and tested method, or a combination of several. Where there is nothing more than a correlation between variables, it frames an article in a way which implies there is causation. Or it is selective with the evidence, ignoring anything that is inconvenient, including choosing a truncated period of time which suits its views, while disregarding longer-term data which would cast doubt on them. More generally, it simply emphasises some things and downplays others, guiding readers from the beginning of the article to the end along a path clearly signposted 'Climate Catastrophe'. This time, however, it went a step further, and its article is a good example of how bold (or reckless – take your pick) it is prepared to be in pushing a narrative of impending environmental calamity. The central claim it made to support its case is demonstrably untrue. It claimed that a big increase in deaths from lightning strikes in Bangladesh is linked to climate change – the story is unambiguously headed 'Bangladesh sees dramatic rise in lightning deaths linked to climate change' – because in recent years there have been more thunderstorms. Yet, on the contrary, data show that in the years when deaths greatly increased, there was not an increase in thunderstorms. This, of course, leaves aside the important, related question of whether more thunderstorms would have been evidence of climate change over the long-term – something the BBC and other believers in climate dogma simply assume is the case. It is not as if the BBC is suggesting climate change may be the cause. When the BBC says the increase in deaths is linked to climate change, it is clearly implying there is causation, not just a correlation. It also seems to be implying that climate change is probably the major cause. The article links to a web page on the United Nations Capital Development Fund's website. No, I'd never heard of it either. In hyperbolic language typical of the UN, it states there has been an increase in the frequency of thunderstorms in this part of Asia and that this is a cause of the increase in lightning strike deaths. It doesn't provide supporting evidence, but a bit of googling reveals that in Bangladesh, over the last 40 years or so, there has indeed been a rising trend in the number of thunderstorms each year. Unfortunately for the BBC, the UN and other alarmists, who are determined to show we are on a "highway to climate hell", between 2000 and 2010, while the number of reported deaths suddenly increased and was significantly higher than in all previous years, over the same period the number of thunderstorms each year did not increase but remained constant, as the authors of this study state, and as can be seen in their graph, above. In fact, there were fewer storms during that period than in the early- and mid-90s, before the rise in deaths. If that wasn't enough to further embarrass the BBC and

the UN, between 2011 and 2020, the number of thunderstorms decreased while the number of recorded deaths began to rocket. Despite there being no evidence that the increase in the number of deaths is caused by more thunderstorms, and therefore climate change, the BBC goes on to say that NASA and the Government of Bangladesh also say climate change is the cause. But on the page it links to on NASA's Earth Observatory website no evidence is provided to support the claim. Instead, the Earth Observatory merely links to a page on the Anadolu Agency's website – a state-run news agency in Turkey. Here, the assertion is repeated, and a Bangladesh Meteorological Department official is quoted, but again no evidence is provided. To make matters worse, other (more likely) reasons for the increase in deaths are discussed openly in the Earth Observatory's article, while the BBC only mentions one non-climate related reason, passing over it as briefly as it can, in its effort to emphasise climate change. Despite the Earth Observatory's unfounded claim about climate change as a cause, unlike the BBC it mentions what it believes are a number of other possible causes. And it links to research where those causes are discussed in more depth. While more research is required, the consensus among those not obsessed with climate is that there are myriad contributory factors that have led to a steep rise in deaths in Bangladesh from lightning strikes. None of them are associated with climate change. The main reasons appear to be an increase in the reporting of deaths, as a result of more widespread electronic communication; an increase in the population, leading to more people – in particular agricultural workers – being vulnerable to lightning strikes; and deforestation, especially the felling of taller trees, which previously afforded significant protection during storms. Increased mobile phone use is also considered a possible hazard during thunderstorms. The BBC's article only briefly mentions one of these factors, suggesting planting more trees would help. But one gets the strong impression that the reporter thinks it of relatively little consequence compared with the larger problem of climate change. The increasing number of deaths in the country is tragic for all involved, but the way the BBC has spun it is bunkum, not to mention self-regarding. There is a considerable amount of evidence (and plain, common sense) to show that more deaths from lightning strikes in Bangladesh are caused by things which have nothing to do with climate change, and no evidence to show climate change is the culprit. But the BBC still brazenly insinuates that it must be down to the climate, regardless of the facts. BBC journalists – and for that matter, the UN, politicians, bureaucrats, activists and others – are of course bent on sustaining a febrile narrative about climate change. Whether, in each case, it is a result of ideology, mendacity or unthinkingly following a narrative to maintain personal reputation among peers and superiors, and for some to retain lucrative funding, is a moot point. But what is clear, if the BBC's article about Bangladesh is anything to go by, is that it will stop at nothing to achieve its aims, even when it means exploiting the deaths of others. Its journalists should show some respect to the families of those who have died and also stop taking their readers for fools.

67: The Real 'Climate Change Deniers' Are Those Who Deny the Climate Changed Before We Started Burning Fossil Fuels, Says Geologist

In 2020, Dr. Matthew Wielicki, then still an Associate Professor in the Department of Geology at the University of Alabama, noticed a great deal of anxiety in his students. On the one hand, this was understandable, as the world was just entering the Covid crisis and there was a lot of ignorance and fear about the disease in society at large. However, the anxiety that Wielicki noticed among his students had another cause – fear of climate change and the climate crisis. “And they really were convinced that the planet was going to end in a decade or in 12 years or whatever the clock somewhere in New York on the side of a building said,” says Wielicki. There were female students who were on the verge of tears, saying that even though they came from large families, they didn’t want to have children because of the climate crisis. “They just couldn’t imagine bringing a child into a world that’s going to end at some point because there’d be too much CO₂ in the atmosphere,” Wielicki recalls. He admits that, as a father of two, it was very heartbreaking to hear. “I couldn’t believe that the field that I was in, earth science, geology, was essentially tricking young students into believing that there was a crisis so big that it should be the number one thing that they think about when they’re planning the rest of their life, and whether or not they should have a family,” he says. This is why Wielicki himself took a detailed look at climate-related issues and started explaining them to his students, as well as talking about them publicly on social media. For young people, the problem is that climate is only discussed in terms of crisis and disaster. For example: what should a young person think when he hears the world’s political leaders like UN Secretary-General António Guterres claim that humanity is on the highway to climate hell? Wielicki says there is little reason to blame the young who attack artworks with tomato soup or glue themselves to the pavement when they hear this. They’re passionate, and the constant proclamation of climate crisis and doom tells them that this is the right thing to do. They are also told that the same climate hell hypothesis is supported by ‘science’. But the problem is that the actual scientific evidence does not support the catastrophe we are being told is happening. The trouble with today’s climate science, says Wielicki, is that it relies primarily on predictions of the future or climate models. There are different models, some of which we can clearly see have been proven wrong to date, i.e., they predicted too much warming. Wielicki points out that any model is only as good as the assumptions which it is based upon. “We can tweak these models to give us essentially any result we want. I always tell people, that look, all models are wrong, but some are useful. I think models are useful for sure, but never will a model outweigh the observable data,” Wielicki explains. “You cannot convince me that the environment is in a crisis or an emergency until you show that to me in three metrics – severe weather occurrences, the cost in insurance and loss of life. We have not seen any increase in any of them,” Wielicki says. According to Wielicki, since 1880 the average temperature of the Earth has risen by 1.2-1.5 degrees, based on various measurements. What impact has this had on society? “If you look at that data, it’s very difficult to find any metric which would define the state of the planet as a crisis or an emergency or a catastrophe or anywhere near collapse – yet these are words that are used a lot in the media,” Wielicki says, adding that even the UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) doesn’t actually use such words in its

reports. Wielicki cites the example of extreme weather events, which are constantly talked about as one of the inevitable consequences of climate change. In reality, we are not seeing an increase in extreme weather events or the associated increase in social damage. According to Wielicki, over the last quarter of a century, since around 2000, the number of natural disasters has decreased. At the same time, however, mankind has been spewing record levels of CO₂ into the Earth's atmosphere, mainly as a result of China's rapid industrialisation. Since mainstream climate science sees CO₂, especially the human emissions of the gas, as the main cause of climate damage, which should also bring us extreme weather events, there is an immediate and obvious contradiction there, but this is not being discussed or taken into account. Secondly, Wielicki gives a simple example of how the number of people who have died as a result of bad weather and natural disasters has changed over the last 100 years. "We've reduced the deaths associated with weather-related disasters by 96% or 98%," he notes. On the one hand, this may show that the number of extreme weather events has decreased somewhat, but on the other hand, it certainly shows that humanity is better able to cope with such disasters. The role of cheap and available energy in this coping, i.e., fossil fuels, should not be underestimated either. Stronger buildings, the ability to move people quickly away from the storm areas, the provision of effective material help or, for example, medical aid to the affected areas, etc. – all this can be achieved if you have the resource of energy to do it. So, according to Wielicki, the data show that CO₂ levels in the atmosphere have gone up somewhat over the last century or so, and that the planet as a whole has warmed a little, but not that we are heading for a catastrophe. "There's no other metric that would argue that society is somehow being harmed right now by the 1.5°C or whatever degrees of warming we've had since 1880," Wielicki says. As a geologist, Wielicki undoubtedly has a better-than-average understanding of how our planet has evolved in the first place, and how its climate has been in a constant state of flux. Today's climate science, however, links climate change primarily to the increasing amount of CO₂ in the atmosphere, especially its anthropogenic component. Scientists who doubt or dispute this are labelled climate deniers. Wielicki points out that we know very well from Earth's relatively recent history that major climate changes, such as the Medieval Warm Period (ca. 950-1250) or the subsequent Little Ice Age (ca. 14th to mid-19th century, precise timing depending on the location), occurred without any significant change in the proportion of CO₂ in the atmosphere. "If there's anything that I argue, it's that we need to be resilient. We should stop pretending that if we changed or lowered our emissions the climate would stop changing. That's the true denial of climate right there," Wielicki says. "What we need to accept is that regardless of the CO₂ in the atmosphere, we are going to have climate change and those shifts could occur over timescales of decades or centuries, and we should be prepared. And being prepared means we need access to cheap, reliable energy," he adds. But the world is moving in the opposite direction under the leadership of today's political leaders. One of the main objectives is to fight CO₂ emissions and to do so by phasing out fossil fuels, among other measures. However, according to Wielicki, the planners have not quite thought everything through. First of all, wind and solar power are unreliable substitutes because they can only be produced when the conditions are right, i.e., when the wind blows and the sun shines. In

addition, they need constant support from the taxpayer, because when they can be produced, i.e., sold as energy to the grid, the price of electricity on the market will be low since there is a lot of it at that particular time. So in order for investors to build up these capacities, they need price guarantees from governments or taxpayer support. And on top of that, you still need to additionally build up controllable capacity to ensure that electricity is always available. Wielicki also says that we need to understand that fossil fuels are not just liquids that we put in our cars at the petrol station but are essential to many aspects of our lives. "About four billion people on the planet are being fed off of agricultural crops that are being fertilised with synthetic fertilizers that are being created from fossil fuels. So you can't just look at one side of a picture," Wielicki explains, adding that the increases in atmospheric CO₂ levels have actually also increased yields. In addition, Wielicki says, it is worth thinking that we need to replace many of today's fossil-fuel-based materials in everyday use, such as plastics, lubricants, oils, chemicals, etc., with new ones if we really want to phase out fossil fuels. "We have to ask what are the benefits that fossil fuels have given the society? And then let's weigh that against the possible detrimental effects that these climate models argue will happen, but haven't happened in the observable data yet," he says. Programmed into this whole Western orientation towards CO₂ reduction, Wielicki says, is hypocrisy on several levels. For a start, it's worth recognising that by reducing CO₂ emissions in Europe or North America, we have effectively decided that we do not produce the goods we need here, but will produce them elsewhere in the world. "We pat ourselves on the back and say: look, we've lowered our CO₂ emissions by this much! But all we've done is essentially offshored that industry to China and India. They do it dirtier. They have no regard for things like environmental policy. And so the global CO₂ is going up faster than ever," Wielicki notes. While the big Asian countries are ramping up the use of coal to satisfy their energy appetite, many African countries don't have a similar option. According to Wielicki, this is directly linked to the UN's policy of not wanting these countries to increase their use of fossil fuels. This means, for example, that farm work that is done elsewhere by tractor still has to be done by many Africans with their hands. A large proportion of Africans also have little or no access to electricity. Food is cooked indoors on open fires, burning dung and wood. The resulting smoke leads to respiratory illnesses and many people die as a result. All this could be easily avoided, according to Wielicki, by giving them access to propane bottles and gas cookers. "It might make them breathe easier at night. It might make their health better. But it's going to increase the atmospheric CO₂, and that is something we can't have. These poor people must suffer and live in poverty because we need to save the planet. It's so hypocritical," Wielicki says. What's more, according to Wielicki, our hypocrisy lies in the fact that at the same time, we want to mine the minerals we need for our own energy transition, such as cobalt, in that very same Africa. "We're switching to very mineral and energy intensive technologies like solar panels and electric vehicles. And we're taking all of these raw materials from Africa," he says. "I think this is going to be, probably, the legacy of this green revolution. I call it the new green colonialism. It's unfortunately going to keep hundreds of millions of poor people in developing nations in poverty for decades longer than they ever needed to be," Wielicki adds. Various examples like this suggest that it all is not being done to somehow increase human welfare and save the climate, but there

are other reasons. According to Wielicki, this is illustrated by the fact that we are being offered ever more fantastic solutions to the climate crisis and global warming. For example, the Bill Gates-backed plan to cool the Earth through geoengineering, the idea of spraying sulphur dioxide into the atmosphere and reflecting the Sun's rays back into space before they reach the ground. What could go wrong? Gates is also an early investor in other well-known 'climate technologies'. One of these involves using large fans to try to capture CO₂ from the air and then turn it into rock. This is an extraordinarily expensive operation, but in reality the profits of the billionaire venture capitalists who develop it and initially invested in it are paid for by ordinary citizens – the U.S. taxpayer is already subsidising the CO₂ capture plants under construction to the tune of billions of dollars. Wielicki says it is comical to listen to Gates himself boast that because he pays for CO₂ capture, it offsets the CO₂ emissions of his own private jet flights. "Can you imagine if you came home and you're like: 'I know sweetheart, I cheated on you but look: I bought into this cheating capture, so it doesn't count. Because I paid this guy and he's not going to cheat on his wife, and that allows me to cheat on you. So it's all good.' It's so absolutely ridiculous," Wielicki observes. He also points out that removing CO₂ from the atmosphere in this way is a complete waste of money. "It's like trying to empty the ocean one spoonful at a time. The amount that they're capturing is so minuscule. And the amount that they're spending to capture it – I mean, CO₂ is the new gold, platinum, because of the cost of that. What a waste of money. Plant some trees," Wielicki says. According to Wielicki, money is a major factor pushing the ongoing 'green revolution'. But most of the money that is being made is not actually in such CO₂ capture technologies and similar projects. It is in energy and transport. "The energy sector is one of the largest sectors in any country's economy. Transportation comes a close second a lot of times. Radically transitioning and reinventing the energy and transportation sectors has a huge amount of potential for money, for wealth," Wielicki says. In addition, governments can also raise tax revenue through climate policies. This in turn means, says Wielicki, that, alongside money, a key driver behind these processes is the empowerment of governments, whether through additional taxation or simply by increasing control over people's lives. "There is no process in the economy, including your bodily processes of just breathing and eating and breaking wind, unfortunately, that doesn't produce a greenhouse gas," Wielicki notes. While normally most people would oppose a government plan to interfere more in their lives, now people are being swayed because it is supposedly about saving the planet. "This is the perfect tool for government to interject itself into people's lives. What you buy, what you eat, what you drive, where you shop, the type of job you have, the type of furniture you buy, where you recreate," Wielicki adds. The climate, he says, is like a front, a Trojan horse for building a system like socialism. The collusion of money and power has also led to a situation in which climate scientists, irrespective of the actual data, are essentially being asked to tacitly acknowledge a climate crisis with catastrophic consequences. Failure to do so will have consequences – being labelled as a climate denier, loss of funding and jobs, etc. Such scientists are also no longer welcome to publish their work in respected scientific journals, which is also a major setback for their scientific careers. The funding of universities and research institutions as a whole could also be at risk if the basic positions everybody needs to take today on climate issues tend to be denied

by someone within the institution. Wielicki calls such a situation “politicisation of science”, whereby a manufactured consensus is created on a particular issue and all scientists are required to accept this consensus. Understandably, science, which is supposed to consist of the constant testing of different hypotheses and ideas, of arguing with each other, and of the pursuit of truth, becomes, in the course of such a process, unscientific, ideological or simply a matter of faith. On the other hand, creating such consensus is about the control of information, which allows the wider public to be offered a story that coincides with the aims of the powers that be. The reputations of scientists who disagree with this story or with the adopted consensus can be destroyed by declaring them to be disseminators of misinformation. “We saw that with Covid. That was a rapid politicisation of science. And we’re seeing it with climate change. Climate change has been a little bit more slow in moving into politicisation of science,” comments Wielicki, who has also been publicly smeared for his scientifically sound positions on climate. Wielicki’s resignation from his job at the university is also directly linked to this politicisation of science. No one was directly driving him away, but in a situation where his own Chair and even the university President were receiving weekly emails and phone calls about his “unacceptable views on climate”, he saw no point in continuing – he would probably not have been given a tenured academic position anyway. In addition, he had long been averse to the so-called Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) policies implemented by the U.S. universities, which means that more attention is paid to a student’s racial or ethnic origin than to their skills, knowledge, commitment and effort, with those classified as ‘minorities’ being given an advantage in access to studies. Criticism of this policy also made him apparently uncomfortable for the university. Although Wielicki comes from an academic family, grew up on campus and was destined to have a career like his parents, he says he has no regrets about leaving. He says that his true vocation as a researcher or teacher is to share information, and he can now do this even more successfully than before through the articles he publishes on his Substack Irrational Fear. He cites the example of how, in the past, he might have been happy if his published research had been cited 150 times, but now, thanks to social media sharing, some of his articles can be seen by 50,000 people in just a few hours. Wielicki is also, of course, pleased that he was able to reassure his young students, to whom he started to explain climate change in a fact-based manner. “This is the first generation, these young 20 year-olds, who have essentially been told that the planet is going to end since they’ve been old enough to understand and read and write. This has been pounded into their heads. It must be just so exhausting to have been told that the planet’s going to end forever. What ambition do you have to sacrifice now and to do things that will ensure a better life for your future, like getting a good education or going to the gym and eating healthy? No, the planet’s going to end. Screw it. I’m just going to eat chips and play video games and wait for the planet to end,” Wielicki says, describing the potential predicament of many of these young people. “We’re robbing them of their ambitions,” he adds, noting that bringing a perspective that didn’t tell young people about the imminent demise of the planet was refreshing to them. “The idea that humans are like a parasite on the planet, that’s just not an idea that really tracks well with young people. They’re tired of that. They don’t believe that,” Wielicki says.

68: New Paper Finds Effect of Human-Caused Carbon Emissions on Climate is 'Non-Discernible'

Every now and then, a giant of modern science should be allowed to express himself in language that we all understand. In the informative *Climate: The Movie*, the 2022 Nobel physics laureate Dr. John Clauser thundered: “I assert there is no connection whatsoever between climate change and CO₂ – it’s all a crock of crap, in my opinion.” While not expressing himself in such forthright terms, the Greek scientist Professor Demetris Koutsoyiannis might agree. He recently published a paper that argues it is the recent expansion of a more productive biosphere that has led to increased CO₂ concentrations in the atmosphere and greening of the Earth. It is widely argued that changing atmospheric carbon isotopes prove that most if not all recent warming is caused by the 4% human contribution from burning hydrocarbons, but such anthropogenic involvement is dismissed by Koutsoyiannis as “non-discernible”. Koutsoyiannis is Professor Emeritus of Hydrology and Analysis of Hydrosystems at the National Technical University of Athens. The isotope argument has been around for some time and has been useful in closing down debate on the role of human-caused CO₂ and its supposed effect in causing a ‘climate emergency’. The carbon in living matter has a slightly higher proportion of ¹²C isotopes, and recent lowering levels of ¹³C, which accounts for 99% of carbon in the atmosphere, are used to promote the idea that it is caused by burning hydrocarbons. But Koutsoyiannis argues that the more productive biosphere has resulted in “natural amplification of the carbon cycle due to increased temperature”. He suggests this may be a “primary factor for the decrease in the isotopic signature ¹³C in atmospheric CO₂”. Clauser’s remarks, along with contributions from a number of other distinguished scientists, have led to widespread attempts to shadow-ban Martin Durkin’s *Climate: The Movie* in mainstream and social media. If Clauser and scientists like Koutsoyiannis are correct, there is no need for the Net Zero global collectivisation. Trillions of dollars can be taken back from the Climate Industrial Network to be used to solve more pressing environmental and social problems. In such circles, the idea that humans control the climate thermostat is regarded as little short of pseudoscience. In the film, the former Princeton professor William Happer says he can live with the descriptive suggestion “hoax”, although he prefers the word “scam”. Disregarding the role of natural forces and promoting a 50 year-old hypothesis – science speak for ‘opinion’ – that can’t even agree on the degree of warming caused by higher levels of CO₂ – holds little attraction for these sceptical science minds. During the course of the Durkin film, the evidence mounts that the warming ‘opinion’ can’t explain any of the climate change observations seen over the last 500 million years of life on Earth. As the Daily Sceptic has noted on numerous occasions, it would help if there was at least one peer-reviewed paper that proved conclusively that humans caused all or most changes in the climate. A politically-manufactured ‘consensus’ and appeals to UN authority do not count. Koutsoyiannis provides some of the historical background to the evolution of the isotope story, and its use to promote the ‘settled’ science narrative around CO₂. The generally accepted hypothesis “may reflect a dogmatic approach or a postmodern ideological effect, i.e., to blame everything on human actions”, he observes. Hence, he says, the null hypothesis that all observed changes are mostly natural has not seriously been investigated. To add

weight to his contention, Koutsoyiannis repeats the infamous claim made recently at a World Economic Forum meeting by Melissa Fleming, Under Secretary-General for Global Communications at the United Nations: “We own the science, and we think that the world should know it.” The Koutsoyiannis paper is long and detailed and he uses data obtained from the California-based Scripps Institute that has been measuring isotopic signatures since 1978, along with proxy data going back five centuries. The complex workings can be viewed in the full paper with the author concluding that instrumental carbon isotopic data of the last 40 years shows no discernible signs of human hydrocarbon CO₂ emissions. He also found that the modern record did not differ in terms of net isotopic signature of atmospheric CO₂ sources and sinks from the proxy data, including Antarctica ice cores, going back 500 years. The lack, or otherwise, of a discernible human-caused carbon isotope signature is an interesting branch of climate science to investigate, although, as we have seen, it is constrained by the political requirements governing the settled science narrative. In 2022, three physics professors led by Kenneth Skrable from the University of Massachusetts broke ranks and examined the atmospheric trail left by the isotopes. They discovered that the amount of CO₂ released by hydrocarbon burning since 1750, “was much too low to be the cause of global warming”. The scientists found that claims of the dominance of anthropogenic fossil fuel in the isotope record had involved the “misuse” of statistics. They stated that the assumption that the increase in CO₂ is dominated by or equal to the anthropogenic component is “not settled science”. They warned that “unsupported conclusions” of human involvement “have severe potential societal implications that press the need for very costly remedial actions that may be misdirected, presently unnecessary and ineffective in curbing global warming”.

69: Huge Increase in Coral Produces Third Year of Record Highs on the Great Barrier Reef

Massive increases in coral across the Australian Great Barrier Reef (GBR) have been reported for 2023-24 making it the third record year in a row of heavy growth. Across almost all parts of the 1,500 mile long reef, from the warmer northern waters to the cooler conditions in the south, coral is now at its highest level since detailed observations began. The inconvenient news has been ignored in mainstream media which, curiously, have focused on a non-story in Nature that claimed “climate change” poses an “existential threat” to the GBR. “The science tells us that the GBR is in danger – and we should be guided by the science,” Professor Helen McGregor from the University of Wollongong told Victoria Gill of BBC News. The existential threat is “now realised” reported the Guardian. Travelling back from the reality inhabited by the Guardian, it can be reported that last year’s gains were eye-catchingly large. On the Northern GBR, hard coral cover leapt from 35.8% to 39.5%, in the central area it rose from 30.7% to 34%, while in the south it went from 34% to 39.1%. The report is the result of monitoring of hard coral cover reefs from August 2023 to June 2024 by the Australian Institute of Marine Science (AIMS). The percentage of hard coral cover is a standard measurement of reef conditions used by scientists and is said to provide a simple and robust measure of reef health. Similar reports have been published by the AIMS over the last 38 years. For the first two years of record coral growth, the narrative-

driven mainstream media ignored the recovery story. But this year, the suspicious might contend, something had to be done to blunt the sensational news of the stonking rises. Help has come in the form of a paper just published in Nature which uses proxy temperature measurements and climate models to suggest temperatures around the vast reef area are the highest recorded in 400 years. This time period is the blink of an ecological eye-lid given that coral has been around for hundreds of millions of years during periods when temperatures and atmospheric carbon dioxide have been markedly different. Nevertheless, this is said to pose an existential threat despite it being known that sub-tropical corals thrive between 24°C-32°C, and in fact seem to grow faster in warmer waters. Natural bleaching, when the coral expels algae and turns white, can occur with temporary local temperature changes, but evidence from many years of scientific observation suggests the corals often and quickly recover. Long term changes in water temperature – tiny compared to coral's optimum conditions – pose no threat, but alarmists concentrate on the bleaching events to warn of possible ecological collapse. The Guardian noted a recent fifth mass bleaching in eight years across the reef, driven, it claimed, by “global heating”. So far, its readers are in the dark as to how this squares with the recent record growth. A decade of mass bleaching, relentlessly catastrophised in the interests of Net Zero by activists in the media, academia and politics, does not appear to have done much harm to the recent growth in the Northern GBR. To read the latest AIMS report is to read the best possible spin on the story that the reef is heading for disaster. And, of course, it is all down to the unproven changes in climate that are said to be caused by human activity. It is claimed this will cause more frequent and long-lasting marine ‘heatwaves’, a product no doubt of a climate model. It is generally suggested that these heatwaves and mass bleaching were rare prior to the 1990s, although how anyone can know this is a mystery. Detailed GBR observations and temperature recordings barely stretch back a few decades. As is often the case with publicly-funded operations, the political message is never far from the surface. Thus we learn that “enabling coral reefs to survive these stressful conditions requires a combination of a reduction in global greenhouse emissions to stabilise temperatures... and the development of interventions to help reefs adapt to and recover from the effects of climate change”. No doubt this last proposal requires large amounts of money from the taxpayer to cover the costs of such worthy work. Not everyone goes along with the coral fear-mongering. The distinguished scientist Dr. Peter Ridd has studied the GBR for 40 years and notes that coral numbers have “exploded” in recent years. He says that all 3,000 reefs in the world's largest system have excellent coral. “Not a single reef or even a single species of reef life has been lost since British settlement,” he reports. The impact of bleaching is “routinely exaggerated by the media and some scientific organisations”. In his view, the public is being deceived about the reef. “How this occurred is a serious issue for the reef-science community which has embraced emotion, ideology and raw self-interest to maintain funding,” he observes.

70: A third of Antarctic ice shelf risks collapse as our planet warms

London (CNN) — More than a third of the Antarctic ice shelf risks collapsing into the sea if global temperatures reach 4 degrees Celsius (7.2 degrees Fahrenheit) above pre-industrial

levels as climate change warms the world, a new study from the UK's University of Reading has warned. In a forecasting study, scientists found that 34% of the area of all Antarctic ice shelves, measuring some half a million square kilometers, could destabilize if world temperatures were to rise by 4 degrees. Some 67% of the ice shelf area on the Antarctic Peninsula would be at risk of destabilization under this scenario, researchers said. Ice shelves are permanent floating platforms of ice attached to areas of the coastline, formed where glaciers flowing off the land meet the sea. They can help limit the rise in global sea levels by acting like a dam, slowing the flow of melting ice and water into the oceans. Each summer, ice at the surface of ice shelves melts and runs into smaller gaps in the snow below, where it usually refreezes. But when there is a lot of melting and little snowfall, this water instead pools onto the ice's surface or flows into crevasses. This deepens and widens the crevasses, causing the shelf to fracture and collapse into the sea. "Ice shelves are important buffers preventing glaciers on land from flowing freely into the ocean and contributing to sea level rise. When they collapse, it's like a giant cork being removed from a bottle, allowing unimaginable amounts of water from glaciers to pour into the sea," study lead author Ella Gilbert, a climate scientist in the University of Reading's Department of Meteorology, said in a statement. Gilbert told CNN that low-lying coastal areas, particularly small island states such as Vanuatu and Tuvalu, in the South Pacific Ocean, are most at risk from global sea level rise. "However, coastal areas all over the world would be vulnerable, and countries with fewer resources available to mitigate and adapt to sea level rise will see worse consequences," she said. In the new study, which used high-resolution regional climate modeling to predict the impact of increased melting and water runoff on ice shelf stability, researchers say that limiting temperature rise to 2 degrees Celsius rather than 4 degrees Celsius would halve the area at risk and potentially avoid significant sea level rise. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change concluded in a landmark report that we only have until 2030 to drastically reduce our dependence on fossil fuels and prevent the planet from reaching the crucial threshold of 1.5 degrees Celsius (2.7 degrees Fahrenheit) above pre-industrial levels. Global net emissions of carbon dioxide would need to fall by 45% from 2010 levels by 2030 and reach "net zero" around 2050 in order to keep the warming around 1.5 degrees Celsius. "The findings highlight the importance of limiting global temperature increases as set out in the Paris Agreement if we are to avoid the worst consequences of climate change, including sea level rise," Gilbert added. In the Paris accord, 197 countries agreed to the goal of holding global temperatures "well below" 2 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels and to pursue efforts to limit it to 1.5 degrees Celsius. But we are on track for a world that is 3.2 degrees Celsius warmer by the end of the century. Gilbert told CNN that increased temperatures means melting occurs more frequently, and more intensely. Researchers identified four ice shelves that would be threatened by a warmer climate: The Larsen C, Shackleton, Pine Island and Wilkins ice shelves, which are vulnerable due to their geography, and the runoff predicted in those areas. Larsen C is the largest remaining ice shelf on the Antarctic Peninsula, and the Pine Island glacier has received a lot of attention in recent years because it has been melting rapidly in response to climate change, Gilbert said. If these ice shelves all collapsed, which is not guaranteed, the

glaciers they currently restrain would flow into the ocean, contributing to sea level rise -- potentially by tens of centimeters, she explained.

71: World's glaciers melting faster than ever recorded

The world's glaciers are melting faster than ever recorded under the impact of climate change, according to the most comprehensive scientific analysis to date. Mountain glaciers - frozen rivers of ice - act as a freshwater resource for millions of people worldwide and lock up enough water to raise global sea-levels by 32cm (13in) if they melted entirely. But since the turn of the century, they have lost more than 6,500 billion tonnes - or 5% - of their ice. And the pace of melting is increasing. Over the past decade or so, glacier losses were more than a third higher than during the period 2000-2011. The study combined more than 230 regional estimates from 35 research teams around the world, making scientists even more confident about exactly how fast glaciers are melting, and how they will evolve in the future. Glaciers are excellent indicators of climate change. In a stable climate, they remain roughly the same size, gaining about as much ice through snowfall as they lose through melting. But glaciers have been shrinking pretty much everywhere over the past 20 years as temperatures have risen due to human activities, principally burning fossil fuels. Between 2000 and 2023, glaciers outside the major ice-sheets of Greenland and Antarctica lost around 270 billion tonnes of ice a year on average. These numbers aren't easy to get your head around. So Michael Zemp, director of the World Glacier Monitoring Service and lead author of the study, uses an analogy. The 270 billion tonnes of ice lost in a single year "corresponds to the [water] consumption of the entire global population in 30 years, assuming 3 litres per person and day", he told BBC News. Bar chart of worldwide glacier mass changes by year since 2000. Glaciers have lost mass in every year, and increasingly so. Between 2023 and 2024 they lost around 550 billion tonnes. The rate of change in some regions has been particularly extreme. Central Europe, for example, has lost 39% of its glacier ice in little over 20 years. The novelty of this study, published in the journal Nature, is not so much finding that glaciers are melting faster and faster - we already knew that. Instead, its strength lies in drawing together evidence from across the research community. There are various ways of estimating how glaciers are changing, from field measurements to different types of satellite data. Each has its own advantages and disadvantages. Direct measurements on glaciers, for example, give very detailed information, but are only available for a tiny fraction of the more than 200,000 glaciers worldwide. By systematically combining these different approaches, scientists can be much more certain about what's going on. These community estimates "are vital as they give people confidence to make use of their findings", said Andy Shepherd, head of the Department of Geography and Environment at Northumbria University, who was not an author of the recent study. "That includes other climate scientists, governments, and industry, plus of course anyone who is concerned about the impacts of global warming." Glaciers take time to fully respond to a changing climate - depending on their size, anywhere between a few years and many decades. That means they will continue to melt in the years ahead. But, crucially, the amount of ice lost by the end of the century will strongly depend on how much humanity continues to warm the planet by releasing carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases. This

could be the difference between losing a quarter of the world's glacier ice, if global climate targets are met, and nearly half if warming continues uncontrolled, the study warns. "Every tenth of a degree of warming that we can avoid will save some glaciers, and will save us from a lot of damage," Prof Zemp explained. These consequences go beyond local changes to landscapes and ecosystems – or "what happens on the glacier doesn't stay there", as Prof Zemp puts it. Hundreds of millions of people worldwide rely to some extent on seasonal meltwater from glaciers, which act like giant reservoirs to help buffer populations from drought. When the glaciers disappear, so does their supply of water. And there are global consequences too. Even seemingly small increases to global sea-level – from mountain glaciers, the major Greenland and Antarctic ice-sheets, and warmer ocean waters taking up more space - can significantly increase the frequency of coastal flooding. "Every centimetre of sea-level rise exposes another 2 million people to annual flooding somewhere on our planet," said Prof Shepherd. Global sea-levels have already risen by more than 20cm (8in) since 1900, with around half of that coming since the early 1990s, and faster increases are expected in the decades ahead.

72: 'Global Warming' Is Out. 'Global Boiling' Is In, United Nations Secretary-General Says

"Global warming" is out, "global boiling" is in, United Nations Secretary-General Antonio Guterres announced Thursday. "Humanity is in the hot seat," Guterres said at a press conference. "For vast parts of North America, Asia, Africa and Europe, it is a cruel summer. For the entire planet, it is a disaster. And for scientists, it is unequivocal – humans are to blame." The science is settled, according to Guterres, but it would seem the fear-based propaganda hasn't worked in scaring enough of the world into submission. And so, Guterres and his team have changed the talking points. "All this is entirely consistent with predictions and repeated warnings. The only surprise is the speed of the change. Climate change is here, it is terrifying, and it is just the beginning," he said. "The era of global warming has ended; the era of global boiling has arrived." Would it surprise you to find out that Guterres is the former president of the Socialist International and a firm believer that the planet can only be saved by a team of "experts" and government control? No, it probably wouldn't surprise you; you're a Daily Wire reader equipped with critical thinking skills. It's easy to draw those conclusions if you pay attention. Yet, it's worth reviewing anyway that in 1999, Guterres gave an address outlining his desire for global socialism, and how his vision for the world would depend upon international organizations like the UN, global regulations, and cooperation between non-government actors. He ended his speech, saying, "Dear friends and dear comrades ... 'We must not abandon utopia because the antagonism between ideas and reality is both the major dilemma of democratic socialism and its fascinating driving force.'" Guterres is still pursuing that "utopia" and is using "global boiling" to enact it — with a sense of urgency, too. Don't think, just do it, Guterres seems to be saying. "It is still possible to limit global temperature rise to 1.5C and avoid the very worst of climate change but only with dramatic, immediate climate action," he said Thursday. "We have seen some progress — a robust rollout of renewables and some positive steps from sectors such as shipping — but none of this is going far enough or fast

enough. Accelerating temperatures demand accelerated action.” Yet Guterres is wrong. The experts are not all-seeing Gods who can predict the future, much less the weather. As best-selling author George Gilder has long touted, the sort of central planning supported by Guterres cannot account for “human creativity, which always comes as a surprise to us. If creativity didn’t come as a surprise, we wouldn’t need it, and socialism would work.” What can work? Gilder is out with a new book, titled “Life After Capitalism.” The book isn’t against capitalism — rather it argues that its critics and many of its defenders get capitalism wrong. The driving force of capitalism is not greed, rather it’s “creativity and faith in the future.” In the book, which casts doubts on global warming boiling, Gilder writes, “Let’s assume, hypothetically, that Co2 somehow becomes a problem. Capitalism deals with problems by pursuing opportunities.” Socialism deals with problems through more government control. “Government mandates and directorates and global resets will not shape the future,” Gilder predicted in “Life After Capitalism.” “They can only retard progress, and only so far as we let them, if we live in democratic countries. What will really shape the future is human creativity, and a new wave of technological entrepreneurs,” he added. Gilder also warned, “More than ever in America, we face the prospect of a life after capitalism in its most negative sense: a life of scarcity, deprivation, and fear.” And that is exactly what Guterres has to offer: Our time left to save the planet is scarce — so is clean air. So we must deprive ourselves of modern technologies, conveniences, and abundant resources of energy. If you don’t, everybody you know will die from “global boiling.” The experts will save the day. What a load of bunk. Socialists never change, but the words they use to sell their ideology does. The views expressed in this piece are the author’s own and do not necessarily represent those of The Daily Wire.

73: Globalists at Munich Security Conference Scheme to Undermine Voters and Protect ‘Climate Action’ from ‘Political Headwinds’

Globalists are scheming to undermine voters worldwide and protect “climate action” from “political headwinds.” The elites — many of whom buzz around on private jets — at the upcoming Munich Security Conference are openly plotting ways to undermine voters worldwide who have rejected climate change insanity, posting on X Monday, “When is it too hot to handle? #MSC2025 will put traditional and non-traditional security threats on the agenda.” The post contains a graphic which reads, “How can climate action be shielded from political headwinds?” The 2025 Munich Security Report also undermines the agenda that individuals worldwide voted for. A summary of the report cites favorite leftist buzzwords and agenda items including “inclusive economic growth” and “threats” like “climate change: The report shows that visions of multipolarity are also polarized. This makes it increasingly difficult to adapt the existing order peacefully, avoid new arms races, prevent violent conflicts within and among states, allow for more inclusive economic growth, and jointly address shared threats like climate change. As the great and not-so-great powers cannot tackle these challenges alone, their cooperation will be crucial. But for this cooperation to materialize, the world could well use some “depolarization.” 2025 will show whether this is in the cards – or whether the world will grow yet more divided than it is. The conference will be held Friday, February 14, 2025 until Sunday, February 16, 2025. America, certainly,

voted against the leftist climate change agenda by electing President Donald Trump, who on day one signed an executive order titled, "PUTTING AMERICA FIRST IN INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL AGREEMENTS." "In recent years, the United States has purported to join international agreements and initiatives that do not reflect our country's values or our contributions to the pursuit of economic and environmental objectives," the order reads in part. It further contends that the agreements "steer American taxpayer dollars to countries that do not require, or merit, financial assistance in the interests of the American people." Ultimately, he withdrew the U.S. from the Paris Agreement and has put an emphasis on American energy, rejecting the electrical vehicle push and embracing fossil fuels. But it is not just America rejected the climate change narrative, either. As Breitbart News reported, "A U.N. demand for countries to submit new targets for slashing carbon emissions was almost entirely ignored Monday, with heavy polluters China, India and the European Union amongst the biggest names on a lengthy absentee list."

74: Earth's storage of water in soil, lakes and rivers is dwindling. And it's especially bad for farming

University of Melbourne hydrology professor Dongryeol Ryu and his collaborator Ki-Weon Seo were on a train to visit Ryu's family when they found something startling. Stopped at a station for technical issues, Seo had pulled out his computer to pass the time with some work when a result popped up in their data that Ryu could hardly believe: It suggested a "remarkable" amount of Earth's water stored on land had been depleted. "At first we thought, 'That's an error in the model,'" Ryu said. After a year of checking, they determined it wasn't. Their paper, published Thursday in the journal *Science*, finds that global warming has notably reduced the amount of water that's being stored around the world in soil, lakes, rivers, snow and other places, with potentially irreversible impacts on agriculture and sea level rise. The researchers say the significant shift of water from land to the ocean is particularly worrisome for farming, and hope their work will strengthen efforts to reduce water overuse. Earth's soil moisture dropped by over 2,000 gigatons in roughly the last 20 years, the study says. For context, that's more than twice Greenland's ice loss from 2002 to 2006, the researchers noted. Meanwhile, the frequency of once-in-a-decade agricultural and ecological droughts has increased, global sea levels have risen and the Earth's pole has shifted. Ryu and his colleagues used three different data sources to verify that Earth storing less water on land than it once did. He also said their results reveal a deeper truth about the land, one farmers have to contend with frequently: When a big, dramatic rainfall event comes after a drought, sometimes leading to huge floods, that doesn't mean the water stored underground has recovered. "It seems that lands lost their elasticity to recover the previous level," he said. Whether that elasticity ever returns will depend on whether humans take action on climate change and significantly change water use, the researchers say. The increasing heat stress on plants means they need more water. Agriculture, particularly irrigated agriculture, continues to draw up more water than it can afford. And humans are continuing to emit greenhouse gases without a strong effort to reverse course. "There are long-term climate changes that have happened in the past and presumably could occur in the future that could reverse the trend described, but probably not in our

lifetimes,” said Katharine Jacobs, a University of Arizona professor of environmental science who wasn’t involved in the study. “Because greenhouse gases will continue to cause global warming well into the future, the rate of evaporation and transpiration is not likely to reduce any time soon.” The study also confirms an explanation for a slight wobble in the rotation of the Earth — it’s being driven by the changing moisture levels of the planet. “When I read this thing, I was very excited,” said Luis Samaniego, a professor of hydrology and data science at the University of Potsdam who wrote an overview commentary discussing the findings in *Science*. “It’s a fascinating puzzle of all disciplines that came at the right moment to verify something that was not possible before.” But Samaniego stressed that the finding isn’t only fascinating; it’s a wake-up call. Imagine the planet’s wobble like an electrocardiogram for the Earth, he said. Seeing this result is like detecting an arrhythmia. Choosing not to listen to the doctor — “that’s what we are playing around with at the moment,” he said.

75: Some sea turtles are laying eggs earlier in response to climate change

For each 1-degree-Celsius increase in sea temp, green sea turtles lay eggs over 6 days earlier. Green sea turtles are adjusting their nesting habits in response to rising global temperatures. Individual females are laying their eggs earlier in the season to cope with warmer conditions, researchers report in the February Proceedings of the Royal Society B. Scientists have long known that the sex of most turtle species is determined by incubation temperature — higher temperatures give life to females, and lower ones produce males. As climate change drives up temperatures, more females and fewer males are being born, potentially weakening populations. Extreme heat can also be lethal for the eggs. To understand how turtles are adapting, conservation ecologist Annette Broderick and colleagues analyzed three decades of nesting data from around 600 tagged green turtles (*Chelonia mydas*) on the beaches of Northern Cyprus. The data included the number of successful hatchlings in each nest and temperatures during incubation. The team found that individual females nested earlier as temperatures rose, laying eggs just over six days earlier, on average, for each 1-degree-Celsius increase. This is “the first time anyone looked at individual turtles and looked at how they’re changing,” rather than studying nesting behavior at a population level, says Broderick, of the University of Exeter in England. While previous research has shown the nesting activity of whole turtle populations moving earlier, the new study confirms that individual turtles are actively adjusting their behavior in response to climate change. “This may seem like a foregone conclusion. It really isn’t,” says study coauthor Mollie Rickwood, a marine biologist at Victoria University of Wellington in New Zealand. That’s because population-wide shifts in nesting behavior could be happening for multiple reasons. “For example,” Broderick says, “each female may be consistent in the time she nests each year, but new recruits to the population may lay earlier than older nesters, therefore making the average earlier.” By looking at individual animals, the researchers showed that all females are adjusting their timing. Along with temperatures, breeding experience and number of clutches laid in a year equally influenced the timing of nesting. Other studies suggest that the earlier egg-laying seen now in some

turtle species seems to be enough to offset the effects of warming temperatures on the eggs. “This gives them a much better outlook in the face of climate change,” Rickwood says.

76: Alarmists: Global Warming Produced ‘41 Extra Days of Dangerous Heat’

People around the planet suffered “an average of 41 extra days of dangerous heat this year because of human-caused climate change,” CBS News lamented Friday. The report cited a joint analysis by World Weather Attribution and Climate Central, which claimed that 2024 was “likely” the hottest year ever measured.

“The finding is devastating but utterly unsurprising,” said Friederike Otto, the leader of World Weather Attribution. “Climate change did play a role, and often a major role in most of the events we studied, making heat, droughts, tropical cyclones and heavy rainfall more likely and more intense across the world, destroying lives and livelihoods of millions and often uncounted numbers of people.”

“As long as the world keeps burning fossil fuels, this will only get worse,” Otto warned.

The new report does not tell the whole story, however, leaving out what is arguably the most important point.

Conspicuous by its absence in the report were statistics concerning the reduction in days of extreme cold, which is far more dangerous for human beings than extreme heat. It stands to reason that a slightly warming planet will mitigate the effects of extreme cold.

Of those who die from weather-related causes each year, many more people die from cold weather than from heat, and many more die during the winter than during the summer. As average temperatures have increased around the world in recent years, fewer weather-related deaths have been registered, in part because the decrease in deaths from the cold more than offsets any increase in deaths from heat.

According to data published by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), over the past

twenty years annual heat-related deaths in the United States have ranged between 0.9 and 3.6 per million people, whereas cold-related deaths have ranged between 3.6 and 5.9 per million people.

The two graphs below, furnished by the EPA using data from the CDC, depict this disparity visually.

The imbalance between heat-based deaths and cold-based deaths becomes even more apparent when looking at the global scenario, where cold-related deaths dwarf heat-related deaths by nearly ten to one.

The UK-based Lancet medical journal, which regularly laments the dire consequences of climate change, published a study in 2021, which found that 5,083,173 deaths worldwide were associated with “non-optimal temperatures per year,” and then went on to explain that the vast majority of these were “cold-related” rather than “heat-related.”

According to the Lancet, people around the world are 9.4 times more likely to die from the cold than from the heat. While 155,000 people die each year from extremely high temperatures, 4.5 million people die from the cold, the Lancet reported.

It added that over the past 20 years, the death rate from heat has slightly increased due to global warming (+0.21 percent), but that the death rate from the cold decreased by more than twice as much (-0.51 percent) during the same period.

Climate alarmists’ fixation with warm weather while ignoring the effects of cold weather suggest an agenda that goes beyond scientific curiosity. An unbiased study would not only make a case for the ill effects of global warming, but also its possible or real benefits.

77: Fringe Scientists Warn of ‘Irreversible Climate Disaster’ from Fossil Fuels

A fringe group of climate scientists have published an apocalyptic report warning that “much of the very fabric of life on Earth is imperiled” by climate change, in the latest attack

on low-cost fossil fuels.

Led by Oregon-based climate activists William J. Ripple and Christopher Wolf, the writers assert that humanity is “on the brink of an irreversible climate disaster” because of increasing greenhouse gas emissions and ecosystem change.

“This is a global emergency beyond any doubt,” they declare in their BioScience article titled “The 2024 state of the climate report: Perilous times on planet Earth.” “We are stepping into a critical and unpredictable new phase of the climate crisis.”

The authors point to 35 “planetary vital signs,” insisting that 25 are at record levels, driving a series of “unprecedented” climate-linked disasters over the past year.

Reading between the lines, however, it becomes evident that what really rankles the writers is humanity’s ongoing insistence on using readily available, low-cost fossil fuels instead of transitioning to undependable, expensive renewables.

Fossil fuel emissions “have increased to an all-time high,” the authors lament, and “climate impacts escalate, bringing forth scenes of unprecedented disasters around the world and human and nonhuman suffering.”

“We are concerned about recent trends in many planetary vital signs, including record-breaking greenhouse gas concentrations, tree cover loss due to wildfires and ice loss,” Ripple states. “We are especially troubled by global consumption of coal and oil reaching all-time highs in 2023.”

“The climate crisis is becoming increasingly severe, and we are now faced with many climate-related disasters along with catastrophic risks in the longer term,” he adds. “We are continuing to go in the wrong direction, with enormous fossil fuel emissions and

unsustainable consumption by the wealthy.”

As is customary in doomsday articles such as this one, the authors threaten a humanity-crushing climate disaster without ever showing how it will come about. Will billions drown from flooding? Will entire cities sink into the earth? Will children bake in their homes from kiln-like temperatures? We are left to guess.

“We find ourselves amid an abrupt climate upheaval, a dire situation never before encountered in the annals of human existence,” the authors confidently declare.

“We have now brought the planet into climatic conditions never witnessed by us or our prehistoric relatives within our genus, Homo,” they add.

What the authors do share with us is their conviction that we are headed toward “a complex situation where climate controlling feedback loops and tipping point systems are interconnected in a way that could trigger self-perpetuating processes that amplify warming beyond human control.”

This severe climate scenario could ultimately help trigger “societal collapse” a possibility that is the focus of increasing research, the report ominously warns.

What is to be done to avert Armageddon?

Nothing short of “immediate, high impact, and socially just climate policies” are needed to avoid a further decline of Earth’s vital signs, Ripple contends, prioritizing a rapid phase down of fossil fuel use.

“In addition, the adoption of a sufficiently high global carbon price could help to dramatically reduce emissions while providing further funding for climate action,” he suggests.

Predictably, the report also proposes “stabilising and gradually reducing the human population,” despite the rising concerns of a serious population implosion that is already negatively affecting many parts of the globe.

Ripple insists that the upcoming UN COP29 climate summit — scheduled to begin this November in Baku, Azerbaijan — should produce a binding agreement on global fossil fuel phaseout, along with a rapid timeline to kickstart climate action.

“We also hope that wealthy countries will increase their climate finance pledges to better support the Global South in scaling up renewable energy capacity and adapting to climate change,” he argues.

78: Low carbon farming 'essential' for climate goals

Low carbon farming practices are "essential" to meeting Northern Ireland's climate goals, the Climate Change Committee (CCC) says.

And the executive "will need to broaden and accelerate action from today".

The CCC has recommended a 77% reduction in overall emissions by 2040 in its advice on Northern Ireland's fourth carbon budget.

As part of a new pathway to reach the legally-binding 2050 net zero target, the CCC has made 18 priority recommendations, including decarbonising electricity supply, support for low-carbon home heating and increasing infrastructure for electric vehicle charging.

In a statement, the Department of Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs of Northern Ireland (DAERA) said it welcomed the publication of the CCC's advice which "will need to be carefully considered by DAERA and by other departments to help inform the best pathway for Northern Ireland to decarbonise and to deliver on our net zero ambition in line with the principles of a Just Transition."

It added that a 16-week public consultation will be carried out, with a view to progressing legislation before the end of 2025.

Carbon budgets set out how much carbon can be emitted over a period of time.

The interim chair of the CCC, Professor Piers Forster, said the team was "delighted" to be able to present a "good news story" about how Northern Ireland can decarbonise.

"To deliver against its ambitious climate commitments, immediate action is necessary.

"Action by government, businesses, and farmers can drive a rapid shift away from fossil fuels, boost investment, and benefit households."

'Unrealistic net zero goal'

The Ulster Farmers Union (UFU) says the budgetary recommendations laid out by the CCC highlight the "drastic measures required to meet the unrealistic net zero goal in Northern Ireland (NI) by 2050".

In a statement the UFC said it has "consistently opposed forced cuts to livestock numbers, which would devastate rural communities and our national food security" and urged that "food production and climate action must be balanced".

It added that "farmers are committed to emissions reductions but must not be unfairly targeted" and warned that "suppressing local food production will only increase reliance on imports from countries with higher emissions".

Advice from the CCC is not policy but is usually accepted by governments.

Its recommendations for the first, second and third carbon budgets in Northern Ireland were put into law by the Assembly in December.

Electrification of technologies in transport, buildings, and industry, with the expansion and decarbonisation of the electricity system, will deliver 55% of the reductions required to meet the fourth budget.

While devolved authorities don't have control over all the areas, the executive does have power to act on the build-out of clean electricity, charging infrastructure for cars, and electric heating.

Acting on these would "significantly contribute" towards Northern Ireland's ambition as well as creating opportunities for new jobs, the CCC says.

It expects much of the needed investment to come from the private sector, but adds that government support is required for woodland creation and peatland restoration.

The CCC anticipates that demand for electricity will more than double as electrification replaces fossil fuels in home heating and domestic transport.

Low-carbon fuels, carbon capture and storage, low-carbon farming and nature-based measures will also make "important contributions".

Low carbon farming

More than three-fifths of the reductions required to meet the fourth budget will come from the domestic transport, buildings, and agriculture and land use sectors.

Agriculture is the largest contributor of greenhouse gases in Northern Ireland.

It is "essential" that low carbon farming practices are developed, according to the CCC.

And farmers should be encouraged "to diversify land use from livestock farming to measures such as peatland restoration and woodland creation".

Even then, "engineered removals" will have to be ramped up in the fourth carbon budget to keep Northern Ireland on track.

These are human-made processes to take carbon from the atmosphere and permanently lock it away.

They include Direct Air Carbon Capture and Storage, or DACCS, as well as Bioenergy with Carbon Capture and Storage (BECCS).

The CCC has relocated DACCS into Northern Ireland from elsewhere in the UK to model the pathway and says the executive would have to ensure conditions are in place to attract

operators.

It adds that other choices could be taken by the Northern Ireland Executive.

The advice goes beyond what the CCC set out as Northern Ireland's contribution to the UK's Balanced Pathway in its seventh carbon budget.

That is because the CCC believes Northern Ireland's legally-binding 2050 Net Zero target requires a more ambitious effort.

79: US could see return of acid rain due to Trump's rollbacks, says scientist who discovered it

Gene Likens, who first identified acidic rainwater in 1960s, said the Trump administration's 'rollbacks are alarming'

Oliver Milman

damaged trees in a forest

Damage from acid rain in Tennessee in 2006. Photograph: Avalon/Universal Images Group/Getty Images

The US could be plunged back into an era of toxic acid rain, an environmental problem thought to have been solved decades ago, due to the Donald Trump administration's rollback of pollution protections, the scientist who discovered the existence of acid rain in North America has warned.

A blitzkrieg launched by Trump's Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on clean air and water regulations could revert the US to a time when cities were routinely shrouded in smog and even help usher back acid rain, according to Gene Likens, whose experiments helped identify acidic rainwater in the 1960s.

While drastic improvements in America's air quality have seemingly consigned acid rain to a problem belonging to a bygone era, Likens said if rules curbing toxic emissions from power plants, cars and trucks are aggressively scaled back, the specter of acid rain could again haunt the US.

"I'm very worried that might happen, it's certainly not impossible that it could happen,"

Likens, 90, told the Guardian. Likens is still involved in a long-term monitoring project, stretching back to 1976, to sample rainwater for acidity but this program has just had its funding cut by the Trump administration.

“I hope we don’t go back to the old days, so these rollbacks are very alarming,” Likens said. “I care about the health of my children and grandchildren, I want them to have clean air to breathe. I care about clean water and clean and healthy soil, I want them to have that too.”

It was in 1963 when Likens, as a young scientist, sampled rainwater in the Hubbard Brook Experimental forest in the White Mountains of New Hampshire and found that it was 100 times more acidic than expected. “That was really an ‘a-ha!’ moment that led us to question what was happening,” he said.

Years of subsequent study by Likens and other scientists ascertained that pollution wafting from coal-fired power plants in the American midwest was being transported by the wind, primarily to the eastern US and Canada. Sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides in the pollution reacted with water and oxygen to form sulfuric and nitric acids, combining with water to fall to the ground as acid rain.

By 1980, the average rainfall in the US was 10 times more acidic than normal, with a devastating environmental impact. Lakes and streams became too acidic to support fish and amphibians, nutrients were stripped from soil and the rain damaged plants, trees and even buildings.

A national outcry about acid rain, with newspaper cartoonists depicting people’s umbrellas dissolving and mounting evidence presented by Likens and others in public talks eventually spurred political action.

In 1990, an update to the Clean Air Act targeting acid rain by reducing power plant pollution was passed resoundingly by Congress and signed by President George HW Bush, a Republican. “Every city in America should have clean air,” Bush said as he signed the bill. “With this legislation I firmly believe we will.”

“Acid rain is an example of a major environmental success story – the public spoke up and the politicians listened,” said Likens. Recent sampling of rainwater and soils in the White Mountains region shows acidity levels have fallen by 85% since a peak period in the 1970s, although Likens said the soil remains degraded and any return of acid rain to ecosystems in this fragile state would be disastrous.

“If the Trump administration starts releasing controls on emissions we are going to destroy that success story,” he said.

The plan by the EPA to eliminate or weaken 31 regulations, a move called a “dagger straight

into the heart of the climate change religion” by the agency’s administrator, Lee Zeldin, risks many thousands of extra deaths and a litany of heart, lung and other illnesses, according to the EPA’s own estimates of the rules’ benefits.

However, the exact scale of the rollbacks will probably take several years and various court battles to become fully apparent. The US, too, is a very different country from the one before the EPA’s foundation in 1970, when rampant air pollution blotted out the skies in cities such as New York and Los Angeles and rivers were so polluted they caught fire.

Major air pollutants have plummeted in recent decades, due to regulations as well as technological upgrades to power plants and vehicle catalytic converters. Coal, meanwhile, has declined as a power source in favor of cleaner-burning gas and renewables, although Trump has sought to stymie clean energy and help resurrect coal, the dirtiest of fossil fuels.

aerial view of smog over a city

Smog over downtown Los Angeles in 1975. Photograph: Ron Eisenberg/Michael Ochs Archives via Getty Images

“I don’t think it’s likely we will see acid rain again because I don’t think there will be a comeback for coal – the main beneficiary of a relaxation in regulations will probably be gas,” said William Reilly, who was EPA administrator in 1990 when the federal action on acid rain was taken.

Reilly said the Clean Air Act amendments were a “home run” victory for public health and a high point in bipartisan cooperation between Republicans and Democrats on the environment. He added the Trump administration was now seeking to take the US in a radically different direction.

“I do think this administration will take us back to a pre-EPA world,” Reilly said. “That will mean unbreathable air, places where there is pollution that you can see, rivers that burn. That is what it was like before and that is what it could be like again if enforcement is cut back.”

There is a viewpoint now that scientists are the bad guys, that the science is corrupt – things that just aren’t true

Other scientists said a return of acid rain was possible, although it would be gradual rather than immediate. “It’s not like you’ll wake up tomorrow and it will be 1975 in terms of acid rain but we could move in that direction,” said Richard Peltier, an environmental scientist at the University of Massachusetts.

“It would take a number of years but why would we want to do that? It’s frustrating because we know improved air quality is good for the public. There is a viewpoint now that scientists are the bad guys, that the science is corrupt – things that just aren’t true.”

Several of the rules targeted for reversal by Trump's EPA are aimed at slashing large amounts of sulfur dioxide, among other pollutants, such as standards around coal plant emissions. "We aren't sure how far back Mr Zeldin is thinking of taking this," said Murray McBride, a crop and soil scientist at Cornell University. "It would take a dramatic rollback to allow that much sulphur dioxide, but it's possible."

After alerting Americans to the dangers of acid rain, Likens founded the Institute of Ecosystem Studies (now the Cary Institute of Ecosystem Studies) to conduct further research.

At Cornell University he then set up a separate monitoring system, near New York's Finger Lakes, which has been running since 1976 but had its funding cut this month by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (Noaa) as part of a Trump administration effort to shrink the size of government.

"There was no explanation given why they cut the funding and I'm not sure if we can keep the project going," said Likens, who conducts this work himself alongside two technicians. "If we don't have the funding for research to look at what's happening, we are just blind. It's an awful way for the country to go."

Likens continues to conduct lectures, often to people who were not born when acid rain was a major problem in the US. "I try to explain to them that this was one of the few environmental success stories that we have," he said. "To see that get turned around is just sad. It makes me extremely sad."

An EPA spokesperson did not answer questions about a potential return of acid rain or how the agency will ensure more people will not become sick or die because of the regulatory rollbacks.

"The US can protect the environment and grow the economy at the same time," the spokesperson said, adding that the rollbacks were "the greatest and most consequential day of deregulation in American history".

"This is a very important change from the previous administration's attempts to shut down American energy and make our citizens more reliant on foreign fossil fuels, resulting in worse environmental outcomes globally, billions in fresh funding to many of our nation's adversaries at the expense to all Americans, and economic pain on those who can least afford it."

80: Arctic sea ice hits record low for its usual peak growth period

A boat travels through a frozen sea inlet outside in Nuuk, Greenland, March 6, 2025. (AP Photo/Evgeniy Maloletka)

Arctic sea ice had its weakest winter buildup since record-keeping began 47 years ago, a symptom of climate change that will have repercussions globally, scientists said Thursday.

The Arctic reaches its maximum sea ice in March each year and then starts a six-month melt season. The National Snow and Ice Data Center said the peak measurement taken Saturday was 5.53 million square miles (14.33 million square kilometers) — about 30,000 square miles (80,000 square kilometers) smaller than the lowest previous peak in 2017.

That's a difference about the size of California.

"Warming temperatures are what's causing the ice to decline," ice data scientist Walt Meier said. "You know, sea ice in particular is very sensitive... 31 degrees is ice skating and 33 degrees it's swimming."

Jennifer Francis, a scientist at the Woodwell Climate Research Center in Cape Cod, said this is yet another ringing alarm bell in the form of a broken record.

"Disappearing sea ice is a particularly worrisome story because it's truly an early warning system alerting us about a variety of hard-to-see changes," Francis said in an email.

Related Stories

Scientists said warming conditions in the Arctic — the region is warming four times faster than the rest of the world — affect weather elsewhere. Pressure and temperature differences between north and south shrink. That weakens the jet stream, that moves weather systems along, making it dip further south with cold outbreaks and storms that often get stuck and rain or snow more, according to the snow and ice center and Francis.

"The warming winter atmosphere above the Arctic Circle does impact large-scale weather patterns that do influence for those of us outside the Arctic," said Julianne Stroeve, an ice scientist at the University of Manitoba.

Of the smaller sea ice, Stroeve also noted that it's not only that there's less of it. The remaining ice is thin enough for more of it to melt quickly this summer, Stroeve said. She cautioned that a record low area in the winter doesn't guarantee a record small area in the summer.

Melting Arctic sea ice — mostly in the summer — is making the polar bear population smaller, weaker and hungrier because they rely on the sea ice to hunt from, scientists said. And winter sea ice is especially important for fisheries and seal pups, Meier said.

Arctic sea ice's biggest year since record-keeping began was 1979, at 6.42 million square miles (16.64 million square kilometers). That means since satellites began tracking it, Arctic sea ice's winter peak has shrunk by about the size of Pakistan.

When winter sea ice is doing well it can extend more than halfway down the Earth toward the equator, reach Japan, China and Canada's Gulf of St. Lawrence, Meier said.

Meier said sea ice extent is shrinking all four seasons, but the most important season for the overall health of the Arctic ice is the summer. That's because ice-free waters warm up quicker, hold more energy and make fall and winter warmer and weaker.

The five lowest amounts for winter peak Arctic sea ice have been since 2015.

Earlier this month, Antarctica came close to breaking a record for record low sea ice — this is the time of year the region hits its minimum — and ended up with the second-lowest sea level on record.

There's more sea ice in the Antarctic in general and the two poles are timed a bit differently, but in February, global sea ice — the combination of Arctic and Antarctic — hit a record low, Meier said.

81: Methane emissions from Queensland mine may be gross underestimates, UN research finds

Data collected by two planes suggests large open-cut coalmine in Bowen Basin is releasing methane at higher rates than official estimates

Graham Readfearn

A light plane flies over an open-cut coalmine

A UNEP study that flew two planes with methane equipment over the Hail Creek coalmine in the Bowen Basin, found methane levels were likely somewhere between three and eight times above the annual emissions reported by the mine. Photograph: Jorg Hacker Airborne Research Australia

Emissions of the potent greenhouse gas methane at a Queensland coalmine were likely between three and eight times higher than officially reported, according to UN-backed research that flew aircraft over the site.

Queensland's open-cut coalmines are known to be a major source of methane and experts are worried that official figures could be a gross underestimation of actual emissions.

The research, part of the UN environment programme's International Methane Emissions Observatory (IMEO), is thought to be the first time monitoring equipment on aircraft have

been used to directly measure a coalmine's methane emissions.

Two aircraft with different types of monitoring equipment and flying at different altitudes looked for plumes of methane coming from Glencore's Hail Creek coalmine in the Bowen Basin – a site highlighted in a previous study as a major emitter.

Glencore challenged the results of the research, published in the American Chemical Society (ACS) journal Environmental Science and Technology Letters.

Glencore's Hail Creek coalmine methane emissions could be higher than official reports – video

In 2023, the mine reported total emissions of 0.53m tonnes of CO₂-equivalent (CO₂e) – including methane and other CO₂ emissions – to the government's safeguard mechanism scheme, which covers sites with high emissions.

But data collected by the UN team's aircraft suggested emissions just from Hail Creek's escaping methane were likely between 1.5Mt and 4.2Mt CO₂e per year.

Sign up for Guardian Australia's breaking news email

Dr Stephen Harris, at the University of New South Wales and UNEP's IMEO, said the two aircraft carried different types of methane monitoring equipment but yielded similar results, "increasing confidence in our results".

"The results suggest this open-cut coalmine, previously identified by satellites as one of the Bowen Basin's higher emitters, is releasing methane at higher rates than official estimates based on widely used emission factors in Queensland.

"This tells us that more advanced, mine-specific inventory methods – verified by atmospheric measurements – are needed at this facility."

Levels of methane in the atmosphere have more than doubled since preindustrial times, contributing about 0.5C of the global heating measured so far. The gas has been rising at a record pace in recent years and two-thirds of emissions are human-caused.

Methane is about 80 times more potent than carbon dioxide over a 20-year period at warming the planet. Cutting these emissions is seen as a quick way to slow global heating.

Australia is one of 159 countries to have signed a pledge to cut methane emissions by 30% in the decade to 2030.

Sign up to Breaking News Australia
Get the most important news as it breaks

Privacy Notice: Newsletters may contain info about charities, online ads, and content funded by outside parties. For more information see our Privacy Policy. We use Google reCaptcha to protect our website and the Google Privacy Policy and Terms of Service apply. The Albanese government is reviewing how miners calculate the amounts of methane released as they dig for coal. Large emitters have been asked to move from using industry-wide estimates to direct measurements.

But the Climate Change Authority and others are concerned the current framework for using direct measurements – known as “method 2” – is out of date and could also underestimate emissions.

An expert group chaired by the former chief scientist, Cathy Foley, which has been given the UN-led study to review, is examining the methodology.

A report last year from RepuTex, an energy and carbon market modelling consultancy, said as mines moved to method 2 there would probably be a fall in methane emissions reported until the framework was tightened to address integrity concerns.

A spokesperson for the climate change and energy minister, Chris Bowen, said: “The Albanese government has taken strong action to improve methane measurement and continues to progress opportunities identified by the Climate Change Authority in their review of the scheme.”

Glencore said in a statement it had “significant doubts” about the research, claiming it used “out of date” data with aerial surveys over a period representing “less than 1% of the mine’s operating period over a two-year period”.

The company said it had moved to “method 2” of measuring emissions at Hail Creek last year and all its Australian coalmines were now using this method. The study did not reflect “inherent mining variability” or emissions upwind of the mine.

“We believe these deficiencies in the paper published by ACS highlight again the shortfalls of satellite/remote sensing methods and unsuitability for annual inventory reporting,” the statement said.

The company was investigating ways “to abate fugitive emissions feasibly and practicably at our open cut mines,” the statement added.

82: Every Dollar Spent on Solar Energy is Wasted

Solar electricity has big problems. Solar is intermittent. It stops working if clouds obscure the sun. It does not work at night. Solar works much better in the summer than in the winter. Solar is peaky. Electricity delivery peaks in the middle of the day and is weaker in the early morning or late afternoon.

Solar electricity is very expensive compared to electricity generated by natural gas or coal. Unsubsidized solar electricity costs about \$150 per megawatt hour. Using natural gas, one can generate electricity for as little as \$20 per megawatt hour -- over seven times less. The high cost of solar is hidden by an extensive system of subsidies.

The intermittent delivery of electricity could be smoothed if it were possible to store the electricity for use when solar is not working. But it's not possible. Bridging the times and seasons when solar is not working by means of storage is not remotely possible because the amount of storage needed would cost ten or even a hundred times more than the solar farms generating the electricity.

There is a demand for electricity storage. Storage can solve the peakiness problem that plagues solar. Because solar output surges in the middle of the day It will often overtax the ability of the local electrical grid to accept the electricity. The solution is time-shifting batteries that store excessive midday power and release it later in the day or in the early evening. New solar plants in solar-heavy states are equipped with time-shifting batteries. Time-shifting batteries increase the cost of solar electricity by about a third.

The U.S. is spending about \$50 billion per year on new solar electricity plants. The money comes from government subsidies and increased electricity rates. New solar plants with a capacity, or peak output, of 27 terrawatts were built in 2023. The solar plants are backed up by fossil-fuel plants capable of stepping in when solar is not working. If existing solar plants were razed, the electric grid would continue to work smoothly using the fossil-fuel plants that would otherwise be on backup duty for solar.

When solar electricity is generated, the backup plants are throttled back and cheap fossil-fuel electricity is replaced with expensive solar electricity. The result is that in solar-heavy states like California residential electrical rates often exceed 50 cents per kilowatt hour or about four times as much compared to states that are not buying into the solar mythology.

Solar electricity is justified by claiming that we may run out of fossil fuels. Another major justification is that using solar will help prevent a climate catastrophe because solar does not emit CO₂.

Solar is also promoted by claiming that solar electricity is cheaper than using fossil fuels.

We might run out of fossil fuels someday. But the U.S. has enough coal and natural gas to last for hundreds of years. No matter what the Sierra Club says, modern fossil-fuel generating plants are not giant air polluters. Insisting that we plan for the hypothetical exhaustion of fossil fuels in the future is like demanding that Columbus devise a plan for interstate horse trails to be built 500 years after his discovery of America.

The climate crisis is widely recognized as being junk science that showers career benefits on climate scientists. Predicting a future catastrophe is a wonderful way to attract attention and finance. Scientists who criticize the catastrophe theory are routinely persecuted, clear evidence that something is amiss in the world of climate science. Close examination of this so-called science, in the British government Stern Review, reveals that the catastrophe at most is a mild shift in the climate. Even that mild shift is probably an exaggeration.

Using solar electricity instead of natural gas electricity, to reduce CO2 emissions is very expensive, costing about \$400 for each metric ton of CO2 not emitted. Nuclear energy reduces CO2 emissions for three times less cost per metric ton. There is enough uranium and thorium to provide nuclear energy for thousands of years. Nuclear electricity is not intermittent and does not require backup plants. Roughly, a single truck can carry nuclear fuel that can supply as much energy as 5000 railroad cars full of coal. Nuclear fuel is much cheaper than any fossil fuel. There are clear paths to make nuclear energy safer and cheaper such as modular reactors or liquid salt thorium reactors.

The current adoption of solar energy on a mass scale is difficult to explain. It is too simple to blame it on collective insanity. The technical and financial analysis is not difficult. Many critics have written articles and books pointing out the fallacies. Somehow, the critics are ignored. Politicians, media, and academics are driving the solar bandwagon full speed ahead.

My best explanation for the survival of the solar hoax is that when the CO2-driven global warming theory gained popularity there was a need for a method of generating electricity without CO2 emissions. The obvious solution, nuclear energy, was rejected because the environmental lobby had previously demonized nuclear energy so much that it would be difficult to rehabilitate it -- that left hydro and various marginal energy sources. Hydro was rejected because the environmental lobby previously demonized dams. Hydro also lacks scalability, because there is a limited supply of suitable sites. The most practical remaining technologies that are scalable are wind and solar. Generous government subsidies hide the high cost of wind and solar. Although wind energy is not discussed here, it has problems similar to solar energy problems.

The solar electricity industry depends on government subsidies and mandates. It is not surprising that a \$50 billion a year industry is able to influence the government to protect its franchise. Many other industries of dubious value are protected by government favors. For example, half the corn crop is turned into ethanol and burned up in gasoline. That activity is supported because Republican farming states need places to sell their corn.

The media rarely critically examines the solar industry. I mark that up to scientific ignorance. Very few media types have any understanding of engineering or science. They can't independently examine the issues because to them it is all a mystery.

The professors that support solar energy are very dependent on government grants that are heavily influenced by politics. Supporting uneconomic but politically popular energy solutions is a matter of career survival. Principled critics risk cancellation.

Solar energy survives due to a web of ignorance, financial opportunism, and promotion by interested parties. Killing the industry will save \$50 billion per year and be a victory for rational policy.

83: Global warming? A new ice age? The only certainty is that YOU'RE paying for the hysteria of our politicians

Who would possibly have thought it? The latest news is that the world may be threatened by a sharp drop in temperatures, possibly so severe that it could herald a new mini ice age. And one reason being put forward for this is that all the pollution being chucked out by thousands of coal-fired power stations may be blocking the sun's heat from the Earth. Dr Robert Kaufman of Boston University blamed China this week. 'During the Chinese economic expansion there was a huge increase in sulphur emissions,' he said. And this was the cause of global cooling. But hang on a moment. Aren't these new climate scaremongers the very same people who only a few years back were telling us that the planet was in danger of being fried to a crisp by runaway global warming? And wasn't it on their say so that the world's politicians, led by our own here in Britain, were committing us to spending hundreds of billions of pounds to save the planet from the catastrophic warming caused by those same evil power stations? The question this extraordinary turn of events raises is whether any of these supposed experts actually have the faintest idea what they are talking about. But perhaps the most bizarre thing about this latest twist in the ongoing climate scare story is the way it takes us precisely back to where it all started 40 years ago. All of us today have become so accustomed to the notion of global warming that it is hard to believe that in the Seventies, U.S. scientists began to warn us the world was heading for a cooling so severe it might even herald a new ice age. This was because for 30 years, after a sharp rise earlier in the 20th century, global temperatures had markedly dropped. And the cause of this cooling, it was argued by the U.S. scientists, led by climatologists Stephen Schneider and James Hansen, was all the sulphur dioxide and other particulates being chucked out by burning fossil fuels — notably those from coal-fired power stations. Fifteen years later, the very same scientists were at the forefront of the great panic over global warming. Schneider, who became Professor of environmental biology and global change at Stanford University, argued this time that the damage was being done not by soot and sulphur preventing the sun's heat reaching the earth, but by carbon dioxide and other 'greenhouse gases', which were trapping heat. It was men such as Schneider and Hansen who, at the end of the Eighties, so terrified the politicians with their theory that CO2 equalled global warming that, within a few years, the world's leaders were gathering in vast conferences in Rio and Kyoto to sign treaties that committed us to massive cuts in the CO2 emissions on which the global economy depended. For a while it seemed that the theory they had programmed into dozens of computer models was being confirmed by the evidence. CO2

levels continued to rise and temperatures appeared to follow suit. But then, more recently, it became obvious that something had gone seriously awry with the theory. Sure, CO₂ in the atmosphere was still continuing to rise. But no longer were temperatures rising in synch, as the computer models predicted they should. By 2007, as temperatures temporarily plummeted by as much as their entire net rise in the 20th century, experts were beginning to question the global warming orthodoxy. An increasing number of breakaway climatologists were saying the cause of that late 20th century rise in temperatures might not be CO₂ at all. Perhaps, they suggested, there were other factors responsible for shaping the earth's climate — such as fluctuations in radiation from the sun and shifts in the world's major ocean currents. So, some of those on the warm-ist side of the argument came up with a compromise theory. Maybe, they agreed, the world was now heading for a period of cooling, but the effect of these natural factors was only to 'mask the underlying warming trend'. Within a decade or two, the warming produced by man-made CO₂ would come back worse than ever. In the past few years, as much of the world has endured three of its coldest winters for decades, it has become almost comical to see how, whatever our weather does to us, the warm-ists still manage to cling on to their pet theory. Whatever happens now, whether it is hot or cold, whether we get heatwaves or record snowfalls, floods or droughts, sooner or later we hear those familiar little voices piping up to tell us that the blame for all these 'extreme weather events' still lies on 'disruption' to the climate caused by the sinful activities of mankind. They're all at it — from the environmental activists of Greenpeace, the WWF and their allies in the BBC and the Met Office, to those thousands of scientists across the world who have received billions in funding from governments investing in climate change research and prevention — all still battling to keep in being the greatest scare story in the history of the world. The truth is that it becomes ever more obvious that none of them really has a clue as to what is responsible for the changes in our climate. They can't even tell us what global temperatures will be next month or next year, let alone what they will be in 100 years' time, as they like to pretend their computer models can predict. But the really terrifying thing about all this is that our politicians have become so locked into the scare story that there is not yet the slightest sign they are prepared to notice the reality now crowding in on them on every side — that global warming is by no means a certainty. Three years ago, when the hysteria over global warming was still at its height, our own British politicians voted almost unanimously for the Climate Change Act committing us, uniquely in the world, to cut our CO₂ emissions by 80 per cent within 40 years. Even on the Government's own figures, showing that this will cost us up to £18 billion every year until 2050, it is by far the most expensive law ever passed by Parliament. We are also committed to meet an EU target that, within a mere nine years, we must generate a third of our electricity from 'renewables' — mainly by spending £200 billion on building thousands more windmills so useless that, last weekend, they could produce only half a per cent of the power we actually needed. As our politicians continually impose on us ever higher taxes and other costs supposedly in the cause of 'fighting climate change' — costs that have already helped to increase every family's energy bills by an average £200 a year — they have been carried away by a collective fantasy that has no parallel in history. And all this is happening in the name of a theory so fraudulent that the same people who told us the world is about to

fry unless we close down all those power stations are now telling us the same power stations may be heading us into a new ice age. Truly, the lunatics have taken over the asylum. And short of some massive injection of common sense from the British people, it seems the rest of us are condemned to live in it.

84: UK carbon emissions fell by 4% in 2024, official figures show

The UK's carbon emissions fell by 4% last year, according to official figures. Provisional statistics published on Thursday by the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ) show UK territorial greenhouse gas emissions were 371m tonnes carbon equivalent (MtCO₂e) in 2024, down from 385 MtCO₂e in 2023. Emissions were 54% lower than they were in 1990, DESNZ said. Greenpeace UK's policy director, Doug Parr, gave a guarded welcome to the announcement. "This good news is the latest demonstration that the UK's efforts to tackle climate change are working, despite what some politicians on the right might try and make you believe," he said. A general view of parched land at Cueva de Las Ninas reservoir in Gran Canaria, Spain. He noted though that while emissions were falling, the UK was still dependent on "expensive and polluting gas" for energy. "This is driving up the cost of household energy bills, controlling the price of electricity and leaving us beholden to gas-exporting countries who may not have our best interests at heart," he said. "The government must put a stop to the great gas rip-off, and rapidly make renewables the backbone of our energy system to lower our bills for good." DESNZ said "decreased gas and coal use in the electricity supply and industry sectors" had driven the fall in emissions, with electricity supply emissions down 15% and industrial emissions down 9%. The closure of the UK's last coal-fired power station in September and an expansion in renewable energy played a significant role, officials said, as did higher electricity imports and the winding down of blast furnaces for the steel industry. The largest source of emissions continued to be the transport sector, which accounted for 30% of the total, but a fall in the use of diesel-powered cars on the UK's roads led to a 2% fall, according to the statistics. Emissions from the buildings and product use sector – the second most significant, accounting for 21% of the total – rose by 2% "due to higher gas use likely driven by an easing of energy and other cost pressures", according to officials. Ironically, climate change may also have contributed to the fall. "Above average temperatures and fewer heating degree days since 2022 has kept residential buildings emissions down relative to earlier years," the statistical release said. "If weather conditions for both 2023 and 2024 had followed long-term trends, there would have been a 4% increase in residential buildings emissions estimates." The estimates cover seven gases which contribute to a "greenhouse effect" in the earth's atmosphere – carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, sulphur hexafluoride and nitrogen trifluoride. CO₂ made up about 78% of the 2024 total. DESNZ has been contacted for comment.

85: The 'world's largest' vacuum to suck climate pollution out of the air just opened. Here's how it works

The world's largest plant designed to suck planet-heating pollution out of the atmosphere like a giant vacuum began operating in Iceland on Wednesday. Mammoth is the second

commercial direct air capture plant opened by Swiss company Climeworks in the country, and is 10 times bigger than its predecessor, Orca, which started running in 2021. Direct air capture, or DAC, is a technology designed to suck in air and strip out the carbon using chemicals. The carbon can then be injected deep beneath the ground, reused or transformed into solid products. Climeworks plans to transport the carbon underground where it will be naturally transformed into stone, locking up the carbon permanently. It is partnering with Icelandic company Carbfix for this so-called sequestration process. The whole operation will be powered by Iceland's abundant, clean geothermal energy. Next-gen climate solutions like DAC are gaining more attention from governments and private industry as humans continue to burn fossil fuels. Concentrations of planet-warming carbon dioxide in the atmosphere reached a record high in 2023. As the planet continues to heat up — with devastating consequences for humans and nature — many scientists say the world needs to find ways to remove carbon from the atmosphere in addition to rapidly cutting fossil fuels. But carbon removal technologies such as DAC are still controversial. They have been criticized as expensive, energy-hungry and unproven at scale. Some climate advocates are also concerned they could distract from policies to cut fossil fuels. This technology is fraught with uncertainties and ecological risks, said Lili Fuhr, director of the fossil economy program at the Center for International Environmental Law, speaking about carbon capture generally. Climeworks started building Mammoth in June 2022, and the company says it is the world's largest such plant. It has a modular design with space for 72 collector containers — the vacuum parts of the machine that capture carbon from the air — which can be stacked on top of each other and moved around easily. There are currently 12 of these in place with more due to be added over the next few months. Mammoth will be able to pull 36,000 tons of carbon from the atmosphere a year at full capacity, according to Climeworks. That's equivalent to taking around 7,800 gas-powered cars off the road for a year. Climeworks did not give an exact cost for each ton of carbon removed, but said it was closer to \$1,000 a ton than \$100 a ton — the latter of which is widely seen as a key threshold for making the technology affordable and viable. As the company scales up the size of its plants and brings costs down, the aim is to reach \$300 to \$350 a ton by 2030 before hitting \$100 a ton around 2050, said Jan Wurzbacher, co-founder and co-CEO of Climeworks, on a call with reporters. The new plant is "an important step in the fight against climate change," said Stuart Haszeldine, professor of carbon capture and storage at the University of Edinburgh. It will increase the size of equipment to capture carbon pollution. But, he cautioned, it's still a tiny fraction of what's needed. All the carbon removal equipment in the world is only capable of removing around 0.01 million metric tons of carbon a year, a far cry from the 70 million tons a year needed by 2030 to meet global climate goals, according to the International Energy Agency. There are already much bigger DAC plants in the works from other companies. Stratos, currently under construction in Texas, for example, is designed to remove 500,000 tons of carbon a year, according to Occidental, the oil company behind the plant. But there may be a catch. Occidental says the captured carbon will be stored in rock deep underground, but its website also refers to the company's use of captured carbon in a process called "enhanced oil recovery." This involves pushing carbon into wells to force out the hard-to-reach remnants of oil — allowing fossil fuel companies to extract even more

from aging oil fields. It's this kind of process that makes some critics concerned carbon removal technologies could be used to prolong production of fossil fuels. But for Climeworks, which is not connected to fossil fuel companies, the technology has huge potential, and the company says it has big ambitions.

86: Scientists warn of severe honeybee losses in 2025

Honeybee colonies in the United States are projected to decline by up to 70% in 2025, entomologists at Washington State University said Tuesday. The university said in a news release that in the past decade, honeybee colony losses have averaged 40% to 50% annually. But this year, a combination of nutrition deficiencies, mite infestations, viral diseases and possible pesticide exposure during the previous pollinating season led to higher losses, the release said. Losses have been increasing steadily, Priya Chakrabarti Basu, an assistant professor of pollinator health and apiculture at WSU, said in the news release. Pollination demands haven't gone down, so beekeepers face tremendous pressure to keep the same number of colonies to meet those needs. The implications could be huge. About 35% of the world's food depends on pollinators, according to the National Institute of Food and Agriculture. Brandon Hopkins, a professor of pollinator ecology at WSU, said in a statement accompanying the release that higher losses could also lead to higher costs for farmers who depend on bee colonies. I don't want to be a fear-monger, but this level of national loss could mean increased bankruptcies amongst beekeepers, Hopkins said. Growers of crops downstream from almonds may need to scramble if the beekeeper they've relied on to pollinate their apple trees, for example, isn't in business anymore.

87: Earth losing fresh water and may have hit irreversible tipping point due to climate change

The Earth is getting drier and may have hit a tipping point for how much water is stored in soil because of climate change. So great is the decline in soil moisture that it has outpaced Greenland's melting ice sheets in its contribution to sea level rise and changes to the wobble in Earth's rotation. That's according to a new study in the journal *Science*, which suggests more than 2,614 gigatonnes of moisture was lost from our planet between 2000 to 2016. It's a trend that scientists think led to a major shift in land-based water storage — sources like groundwater, rivers, lakes, soil moisture and ice — from 1992. The researchers estimated between 2000 to 2002, soil moisture loss was about 1,614 Gt, equivalent to a 1.95 millimetre per year rise in sea level. That's compared to a 900 Gt loss of ice in Greenland from 2002 to 2006, which contributes to about 0.8mm of sea level rise annually. Global soil moisture levels have not recovered, and a further 1,009 Gt was lost from 2003 to 2016. One of the study's lead co-authors Dongryeol Ryu, a hydrologist and remote sensing specialist at the University of Melbourne, said the planet was seeing its land-based water storage drop without recovering. It's pretty similar to inflation, he said. If you are purchasing consumer goods the same way, somehow your wallet becomes slimmer. That means that if we use the water in agriculture and other sectors as we did before ... we will have much less water left on the land. How researchers estimated Earth's loss of moisture For some years, scientists have been aware of changes to Earth's hydrological cycle — the movement of water

between the surface and the atmosphere — at a regional level. But getting an idea of whether there has been a longer term global drying trend tied to a warming planet has been more difficult to calculate. The twin satellite program Gravity Recovery and Climate Experiment (GRACE) started collecting data in 2002, and has helped scientists to measure groundwater depletion, sea level changes and ice sheet loss. These sources can be used to calculate changes in the planet's land-based water storage. To develop a data set pre-2002, however, the researchers estimated land-based water storage by comparing GRACE's data with historical sea level changes and the wobble in Earth's planetary rotation. Professor Ryu said global rain precipitation changed every year, oscillating with ups and downs. Even if you have large rainfall or drought in one year, it doesn't mean you see that impact right away in soil moisture because it's a delayed response, he said. We had quite a strong El Niño in 1997 and 1998 and also global temperature increasing steeply from the 1980s. They all worked together to create this unusual drop in soil moisture in 2000 to 2002. At the same time, global precipitation dropped, he said. Georgy Falster, a University of Adelaide climatologist who was not involved in the study, said soil moisture observations around the globe were unfortunately sparse. That meant reanalysis data used in the study relied heavily on how well modelling simulated changes in soil moisture. The satellite and reanalysis data match quite well from 2003 to 2019, providing confidence in these results, Dr Falster said. Unfortunately, the satellite data are only available from 2003 so the rapid change across 2000–2002 cannot easily be verified. What's global warming got to do with it? Professor Ryu said, on average, it seemed the Earth was losing land-based water storage because of an increase in air temperature and vapour pressure deficit (VPD). VPD measures the gap between how much moisture is in the air compared to how much moisture the air could have when fully saturated. Saturated air leads to things like cloud formation and increased precipitation. Professor Ryu said water was lost in the soil faster if VPD was greater. If you look at the global data ... both ground and model data show a very clear and steep increase in VPD from around the year 2000, he said. At a regional scale like in Australia, in the Northern Territory and Queensland, soil is wetter now than 20 or 30 years ago. But on average, it seems [globally] the land is losing water and that's largely because of the increase in temperature and an increase in VPD. Areas which have seen greater groundwater depletion than other regions include northern India, central California and eastern China. Dr Falster said the increasing VPD in recent decades was the result of human-caused global warming. [It's] making the recovery of lost soil moisture increasingly difficult, she said. The authors suggest that droughts over [recent] decades have been so widespread and severe that more than 2,600 Gt of water has permanently been transferred from the continents to the ocean. Dr Falster said the findings highlighted the importance of continued investment in monitoring variables like soil moisture and evapotranspiration — the movement of water into the atmosphere from evaporation and plant transpiration — both globally and in Australia. Professor Ryu said further research could look at agricultural water-use to get a better understanding of its impact on water storage depletion.

88: UN report warns of a 'frightening' future: 'Your five-year-old now faces a future with 7 times more heatwaves'

Record heat, melting glaciers, and oceans warming at an unprecedented pace made 2024 the hottest year ever recorded, delivering consequences that scientists warn are now irreversible for hundreds of years. Global temperatures soared past the critical 1.5C threshold above pre-industrial levels in 2024, the World Meteorological Organisation (WMO) has confirmed. Earlier, a report from the EU's Copernicus Climate Change Service also confirmed it in January this year. But new details from the WMO's State of the Global Climate report show how this heat reshaped the planet, unleashing permanent damage to oceans, glaciers, and ecosystems, and displacing millions from their homes. It's frightening to see our climate report looking so dire yet again," said Dr Linden Ashcroft, a senior lecturer in climate science at The University of Melbourne. I've been providing comments like these for my entire career, and honestly, I'm not quite sure what to do next. Scream these findings from the tops of buildings? Write my comments in capitals? Saying all this while dancing on TikTok? I don't know. But unless we see real climate leadership from governments and businesses, I will save this response and send it through again next year. Crossing 1.5C for a single year doesn't mean the Paris Agreement, which uses long-term averages to track warming, has failed. But scientists warn this year's extreme heat is a clear sign the planet is heading toward dangerous territory. Dr Paul Read, director of the Future Emergency Resilience Network at UTS, said the world needs to brace for a 1.5 world, with a third of the Arctic nearing tipping points and permafrost melting three times faster than elsewhere. Your average five-year-old now faces a future with seven times more heatwaves, triple the floods, droughts and crop failures, double the wildfires, he said. However, WMO secretary-general Celeste Saulo stressed the difference between one-year spikes and longer-term trends. While a single year above 1.5C of warming does not indicate that the long-term temperature goals of the Paris Agreement are out of reach, it is a wake-up call that we are increasing the risks to our lives, economies and to the planet. The report shows atmospheric carbon dioxide reached 420 parts per million, the highest level in at least 800,000 years, with no signs of slowing down. This rising concentration is driving global heating, sea-level rise, and ocean acidification, and threatening marine ecosystems and fisheries globally. Dr Xuebin Zhang, principal research scientist at CSIRO Environment, warned that these past emissions mean some changes are now unavoidable. Ocean heat content will continue to increase, leading to long-term sea-level rise even if emissions are significantly reduced," Dr Zhang said. This committed response, driven by past greenhouse gas emissions, must be accounted for in any long-term climate adaptation planning. WMO documented an unprecedented surge in ocean temperatures in 2024, which reached record highs for the eighth consecutive year. Ocean heat content is now rising twice as quickly as the average from 1960 to 2005. This heat trapped in the ocean is expected to drive sea-level rise for centuries, even if emissions drop sharply today. Sea levels rose 4.7 mm per year between 2015 and 2024, more than double the rate recorded in the decade after satellite measurements began, according to the WMO. This rapid rise now poses existential threats to low-lying coastal communities around the world. Data for 2024 show that our oceans continued to warm, and sea levels continued to rise. The frozen parts of Earth's surface,

known as the cryosphere, are melting at an alarming rate: glaciers continue to retreat, and Antarctic sea ice reached its second-lowest extent ever recorded. Meanwhile, extreme weather continues to have devastating consequences around the world, said Ms Saulo. Temperatures were boosted in the first half of 2024 by the natural El Niño climate phenomenon, but remained very high in the second half of the year even when El Niño dissipated. The WMO report says the largest three-year loss of glacier mass ever recorded was from 2022 to 2024. Antarctic sea ice shrank to its second-lowest extent on record, compounding the rapid loss of Arctic ice, where the 18 lowest extents have all occurred in the past 18 years.

89: From deluges to drought: Climate change speeds up water cycle, triggers more extreme weather

Prolonged droughts, wildfires and water shortages. Torrential downpours that overwhelm dams and cause catastrophic flooding. Around the globe, rising temperatures stoked by climate change are increasing the odds of both severe drought and heavier precipitation that wreak havoc on people and the environment. Rainfall can disappear for years only to return with a vengeance, as it did in California in 2023, with record-setting rain and snowfall. That led to heavy vegetation growth that provided fuel for the devastating January wildfires in Los Angeles after drought returned. But how can global warming cause both drier and wetter extremes? Here's what experts say. It's all about the water cycle. People walk through a part of the Amazon River that shows signs of drought, in Santa Sofia, on the outskirts of Leticia, Colombia, Oct. 20, 2024. (AP Photo/Ivan Valencia, File) People walk through a part of the Amazon River that shows signs of drought, in Santa Sofia, on the outskirts of Leticia, Colombia, Oct. 20, 2024. (AP Photo/Ivan Valencia, File) Water constantly moves between the Earth and its atmosphere. But that system called the hydrological cycle is speeding up as global temperatures get hotter, primarily due to the burning of fossil fuels like coal and gas. A hotter atmosphere sucks up more water vapor from bodies of water and vegetation and soil. Over land, this atmospheric demand and loss of surface moisture leads to longer and more intense droughts, even causing some arid areas to expand. Though rain falls less often, when it does, it's often in intense and destructive deluges. Basically, global warming is turning the atmosphere into a bigger sponge so it can soak up more moisture ... and then when the conditions are right for rainfall, it's like squeezing that sponge, said Jonathan Overpeck, a climate scientist at the University of Michigan. You get more moisture coming out faster. Oceans play outsized role. Oceans absorb most of the planet's extra heat. That causes the water to expand and ice to melt at the poles, raising sea levels. The warmer water also provides fuel for larger hurricanes and cyclones that can dump massive amounts of water in a short time. In 2023, for example, heavy one-day rains from Mediterranean storm Daniel caused massive flooding across eastern Libya that overwhelmed two dams, sending a wall of water through the coastal city of Derna that destroyed entire neighborhoods and swept bridges, cars and people out to sea. Climate scientists say climate change made that storm far more likely. Climate change also is affecting snowpack, a critical part of the hydrological cycle. Melting snow helps fill reservoirs and waterways, including for drinking and agriculture. But less

snow is falling in general, and what does often is absorbed by thirsty soil. Whats more, because winters are becoming warmer overall, the growing season is longer, meaning snowmelt also is being lost through evapotranspiration of plants. But, just like rain, climate change also can cause more intense and sometimes damaging snowstorms. All this stuff is related to warming, which we know with perfect confidence is almost all due to human activity, Overpeck said. The good news is, we know how to stop it if we want to.

90: Climate Alarmists: 'Wild Weather' Is Now the 'Global Norm'

Climate alarmists have reacted to hurricane season with predictable hysteria, seeing in every storm further confirmation of their worst doomsday fears.

A case in point is Jan Wondra, writing for Ark Valley Voice, who suggests that Hurricane Helene proves no place on earth is immune from the effects of global warming and may be a harbinger of an impending 'climate breakdown.'

Wondra even goes so far as to cite the 2004 apocalyptic climate thriller 'Day After Tomorrow' to warn readers their direst fears are true and the end is indeed nigh.

The 'ominous signs are everywhere,' she writes, and even 'places that were assumed safe — or safer— from the impacts of extreme weather are proving not to be as immune from growing climate changes.'

The 'horribly real' reality is that the changes occurring in our climate are global and no place is completely safe from climate change, she declares.

In other words, be very afraid: death by weather is coming for you.

It Just Doesn't Stop! Tornado Spotted in Florida Ahead of Hurricane Milton Landfall

Keeping strictly to the alarmist script, however, Wondra does not cite deaths from extreme weather events — which are decreasing each year and now are a tiny fraction of what they were 100 years ago — and writes instead about the dollar cost of damage.

Even this is misleading, however. As climate expert Bjorn Lomborg noted in a 2021 op-ed in the Wall Street Journal, measuring the total damage of natural disasters over time misses the important point, namely that 'there's much more stuff to damage today than there was several decades ago.'

'As the world has gotten richer and its population has grown, the number and quality of structures in the path of floods, fires, and hurricanes have risen,' he added.

A much more accurate measure even of the cost of weather-related damage is found by looking at damage as a percent of gross domestic product, Lomborg reasoned, and the trend of weather-related damages from 1990 to 2020 declined from 0.26 percent of global GDP to just 0.18 percent.

Hurricanes are not the only phenomenon getting alarmists excited, however.

Over at Gizmodo, folks are actually upset about the greening of Antarctica, which 'isn't supposed' to happen.

Florida Police Leap in to Secure and Anchor Boat During Helene Flooding

If you foolishly thought that recovering green space was actually a good thing for humanity, science writer Passant Rabie is here to set you straight, declaring that Antarctica is turning green at an 'alarming rate' as 'events of extreme heat' have reshaped the continent's landscape over the past few decades.

Using satellite data, a team of scientists captured the ‘dramatic increase’ in vegetation across the Antarctic Peninsula, Rabie notes with horror. ‘They found that vegetation increased more than tenfold from 1986 to 2021, growing from 0.39 square miles (1 square kilometer) to almost 4.6 square miles (12 square kilometers).’

This year, Antarctica experienced its ‘most extreme heatwave on record,’ she laments, with temperatures climbing up to 50 degrees Fahrenheit (28 degrees Celsius) above normal in mid-July.

What Ms. Rabie fails to mention is that the average yearly temperature in the interior of Antarctica is -43.5°C (-46.3°F). Even 50°F higher is still well below freezing and hardly constitutes a ‘heatwave’ to anyone except the most ideologically driven.

For some, even the good news of added green spaces is cause for mourning.

91: How Close Are the Planet’s Climate Tipping Points?

Earth’s warming could trigger sweeping changes in the natural world that would be hard, if not impossible, to reverse. Mass Death of Coral Reefs When corals go ghostly white, they aren’t necessarily dead, and their reefs aren’t necessarily gone forever. Too much heat in the water causes the corals to expel the symbiotic algae living inside their tissues. If conditions improve, they can survive this bleaching. In time, the reefs can bounce back. As the world gets warmer, though, occasional bleaching is becoming regular bleaching. Mild bleaching is becoming severe bleaching. Scientists’ latest predictions are grim. Even if humanity moves swiftly to rein in global warming, 70 percent to 90 percent of today’s reef-building corals could die in the coming decades. If we don’t, the toll could be 99 percent or more. A reef can look healthy right up until its corals start bleaching and dying. Eventually, it is a graveyard. This doesn’t necessarily mean reef-building corals will go extinct. Hardier ones might endure in pockets. But the vibrant ecosystems these creatures support will be unrecognizable. There is no bouncing back anytime soon, not in the places corals live today, not at any scale. When it might happen: It could already be underway. Abrupt Thawing of Permafrost In the ground beneath the world’s cold places, the accumulated remains of long-dead plants and animals contain a lot of carbon, roughly twice the amount that’s currently in the atmosphere. As heat, wildfires and rains thaw and destabilize the frozen ground, microbes get to work, converting this carbon into carbon dioxide and methane. These greenhouse gasses worsen the heat and the fire and the rain, which intensifies the thawing. Like many of these vast, self-propelling shifts in our climate, permafrost thaw is complicated to predict. Large areas have already come unfrozen, in Western Canada, in Alaska, in Siberia. But how quickly the rest of it might defrost. Around 15,000 years ago, the Sahara started turning green. It began when small shifts in Earth’s orbit caused North Africa to be sunnier each summer. This warmed the land, causing the winds to shift and draw in more moist air from over the Atlantic. The moisture fell as monsoon rain, which fed grasses and filled lakes, some as large as the Caspian Sea. Animals flourished: elephants, giraffes, ancestral cattle. So did humans, as engravings and rock paintings from the era attest. Only about 5,000 years ago did the region transform back into the harsh desert we know today. Scientists now understand that the Sahara has flipped several times over the ages between arid and humid, between barren and temperate. They are less sure about how, and whether,

the West African monsoon might shift or intensify in response to today's warming. (Despite its name, the region's monsoon unleashes rain over parts of East Africa as well.) Whatever happens will matter hugely to an area of the world where many people's nutrition and livelihoods depend on the skies. When it might happen: Hard to predict. Loss of Amazon Rainforest Besides being home to hundreds of Indigenous communities, millions of animal and plant species and 400 billion trees; besides containing untold numbers of other living things that have yet to be discovered, named and described; and besides storing an abundance of carbon that might otherwise be warming the planet, the Amazon rainforest plays another big role. It is a living, churning, breathing engine of weather. The combined exhalations of all those trees give rise to clouds fat with moisture. When this moisture falls, it helps keep the region lush and forested. Now, though, ranchers and farmers are clearing the trees, and global warming is worsening wildfires and droughts. Scientists worry that once too much more of the forest is gone, this rain machine could break down, causing the rest of the forest to wither and degrade into grassy savanna. By 2050, as much as half of today's Amazon forest could be at risk of undergoing this kind of degradation, researchers recently estimated. When it might happen: Will depend on how rapidly people clear, or protect, the remaining forest. Shutdown of Atlantic Currents Sweeping across the Atlantic Ocean, from the western coasts of Africa, round through the Caribbean and up toward Europe before heading down again, a colossal loop of seawater sets temperatures and rainfall for a big part of the globe. Saltier, denser water sinks to the ocean depths while fresher, lighter water rises, keeping this conveyor belt turning. Now, though, Greenland's melting ice is upsetting this balance by infusing the North Atlantic with immense new flows of freshwater. Scientists fear that if the motor slows too much, it could stall, upending weather patterns for billions of people in Europe and the tropics. Scientists have already seen signs of a slowdown in these currents, which go by an unwieldy name: the Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation, or AMOC. The hard part is predicting when a slowdown might become a shutdown. At the moment, our data and records are just too limited, said Niklas Boers, a climate scientist at the Technical University of Munich and the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research. Already, though, we know enough to be sure about one thing, Dr. Boers said. "With every gram of additional CO₂ in the atmosphere, we are increasing the likelihood of tipping events," he said. "The longer we wait" to slash emissions, he said, "the farther we go into dangerous territory." When it might happen: Very hard to predict.

92: We've failed to stop climate change — this is what we need to do next

There is a story that used to be told about the fight against climate change. It was a narrative of hope, of a battle to be fought and won. 'This is the moment when we must come together to save this planet,' Barack Obama told a crowd of 200,000 people in Berlin in 2008, the summer before he was elected president. That moment, of course, came and went. But there were more speeches, more moments of urgency. Al Gore tried, so did Leonardo DiCaprio. Sir David Attenborough and Greta Thunberg attempted to mobilise the masses; even the King has had a go. Boris Johnson tried again in 2021 at the Cop26 climate summit in Glasgow, urging world leaders to 'keep alive' the hope of limiting global warming to 1.5C,

enshrined in the Paris Agreement of 2015. He said: 'Let's keep moving forward and make this the moment we irrefutably turn the tide against climate change.' There are only so many times, however, that the same stories can be told. Laurie Laybourn, director of the Strategic Climate Risks Initiative, said: 'It's only really now that the penny is dropping that we didn't prevent a global-scale climate crisis. We're now in a global-scale climate crisis.'

Wildfires in Los Angeles The wildfires in Los Angeles, flooding in Valencia, and the storms that have battered the British Isles this winter — Bert, Darragh and Éowyn — have confirmed what the scientists have long forecast. Climate change is no longer something that can be averted: it has arrived. In January the Met Office announced that global average temperatures for 2024 had risen 1.5C above pre-industrial levels for the first time. One year's weather records do not in themselves mean the 2015 Paris Agreement, which set out to limit global warming long-term, has failed. But the Met Office also warned that carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is still rising, and is now 'incompatible' with the modelled pathways that would keep warming below the totemic 1.5C. Past the limit Average global temperatures have now breached the 1.5C limit of warming 'There is an adjustment that's needed now to understand that that preventative project has not worked,' Laybourn said. 'Emissions reductions were not tried at the scale that were needed — being confronted with that failure is actually quite difficult for people.'

After years of focusing on averting climate change, what climate scientists refer to as 'mitigation', experts are warning that we now need far greater focus on adaptation to cope with the new weather that comes with a warming world. There is no doubt that in the UK we are not ready for climate change. Chris Stark, former chief executive of the climate change committee (CCC) and now a senior energy official, in 2022 described the government's planning for global warming as 'genuinely poor', blaming a 'wilful reluctance' to factor adaptation into policy. This reluctance goes back years. In a speech at Chatham House in September, the former Labour politician David Miliband admitted that preparing for global warming had been something of a taboo. 'When I was environment secretary in 2006-7, it felt as though talking about adapting to climate change meant admitting defeat on mitigating climate change.'

Climate change for the UK means hotter, drier summers and wetter winters with more frequent, more severe storms. Storm Helene

The new Labour government has pledged to get to grips with the problem, promising in its manifesto last year that it would 'improve resilience and preparation across central government, local authorities, local communities, and emergency services'. It added: 'Without action, flooding and coastal erosion will pose greater risks to lives, livelihoods and people's wellbeing.' But Baroness Brown of Cambridge, who chairs the CCC's adaptation committee, said ministers have not yet followed through. 'We've had some positive conversations, but it hasn't got to anything beyond that yet,' she said. 'Ministers and civil servants nod and say 'yes, I understand the problem'. But we've got to see some action.'

Last spring, while the Conservatives were still in power, the CCC published an assessment of the UK national adaptation programme. It made for grim reading. Adaptation 'falls far short of what is needed' and 'lacks the pace and ambition to address growing climate risks, which we are already experiencing in the UK', the report said. It added that the government's plan 'fails to set out a compelling vision for what the government's 'well-adapted UK' entails'. In April the CCC will publish its next adaptation report. Brown said: 'I

fear we will be saying a lot of things we've said before.' Flooding in Valencia Labour has made decarbonisation a key part of its programme for government, with achieving a clean electricity system by 2030 one of its five core 'missions'. But there is growing unease among experts that such a laser focus on a single aspect of tackling climate change means others are neglected. 'The missions programme is great,' one senior official said. 'Stuff is getting done. But there is a risk that anything that is not part of the 'mission' falls through the cracks.' The consequences of failing to adapt are already becoming clear. According to a new report by the Association of British Insurers (ABI), last year insurance companies paid out a record £585 million for weather-related damage to homes and possessions. Mark Shepherd, head of general insurance policy at the ABI, said: 'Our latest data serves as a blunt reminder of the devastating damage that adverse weather can cause to people's homes and businesses. Prevention is always better than cure. That's why we continue to advocate for climate resilience measures to be carefully considered in all planning decisions and building standards, to ensure properties are fit for the future and that they are not built in areas prone to climate risk.' Yet the risk is growing. According to an Environment Agency report published in December, 6.3 million homes and businesses in England are now in areas at risk of flooding, up from 5.5 million in 2018. By the middle of the century, the number of properties at risk is expected to rise to eight million — one in every four homes in the country. Summer heat is also a problem. Our entire infrastructure, our homes, offices and schools, is designed for the cold, rather than heat. In the blistering heatwave of 2022, when Britain's first 40C day was recorded and wildfires raged across the country, there were 3,469 'excess' deaths linked to high temperatures. The train network also ground to a halt. Our tracks are designed to cope up to 27C — above that and trains must run slower to avoid buckling the metal. But it is not as simple as redesigning our entire infrastructure for a Mediterranean climate, because then it wouldn't be able to cope with the cold. Train tracks, for example, need to be able to withstand low temperatures — and designing tracks that can cope with both extremes is an engineering headache. 'It's not just storms and heatwaves that we need to worry about,' Laybourn said. 'It's that those storms and heatwaves smash up the food supply and lowered harvests increase food prices. They also increase the cost of fertiliser, which further increases prices. That then cascades into higher overall inflation, which itself then influences politics.' He added: 'Over the last six months in 2024, the big year of elections, that inflation played a major role in toppling some governments. So it's those ripple effects that are increasingly emerging as some of the most concerning threats coming from climate change.' It is not just the UK failing to prepare. The United Nations Environment Programme (Unep) in November published its 'adaptation gap' report, setting out how far the issue has been neglected. It found that annual global spending on climate adaptation is between \$187 billion and \$359 billion short of what it should be, 'with adaptation planning slowing and implementation falling behind'. Inger Andersen, Unep executive director, said in the foreword: 'People and the natural systems upon which our livelihoods depend are increasingly in danger from the hell and high water that climate change is bringing. The world must get serious about adaptation, now.' Laybourn stressed that while much more must be done to adapt to climate change, it does not mean that politicians should abandon decarbonisation. 'You have to do both,' he said. 'If you're busy

mopping the floor you mustn't forget to turn off the tap.' Part of the reluctance to push forwards with climate adaptation is finding ways to pay for it. Decarbonisation is a relatively easy sell: it is not difficult to persuade a developer to build a wind farm or install solar panels if they can then profit from the cheap power they generate. Flood defences, on the other hand, do not generate a return, so central investment is needed. But experts say a long view is required. Existing flood defences in Britain prevent £1.15 billion in damage each year. Laybourn thinks this approach is required for other sectors. 'If the UK had a more nature-abundant, more balanced, sustainable farming system, for example, it would mean that the farming system was better able to handle shocks.' A UK government spokesman insisted adaptation was being taken seriously: 'Alongside transitioning to become a clean energy superpower and accelerating towards net zero, the government is taking robust action to prepare for the impacts of a warming climate.' He pointed to 'record investment of £2.65 billion to repair and build new flood and coastal defences, protecting tens of thousands of homes and businesses across the country'.

93: USDA ordered to scrub climate change from websites

The directive could affect information across dozens of programs including climate-smart agriculture initiatives. Agriculture Department employees have been ordered to delete landing pages discussing climate change across agency websites and document climate change references for further review, according to an internal email obtained by POLITICO. The directive from USDA's office of communications, whose authenticity was validated by three people, could affect information across dozens of programs including climate-smart agriculture initiatives, USDA climate hubs and Forest Service information regarding wildfires, the frequency and severity of which scientists have linked to hotter, drier conditions fueled by climate change. And it is reminiscent of moves made during the first Trump administration to remove references to climate change from federal government websites. The email sent Thursday afternoon calls on website managers to "Identify and archive or unpublish any landing pages focused on climate change" and "Identify all web content related to climate change and document it in a spreadsheet" for the office to review. It set a Friday deadline for handing over titles, links and "your recommendation on how the content should be handled." The action comes as funds for clean energy and agriculture programs remain in limbo amid a federal spending review ordered by the Office of Management and Budget. The Trump administration has pushed to halt and reverse spending from the Inflation Reduction Act and Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, which provided billions of dollars for wildfire management, clean energy investments and credits to store carbon dioxide that benefit rural communities USDA serves. A spokesperson for USDA did not immediately respond to a request for comment. In the first Trump administration, officials buried government-funded research that showed the impacts of climate change on American farmers, including issues like volatile weather and increased levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. In 2019, USDA also refused to release a multiagency plan to help farmers respond and adapt to a changing climate. As of Friday, some landing pages remained active, such as for USDA Climate Hubs, a cross-agency effort to address and adapt to climate change. Others already appeared mothballed, like a

page on USDA's Partnerships for Climate-Smart Commodities. Extreme weather events just in the last few years have devastated the entire peach crop in Georgia, flooded farms in North Carolina and a disease called citrus greening — made worse by climate change — has led to sharp declines in Florida's famed citrus crop. Smoke from wildfires in the West have ruined fields of grapes, and drought has forced ranchers to shrink their cattle herds. The USDA instructions also come as California recovers from wildfires that could amount to the costliest natural disaster in U.S. history, which scientists said climate change exacerbated. The U.S. Forest Service is the primary federal agency for preparing for and mitigating wildfires. Under former President Joe Biden's Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack, USDA spent \$3.1 billion on the Partnerships for Climate-Smart Commodities, working with private food companies, nonprofits and universities to research ways for farmers to reduce their carbon footprint, develop more resilient crops and restore land. But Trump's executive order targeting climate spending in the IRA forced officials at USDA to temporarily pause funding disbursements through the program. Under the IRA, Congress directed USDA to pay billions of dollars to farmers for conservation practices, including some that address climate change. But Trump's Day 1 executive order aims to halt agency payments for major climate, energy and infrastructure projects — and could jeopardize billions in payments as farmers prepare for planting season.

94: Florida is about to erase climate change from most of its laws

The state is spending big on adapting to sea level rise, but Republicans don't want to name the cause. In Florida, the effects of climate change are hard to ignore, no matter your politics. It's the hottest state — Miami spent a record 46 days above a heat index of 100 degrees last summer — and many homes and businesses are clustered along beachfront areas threatened by rising seas and hurricanes. The Republican-led legislature has responded with more than \$640 million for resilience projects to adapt to coastal threats. But the same politicians don't seem ready to acknowledge the root cause of these problems. A bill awaiting signature from Governor Ron DeSantis, who dropped out of the Republican presidential race in January, would ban offshore wind energy, relax regulations on natural gas pipelines, and delete the majority of mentions of climate change from existing state laws. "Florida is on the front lines of the warming climate crisis, and the fact that we're going to erase that sends the wrong message," said Yoca Ardití-Rocha, the executive director of the CLEO Institute, a climate education and advocacy nonprofit in Florida. "It sends the message, at least to me and to a good majority of Floridians, that this is not a priority for the state." As climate change has been swept into the country's culture wars, it's created a particularly sticky situation in Florida. Republicans associate "climate change" with Democrats — and see it as a pretext for pushing a progressive agenda — so they generally try to distance themselves from the issue. When a reporter asked DeSantis what he was doing to address the climate crisis in 2021, DeSantis dodged the question, replying, "We're not doing any left-wing stuff." In practice, this approach has consisted of trying to manage the effects of climate change while ignoring what's behind them. The bill, sponsored by state Representative Bobby Payne, a Republican from Palatka in north-central Florida, would strike eight references to climate change in current state laws, leaving just seven

references untouched, according to the Tampa Bay Times. Some of the bill's proposed language tweaks are minor, but others repeal whole sections of laws. For example, it would eliminate a "green government grant" program that helps cities and school districts cut their carbon emissions. A 2008 policy stating that Florida is at the front lines of climate change and can reduce those impacts by cutting emissions would be replaced with a new goal: providing "an adequate, reliable, and cost-effective supply of energy for the state in a manner that promotes the health and welfare of the public and economic growth." Florida politicians have a history of attempting to silence conversations about the fossil fuel emissions driving sea level rise, heavier floods, and worsening toxic algae blooms. When Rick Scott was the Republican governor of the state between 2011 and 2019, state officials were ordered to avoid using the phrases "climate change" or "global warming" in communications, emails, and reports, according to the Miami Herald. It foreshadowed what would happen at the federal level after President Donald Trump took office in 2017. The phrase "climate change" started disappearing from the websites of federal environmental agencies, with the term's use going down 38 percent between 2016 and 2020. "Sorry, but this web page is not available for viewing right now," the Environmental Protection Agency's climate change site said during Trump's term. Red states have demonstrated that politicians don't necessarily need to acknowledge climate change to adapt to it, but Florida appears poised to take the strategy to the extreme, expunging climate goals from state laws while focusing more and more money on addressing its effects. In 2019, DeSantis appointed Florida's first "chief resilience officer," Julia Nesheiwat, tasked with preparing Florida for rising sea levels. Last year, he awarded the Florida Department of Environmental Protection more than \$28 million to conduct and update flooding vulnerability studies for every county in Florida. "Why would you address the symptoms and not the cause?" Arditi-Rocha said. "Fundamentally, I think it's political maneuvering that enables them [Republicans] to continue to set themselves apart from the opposite party." She's concerned that the bill will increase the state's dependence on natural gas. The fossil fuel provides three-quarters of Florida's electricity, leaving residents subject to volatile prices and energy insecurity, according to a recent Environmental Defense Fund report. As Florida isn't a particularly windy state, she sees the proposed ban on offshore wind energy as mostly symbolic. "I think it's more of a political kind of tactic to distinguish themselves." Solar power is already a thriving industry that's taking off in Florida — it's called the Sunshine State for a reason. Greg Knecht, the executive director of The Nature Conservancy in Florida, thinks that the removal of climate-related language from state laws could discourage green industries from coming to the state. (And he's not ready to give up on wind power.) "I just think it puts us at a disadvantage to other states," Knecht said. Prospective cleantech investors might see it as a signal that they're not welcome. The bill is also out of step with what most Floridians want, Knecht said. According to a recent survey from Florida Atlantic University, 90 percent of the state's residents accept that climate change is happening. "When you talk to the citizens of Florida, the majority of them recognize that the climate is changing and want something to be done above and beyond just trying to build our way out of it."

95: Fewer swans migrating to UK wetlands, says charity

Warmer temperatures due to climate change mean fewer wild swans are returning to the UK in winter, a charity says. Staff at the Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust (WWT) near Slimbridge, Gloucestershire, say their population of Bewick's swans has declined by 86% over the past almost 50 years. Every year, thousands of these birds migrate from breeding grounds in northern Russia to the UK to avoid getting caught in the ice and snow of the arctic winter. However, they no longer need to travel as far to reach ice-free wetlands, with only 87 Bewick's swans returning to the reserve this year, without any cygnets in tow. The Bewick's have been studied at WWT Slimbridge for about 50 years with more than 10,000 swans being recorded - making it one of the longest single-species studies ever researched. However, warmer temperatures in Europe mean the swans are now cutting their 2174-mile (3,500km) journeys short in comfortable climates along the way. Early figures suggest more than 7,000 Bewick's 'short-stopped' their migration this winter, in parts of Denmark, Germany and the Netherlands, according to WWT. Reserve manager at WWT Slimbridge, Martin McGill, said their absence at the reserve this year had been 'concerning'. 'Bewick's swans are hugely important to our history here at WWT, and it's almost impossible to imagine Slimbridge without them,' he said. 'We love welcoming them back each winter so it's terribly sad to see so few of them this year and without any cygnets.' Mr McGill explained that Bewick's swans also faced dangers on their migration route from toxic lead poisoning and illegal shooting. 'We make sure the Bewick's swans have everything they need while they're with us, but we know they face challenges on their migrations and at their breeding grounds,' Mr McGill continued. 'We need more wetlands to help us reverse the impacts of climate change and prevent situations like this from happening in future.' WWT is now leading a coalition of charities urging the UK government to take swift action to ban the sale and use of lead ammunition to protect these birds from needlessly painful deaths.

96: 'The article is false' – Meteorologist: AP's 'Juiced' Weather Claims Collapse Under Scrutiny – 'Climate change is not triggering more extreme weather'

The Associated Press (AP) recently published an article titled 'From Deluges To Drought, Climate Change Speeds Up Water Cycle, Triggers More Extreme Weather.' The article is false.

Evidence clearly indicates that no changes in extreme weather trends are found in the data, and as such, no changes can be tied to climate change.

'Scientists have warned for decades that rising global temperatures would juice the water cycle, leading to more intense storms, worse droughts, and more chaotic shifts between the two,' says the AP's article.

This tired trope assumes climate change drives individual weather events, a point factually refuted repeatedly in rebuttals at Climate Realism.

Examining actual data blows down the AP's extreme weather 'juicing' fantasy faster than a house of cards in a windstorm.

Let's start with floods. For example, the Climate Realism piece 'No, Reuters, Climate Change Is Not Increasing the Impact of Floods' cites NOAA's historical flood records to prove these events have ebbed and flowed naturally for centuries—long before SUVs roamed the earth.

Then there's drought. Climate at a Glance: Drought lays out the U.S. Palmer Drought Severity Index, showing no long-term trend toward worsening conditions over the past 120 years, despite rising atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO₂).

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, often the go-to for climate alarmists, even admits low confidence in linking extreme weather shifts to human CO₂ emissions—a nuance the Seattle Times, which carried the AP's story, conveniently skips.

But it doesn't stop there. The AP's obsession with a 'juiced' water cycle glosses over natural climate drivers like El Niño and La Niña, which have dictated weather swings for millennia.

Strong evidence for this comes from the study 'Variability of El Niño/Southern Oscillation activity at millennial timescales during the Holocene epoch,' published in Nature.

This research analyzed a 10,000-year sediment record to reconstruct variability over the Holocene (the last ~11,700 years).

The study found that El Niño and La Niña (ENSO) events—marked by changes in precipitation and sediment deposition—have occurred for at least 10,000 years, with their frequency and intensity fluctuating naturally over decades, centuries, and millennia.

'ENSO variability has been a persistent feature of the tropical Pacific climate system throughout the Holocene,' state the authors of the study. They link these cycles to significant weather swings, such as flips from wetter to drier conditions.

The Seattle Times uncritically republished the AP article. What about the Pacific Northwest's wet-to-dry cycles affecting Seattle?

Historical records—detailed in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences in 2011, titled 'Drought variability in the Pacific Northwest from a 6,000-yr lake sediment record,' analyzed a sediment core from Castor Lake in Washington to reconstruct 6,000 years of deluge/drought history in the Pacific Northwest.

It found that wet and dry cycles have fluctuated naturally over millennia, with some dry periods lasting decades, driven largely by natural climate patterns like El Niño/La Niña.

Getting back to the AP's article, it also claims: Oceans absorb most of the planet's extra heat. That causes the water to expand and ice to melt at the poles, raising sea levels. The warmer water also provides fuel for larger hurricanes and cyclones that can dump massive amounts of water in a short time.

Those claims are easily refuted.

Data presented in *Climate at a Glance: Hurricanes* demonstrates definitively that global cyclone activity has remained stable, with no climate change fingerprint to be found.

Also, sea levels have been naturally and gradually rising long before 'climate change' was ever a twinkle in the eye of the media.

Other data reveal that wilder swings in extreme weather occurred during the early 20th century and before, like during the 1930s Dust Bowl, when CO2 levels were much lower than at present.

Floods in the past, like the devastating 1911 Green River Valley inundation or the Great Mississippi Flood of 1927, dwarf many modern events, yet we're supposed to believe this is all new?

The AP also ignores inconvenient truths, like how improved infrastructure, better forecasting, and improved warning systems have reduced weather-related deaths by more than 90 percent over the last century.

A 2021 World Health Organization report confirms that deaths from extreme weather have declined dramatically.

'Thanks to improved early warnings and disaster management, the number of deaths decreased almost three-fold,' reported the WMO.

Above the AP's article, next to a donate button, is the statement: 'AP SETS THE STANDARD FOR POLITICAL REPORTING. SUPPORT INDEPENDENT, FACT-BASED JOURNALISM.'

Yet the evidence is clear that while the AP is hyping claims of a 'juiced' water cycle based on unsubstantiated, vague expert claims, the [news] agency ignored government studies and peer-reviewed reports that undermine such a conclusion.

For example, NASA's Global Precipitation Climatology Project examined global precipitation trends and determined that current variability is well within historical norm; no water cycle juicing is in evidence.

Also, Climate Realism has published dozens of articles citing real-world data that

demonstrate that neither wildfire nor hurricane nor tornado trends are worsening at all, much less worsening in response to purported climate change, here, here, and here, for example.

'Fact based?' Hardly, since the AP routinely, as its 'reporters' did in this story, ignores mountains of easily found data that undermine claims the world faces a climate crisis. Shame on the AP for this journalistic malpractice.

The Fourth Estate is supposed to inform, not indoctrinate. In this story, the AP gets an 'F' for false reporting.

97: No, Axios, Climate Change Is Not Making Atlanta's Allergy Season Worse

Axios Atlanta recently published an article titled "Pollen season in Atlanta is getting worse, thanks to climate change," claiming that rising temperatures caused by climate change are making allergy season more severe. Axios' article is misleading at best, and misses a larger point. Data and historical trends indicate that while pollen levels fluctuate, factors like urbanization and land use changes—particularly the Urban Heat Island (UHI) effect—are far more significant contributors to Atlanta's pollen patterns than their so-called local climate change.

"A warming climate means that allergy season is starting earlier and lasting longer," write Kristal Dixon and Alex Fitzpatrick for Axios. "Longer, warmer growing seasons are leading to earlier pollen releases and higher overall pollen levels."

Dixon and Fitzpatrick ignore several key facts in their attempt to connect long-term climate change to longer allergy seasons. For example, Atlanta's well-documented Urban Heat Island effect—caused by dense infrastructure, concrete, and asphalt trapping heat—plays a much larger role in local temperature trends than any global warming influence. The city has expanded significantly over the last few decades, increasing localized temperatures and extending the growing season for plants.

According to a NASA analysis of Atlanta's UHI effect, the city consistently experiences significantly higher temperatures than surrounding rural areas due to human-made structures retaining heat. This localized warming—not global climate change—is a key driver of temperature-related shifts in pollen cycles.

Second, pollen levels are heavily influenced by regional vegetation patterns and CO₂ fertilization effects, which lead to healthier plant growth.

As pointed out in a Climate Realism article, pollen season is largely dependent on precipitation levels and natural climate variability, not just temperature. When there's more rain, plants produce more pollen. Conversely, droughts can suppress pollen levels. Climate models do not reliably account for these local and regional factors, yet Axios presents the

issue as if it is solely driven by global temperature changes.

Additionally, previous claims about worsening allergy seasons have not held up to scrutiny. For example, a 2022 Climate Realism analysis debunked similar assertions by showing that pollen trends vary by region and that some areas are actually experiencing less pollen, not more. Furthermore, studies cited in mainstream media often rely on cherry-picked data from limited time frames rather than examining long-term historical trends.

Axios embraced Climate Central's use of "consecutive freeze-free days" as a proxy for pollen season noting that between 1970 and 2024 the number of consecutive freeze free days increased in cities like Reno, Myrtle Beach, and Toledo. Interestingly, it didn't provide any data addressing whether incidences of treatment for allergies or sales of allergy medicine increased in those cities corresponding to the increase in days between and without freezing temperatures. And, despite climate change being a supposedly global phenomenon, it turns out the number of cities experienced a decline in the number of consecutive freeze free days, so the logical question to ask, did reported incidences of allergy attacks, or sales of allergy medicine, as a proxy, also decline. If Axios asked those questions it certainly provided no answer to them in the article, yet that is a reasonable connection to make if one is asking whether climate change is impacting allergies.

Even if climate change, as opposed to other factors, is causing longer allergy seasons, this misses a larger point, the positive benefits of a decline in freezing temperatures. The Axios story mentioned one in passing but failed to expand on it writing, "[a]bove-freezing temperatures allow for better plant growth." While the suffering of allergy sufferers should not be ignored, as Axios notes, allergies are treatable, but fewer below freezing days and nights benefit plants, pollinating insects, and humans alike.

Climate Realism has made this point in repeated posts, [here](#), [here](#), and [here](#), for example. Global greening has contributed to the largest decline in global hunger in history. Greater plant growth not only removes carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, but the allergy causing pollen it emits is great for pollinating insects like bees, and birds.

More directly, copious peer reviewed reports confirm that cold temperatures are responsible for 10 times more deaths than hot temperatures. As a result, as the number of freezing days has declined, the number of deaths attributable to non-optimum temperatures has also fallen sharply, preventing hundreds of thousands of deaths each year.

Instead of taking a broad, evidence-based approach, Axios in its attempt to connect worsening allergies to climate change it has once again resorted to alarmist claims without addressing all relevant factors. Atlanta's allergy season is influenced by many variables, including land use changes, dense urban landscaping with pollen producing plants, increased green space, and urbanization. Blaming climate change without considering these other influences misleads the public and fosters unnecessary panic. If the media is truly

interested in informing the public, they should focus on all contributing factors that might be causing a longer allergy season. They could also discuss the tremendous global net benefits of fewer freezing days.

98: No, 'Extreme Heat' Isn't Accelerating Aging—And It's Not Getting Worse

Yahoo News recently published an article titled 'Extreme heat may speed up aging in older adults, USC study says,' which was also reported by CBS News Boston. The article claims that extreme heat may accelerate aging and increase the risk of disease. However, this claim is misleading. While prolonged exposure to harsh environmental conditions can affect health, historical data does not support the idea that extreme heat is an increasing and worsening threat due to climate change. Evidence suggests that extreme heat waves in the United States are not becoming more frequent or severe, and cold weather remains a far greater threat to human health.

The study, published in *Science Advances*, analyzed DNA changes in older populations using epigenetic clocks and compared biological age changes to heat index history between 2010 and 2016. The researchers found a correlation between heat exposure and aging indicators. However, this study fails to consider other critical aging factors such as pollutants, UV exposure, diet, physical activity, and stress. Additionally, the study's reliance on a short dataset (2010-2016) does not meet the 30-year climate data standard set by the World Meteorological Organization.

Historical climate data from NOAA and *Climate at a Glance* show that heat waves in the U.S. were far more severe in the 1930s, particularly during the Dust Bowl years. If extreme heat were an escalating crisis, we would see a consistent upward trend, which is not evident. Furthermore, the study overlooks the Urban Heat Island (UHI) effect, where urban infrastructure retains heat, contributing to higher local temperatures. Many of the high-heat areas in the study overlap with urban zones known for UHI, indicating that urbanization, not climate change, may be responsible for the observed temperature increases.

Additionally, the study ignores the impact of the 2015-2016 El Niño event, one of the strongest recorded, which led to significantly higher temperatures. In 2015, more than 4,000 daily record highs were set across the U.S., and in 2016, over 5,350 daily records were broken, according to NOAA. By not considering El Niño's influence, the study falsely attributes short-term warming to long-term climate change.

While heat-related health risks exist, cold weather is a much greater public health threat. A study in *The Lancet* found that cold-related deaths vastly outnumber heat-related deaths worldwide, by nearly a 10-to-1 margin. In the U.S., extreme cold, winter storms, and energy policies that make heating more expensive pose a bigger risk than summer heat. Instead of highlighting these dangers, media outlets focus on 'extreme heat' as an existential threat while ignoring the well-documented risks of cold weather.

This type of reporting prioritizes a climate crisis narrative over scientific accuracy. By selectively using flawed short-term studies and ignoring broader historical data, the media promotes fear rather than providing a complete and balanced analysis. If true public health concerns were the priority, more attention would be given to the dangers of cold weather and the impact of rising energy costs rather than misleading claims about heat waves accelerating aging.

99: Report forecasts climate change to drive rise in heart disease

Researchers say 50,000 years of healthy life lost annually in Australia to weather-linked cardiovascular disease. Researchers have reported a link between cardiovascular issues and hot weather, forecasting that heart disease could double or triple in the next 25 years if current climate trends continue. In a report published on Monday, researchers in Australia said they had found that 49,483 years of healthy life were lost every year to cardiovascular disease caused by hot weather. They warned that under current climate trends, the impact of extreme weather is set to multiply in the coming decades. The study, published in the *European Heart Journal*, used data from the Australian Burden of Disease Database on illness caused by heart disease from 2003 to 2018. "When the weather is hot, our hearts must work harder to help us cool down. This added pressure can be dangerous, especially for people with cardiovascular disease," said Professor Peng Bi from the University of Adelaide. The researchers calculated that 7.3 percent of the total burden due to cardiovascular disease or death could be attributed to extreme weather conditions. Modelling suggests that the figure could double or even triple by 2050, depending on different greenhouse gas emission scenarios outlined by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, according to the report. 'First study of its kind'. "Although our study is focused on Australia, the fundamental link between higher temperatures and increased cardiovascular risk has been documented globally," said lead author Jingwen Liu from the University of Adelaide. Liu noted that the research was "the first of its kind globally", adding that "our comprehensive approach makes the study valuable for planning future climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies". The authors also found that there was scope for lowering the impact of high temperatures on cardiovascular disease with strategies helping people to adapt. "Our findings also call for urgent investment in adaptation and mitigation strategies, including urban cooling plans, public health campaigns and improved emergency responses during hot weather," said Bi.

100: Supreme Court allows Hawaii climate change lawsuit to move forward

WASHINGTON — The Supreme Court on Monday turned away appeals filed by various oil companies trying to shut down a lawsuit in Hawaii that seeks to hold them accountable for climate change. The decision means that the municipality of Honolulu can move forward with a closely watched lawsuit against companies, including Sunoco and Shell, that raises claims under Hawaii state law. The companies argue that climate change is inherently an issue of federal law that should not be addressed by state courts. Other companies that were sued include ExxonMobil, Chevron and BP. The Hawaii Supreme Court ruled in October 2023 that the case could move forward, focusing on allegedly deceptive marketing and public statements made by the oil companies rather than the physical impacts of

climate change. The state court concluded that the lawsuit was not displaced by federal law because it “does not seek to regulate emissions and does not seek damages for interstate emissions.” The Biden administration had urged the Supreme Court not to take up the cases. Business interests have been desperately trying to shut down climate change lawsuits that municipalities have been filing in state courts all over the country. In doing so, they have repeatedly turned to the Supreme Court. In 2021, the court ruled in favor of companies on a procedural issue in a case concerning claims brought by the city of Baltimore. But two years later, the justices turned away appeals brought by various companies trying to get the case transferred to federal court, which is generally seen as more business-friendly. At the national level, the court’s conservative majority has hampered the ability of the Environmental Protection Agency to tackle climate change, putting new curbs on its authority in a 2022 ruling. Also of relevance is a 2011 ruling in which the Supreme Court rejected an attempt to sue companies under federal common law. The court ruled then that the Clean Air Act, the key federal law for regulating air pollution, meant that common law claims could not be brought.

101: Bill Gates Gives Up on Climate Change

In decades past, as the effects of climate change slowly became undeniable, some looked to the super-rich — the billionaires with enough cash to really make a splash — for solutions. They backed green energy campaigns and carbon capture programs, pushed plastics recycling and climate change messaging. New products hit the market as ethical consumption became the rule of the day: electric vehicles, solar panels, reusable bags, carbon-neutral dryer balls. By the early 2020s, billionaires had positioned themselves as the masters of climate change policy, taking advantage of their great fortunes to become indispensable to environmentalism. Now, however, many of those same billionaires are pulling support at an alarming rate. And Bill Gates — Microsoft founder, sixth richest man in the world, and alleged sex pest — is the latest among them. New reporting by Heatmap is signaling the end of a “major chapter in climate giving,” as Breakthrough Energy — Gates’ climate change nonprofit — has locked the doors on its policy and advocacy office, laying off dozens of employees throughout Europe and the US. Breakthrough’s lobbying was central to advancing climate policy through legislation championed by the Biden administration, including the Inflation Reduction Act, the CHIPS Act, and the bipartisan Infrastructure Law. Though the billionaire’s for-profit green energy investments at companies like Arnergy and Mission Zero Technologies remain in place, Breakthrough’s belt-tightening will very likely end the nonprofit’s grant writing efforts. That’s a major blow to climate nonprofits, and further evidence that, for all their feel-good bluster, the mega-rich never forget their bottom line. Ever since billionaire real estate mogul Donald Trump won his second presidential election, tech barons like Mark Zuckerberg, Jeff Bezos, Sundar Pichai, and of course Elon Musk have made no bones about shedding their progressive skin and embracing the new administration. Gates, too, is cozying up to the returning president. In early January, the Microsoft founder spent three hours dining with his fellow billionaire, telling the Wall Street Journal he was “frankly impressed” by Trump’s grasp on the issues dear to him. Though many no doubt feel betrayed by what seems like a sudden rightward turn, billionaires like

Gates have always behaved like wolves in sheep's clothing, prioritizing their fortunes above all. For example, Gates was heavily involved in establishing the Global Fund, a privately-funded rival to the World Health Organization. While the Global Fund did improve global vaccination rates, the cost of basic medicines skyrocketed thanks to his introduction of for-profit actors into global health efforts — another sector made to rely on the generosity of billionaires. Since then, Gates has had no trouble withholding COVID vaccines from impoverished countries, raking in profits from union-busting corporations, and throwing out money to buy media influence — to say nothing of his chummy friendship with Jeffrey Epstein. It all goes to show: billionaires were never going to save the world from climate catastrophe — they just needed us to believe they could.

102: Sun 'Lockdown' Could Trigger Freezing Weather, Earthquakes, and Famine

OUR sun has gone into lockdown, which could cause freezing weather, earthquakes and famine, scientists say.

The sun is currently in a period of “solar minimum”, meaning activity on its surface has fallen dramatically. Experts believe we are about to enter the deepest period of sunshine “recession” ever recorded as sunspots have virtually disappeared.

Astronomer Dr Tony Phillips said: “Solar Minimum is under way, and it’s a deep one.

“Sunspot counts suggest it is one of the deepest of the past century. The sun’s magnetic field has become weak, allowing extra cosmic rays into the solar system.

“Excess cosmic rays pose a health hazard to astronauts and polar air travellers, affect the electro-chemistry of Earth’s upper atmosphere, and may help trigger lightning.”

Nasa scientists fear it could be a repeat of the Dalton Minimum, which happened between 1790 and 1830 — leading to periods of brutal cold, crop loss, famine and powerful volcanic eruptions.

Temperatures plummeted by up to 2C over 20 years, devastating the world’s food production. On April 10, 1815, the second largest volcanic eruption in 2,000 years happened at Mount Tambora in Indonesia, killing at least 71,000 people.

It also led to the so-called Year Without a Summer in 1816 — also nicknamed “eighteen hundred and froze to death” — when there was snow in July.

So far this year the sun has been “blank” with no sunspots 76 per cent of the time, a rate surpassed only once before in the Space Age — last year, when it was 77 per cent blank.

103: Wildfires Will Become Worse Thanks To Decades-Old Liberal Policies, Says Fire Expert Who Predicted Uptick In Blazes

Former President Bill Clinton's land management rules and other liberal policies paved the way for future debilitating wildfires, fire expert Bob Zybach told the Daily Caller News Foundation.

Zybach warned of potential disastrous wildfires shortly after Clinton signed a slate of rules in the mid-1990s that, according to a study published in the Ecological Society of America in 2019, was "inconsistent with management for ... historically fire-frequent forests."

Zybach's comments come as California, Oregon, and parts of Washington deal with catastrophic wildfires that have killed 26 people and destroyed buildings.

Former President Bill Clinton made a significant change to federal land management nearly 30 years ago that created conditions necessary to increase the severity of wildfires on the West Coast, according to one fire expert who predicted the problem years ago.

Shortly before leaving office in 2001, Clinton limited the ability of the United States Forest Service to thin out a dense thicket of foliage and downed trees on federal land to bring the West into a pristine state, Bob Zybach, an experienced forester with a PhD in environmental science, told the Daily Caller News Foundation. The former president's decision created a ticking time bomb, Zybach argues.

"If you don't start managing these forests, then they are going to start burning up. Thirty years later, they are still ignoring it," said Zybach, who spent more than 20 years as a reforestation contractor. He was referring to warnings he made years ago, telling officials that warding off prescribed burns in Oregon and California creates kindling fueling fires.

Such rules make it more difficult to deploy prescribed burns, which are controlled burns designed to cull all of the underbrush in forests to lessen the chance of massive fires, Zybach noted. Years of keeping these areas in their natural state result in dead trees and dried organic material settling on the forest floor, turning such material into matchsticks soaked in jet fuel during dry seasons, he said.

Zybach's comments come as wildfires continue churning through parts of California, Oregon and Washington, media reports show. Fires have killed 26 people in West Coast states since August, including 19 people in California, and have culminated in more than half-a-million people evacuating Oregon, a number representing roughly 10% of the state's overall population.

Roughly 100 massive fires are blazing Saturday in the West, including 12 in Idaho and nine in Montana, the National Interagency Fire Center said Saturday. All told, the wildfires have churned through more than 4.5 million acres in 12 states. (RELATED: Wildfires, Blackouts And High Gas Prices: Californians Fight Familiar Foes Amid Pandemic) Shortly before leaving office, Clinton introduced the Roadless Rule that restricted the use of existing roads and construction of new roads on 49 million acres of National Forest, making it difficult for

officials to scan the land for the kind of kindling that fuels massive conflagrations.

The move was part of the Northwest Forest Plan (NWFP), a resolution adopted by Clinton in 1994 in order to settle ongoing disputes between economic and environmental interests, according to The New York Times. The plan was intended to protect certain portions of forests while allowing logging in others.

But the plan was “inconsistent with management for ecological integrity in the dry, historically fire-frequent forests” that make up portions of the protected forests, according to a study published in the Ecological Study of America in 2019.

Meanwhile, fire suppression policies, which began at the beginning of the 20th century, have allowed kindling to accumulate in forests, according to The Guardian.

Ten years before Clinton’s rule, the Fish and Wildlife Service placed the northern spotted owl on the Endangered Species Act, forcing the Forest Service to adopt a new policy that resulted in a greater reduction in timber harvests. The amount of timber removed from federal lands plummeted, according to data accumulated in 2015 by the Reason Foundation.

An average of 10.3 billion feet of timber was removed each year from Forest Service land between 1960 and 1990, the data show. Those numbers dropped between 1991 and 2000 and continued dropping — an average of only 2.1 billion feet of timber was removed from the land between 2000 and 2013, according to the data. That’s an 80% decline.

And while logging can be an ineffective method to preventing forest fires and can, in some instances, cause an increase, according to the BBC, the Times reported that, following the Northwest Forest Plan, wildfire risk grew along with fuels like combustable trees and underbrush.

Actions like “thinning and prescribed fire to reduce fuel continuity” would “promote ecological integrity” in certain portions of forests protected under the plan, according to the Ecological Society of America study.

“They’ve gone and left hundreds of thousands of acres of burnt timber, a fire bomb waiting to happen, standing in place because the black back woodpecker prefers that habitat,” Zybach said. “It’s great for lawyers, but it’s bad for people who breathe air or work in the woods.”

“The prescribed burns are an ancient form of management for keeping the fuels down so these events don’t happen,” Zybach added, referring to Native American Indians who used controlled burns to ward away pests and prevent wildfires from licking their homes.

The Clinton administration’s plan to turn forests in the West into pristine land free of

human interference risked fueling “wildfires reminiscent of the Tillamook burn, the 1910 fires and the Yellowstone fire,” Zybach, who is based in Oregon, told Evergreen magazine in 1994, when the NWFP came into effect.

Western Oregon had one major fire above 10,000 acres between 1952 and 1987, reports show. The Silver Complex Fire of 1987 snapped that streak after torching more than 100,000 acres in the Kalmiopsis Wilderness area, killing rare plants and trees the federal government sought to protect from human activities.

And the Mendocino Complex Fire is spreading across California and is on its way to becoming the largest wildfire in the state, engulfing more than 283,000 acres.

Zybach said he believes land management, rather than climate change, is increasing the severity of Western wildfires, noting that climate change has little to do with kindling gathering on forest floors.

University of Washington climate scientist Cliff Mass told the DCNF in 2018 that “the key factors are mismanaged forests, years of fire suppression, increased population, people living where they should not, invasive flammable species, and the fact that California has always had fire.”

Other scientists, however, say climate change is the driving cause as summer heat intensifies and further dries out dead brush on forest floors.

The Washington Post reported that the West is becoming hotter, drier and and more susceptible to large blazes. It also pointed to an August study that found fall days in California with extreme fire-weather conditions had more than doubled since the 1980s.

“I can’t say it was unexpected what happened there, but the speed with which it went was mind-blowing to a lot of us,” a U.S. Forest Service research ecologist, Eric Knapp, told the Post, referring to the Creek Fire. Climate change increased the likelihood and severity of a drought that killed trees ahead of the fire in that region, according to the Post.

Meanwhile, former President Barack Obama tweeted: “The fires across the West Coast are just the latest examples of the very real ways our changing climate is changing our communities.”

Similarly, Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer tweeted: “The proof of the urgency of the climate crisis is literally in the air around us.” The New York Democrat included a link to a Sept. 10 article from CBS blaming climate change for the fires.

Fire Experts Agree: Prescribed Burns Are Critical, Experts Say
Overzealous fire suppression across California are helping to build up wildland fuels, which

contribute to wildfires, according to Tim Ingalsbee, a fire ecologist who began a career in the 1980s as a wildland firefighter. The solution is “to get good fire on the ground and whittle down some of that fuel load,” he told ProPublica in August.

“It’s just ... well ... it’s horrible. Horrible to see this happening when the science is so clear and has been clear for years. I suffer from Cassandra syndrome,” Ingalsbee said, referring to a Greek metaphor people use when they believe their valid warnings are ignored.

“Every year I warn people: Disaster’s coming,” he said. “We got to change. And no one listens. And then it happens.”

Other experts have made similar arguments in the past. (RELATED: Decades Of Mismanagement Turned US Forests Into ‘Slow-Motion Time Bombs’)
Overgrown grasslands, forests, and woodlands contributed to California wildfires in 2017, Sasha Berleman, a fire ecologist, told High Country News that year.

“I’m more certain than ever that there’s a lot we can do between now and the next time this happens to make it so that the negative consequences to people are nowhere near as dramatic,” she said.

The devastating fires that ran through California’s wine country in October of 2017 killed 42 people and destroyed nearly 7,000 buildings, High Country News noted.

The solution might be easier said than done. Nearly 20 million acres in California, or an area about the size of Maine, will need to experience controlled burns to limit catastrophic wildfires, a January study from Nature Sustainability found.

104: Climate Change: The Greatest-Ever Conspiracy Against The Taxpayer

Climate change is the biggest scam in the history of the world – a \$1.5 trillion-a-year conspiracy against the taxpayer, every cent, penny and centime of which ends in the pockets of the wrong kind of people, none of which goes towards a cause remotely worth funding, all of it a complete and utter waste. Here is an edited version of a speech on this subject I gave last week to the World Taxpayers’ Associations in Berlin. Good evening ladies and gentlemen; Guten Abend meine Damen und Herren. May I say how grateful I am to Staffan Wennberg and the World Taxpayers Associations for inviting me to speak in Berlin. This is my first time here since 1978. I was a schoolboy then. I learned my first German: “Was trinken wir? Schultheiss Bier.” Now I’m grown up and married with children even older than I was then. Yesterday I went on a tour and I couldn’t help noticing there seem to have been one or two changes. When I last came I have to confess that the Wall was the highlight of my trip. So echt Cold War. So Spy Who Came In From The Cold! I remember taking the U-bahn underneath the wall, passing through the East German side, and seeing empty grey platforms where the train never stopped, and lurking in the shadows grim looking guards with machine guns. And you know how they say: “If you’re not a communist by the time

you're 18 then you're heartless and if you're not a capitalist by the time you're 40 then you're brainless." Well I'm afraid I skipped that first stage and went straight to the second. All it took was that little glimpse of East Germany – a place so horrible that if you tried to escape they would shoot you with machine guns – to give me an abiding preference for free markets. Small Government. And low taxes. Low taxes. To many of us here, I suspect, it seems so obvious why low taxes are a desirable thing. We know, as Bastiat says: "The State is that great fiction by which everyone tries to live at the expense of everyone else." We've seen the performance of low-tax economies like Singapore and Hong Kong and compared it to the performance over the years of high-tax economies like Cuba, North Korea or France. And drawn the obvious conclusions. It's obvious to us. The evidence supports it. Why isn't it obvious to the rest of the world? Well one of the big problems I think is that over the years taxation has acquired a moral dimension it never had originally. When bad King John sent his tax collectors round 13th century England, everyone knew it was to fund his unpopular wars with France. No one said as they handed over their hard-earned groats: "Well at least it's going to make a better society." But today you hear it a lot. You hear people say things like "I don't mind paying a bit extra in tax if it gives us a better health service." Celebrities who try to reduce their taxes in complicated offshore schemes are pilloried in the newspaper. Companies like Google, Starbucks and Amazon which avoid paying taxes find themselves boycotted and the subject of angry campaigns on Twitter. There's an idea abroad that if you don't pay your taxes you're not being clever and canny – as you would have been considered in John's day. Rather you're shirking your moral duty to create a better world. Well I disagree with this. I couldn't disagree with it more strongly. I believe that far from being a moral force for good, taxes are – almost invariably – a force for greed, corruption, profligacy and waste. As PJ O'Rourke once noted: "Giving money and power to government is like giving whiskey and car keys to teenage boys." Nowhere is this truer in the field of the environment which, I sincerely believe – and I've been doing a lot of research into this – must count among the biggest wastes of tax money in the history of the world. Last year Climate Change Business Journal – calculated that the total annual spend on the climate change industry is \$1.5 trillion a year. All those carbon traders, climate researchers, renewables and biofuels experts, environment correspondents, professors of climate science at the University of East Anglia and the Potsdam Institute, sustainability officers on local councils, and so on, add up the cost of their grants and salaries – and \$1.5 trillion per year is the ballpark figure you reach. So what does \$1.5 trillion look like in a global economic context? Well, it's roughly the amount we spend every year on the online shopping industry. \$1.5 trillion on the global warming industry; \$1.5 trillion on the online shopping industry. But there's a key difference between these two industries. One exists to provide buyers and sellers what they want – to their mutual benefit; the other is a sham. Buying stuff on the internet: it's really useful, isn't it? It has had a dramatically transforming effect on our quality of life, the way you can order a book at 11 o'clock on a Sunday night and have it appear on your doorstep the very next day. But how did this marvellous industry spring up? Was it because of all the special incentives and tax breaks granted by wise governments? Nope of course not. They weren't necessary. The online shopping industry sprung up and grew and grew because it was what people wanted, where they

chose – of their own volition – to spend their money. Now compare and contrast the global warming industry – which I call a Potemkin industry – because that’s what it is: a fraud; a sham; a conspiracy against the taxpayer. Do you want to have a guess how much that industry would be worth if it weren’t for all the money funnelled into it via government grants and taxpayer levies and subsidies and regulatory capture? Pretty close to zero, I’d say. Take wind farms – my hobby horse. The cost of intermittent, unreliable wind energy is roughly twice the market rate for onshore wind; three times the market rate for onshore. Nobody’s going to pay that kind of money in the open market. The only way it’s going to happen if people are mandated by the government to do so: which is what of course has happened across Europe and in the US. Warren Buffett has said it: “wind farms don’t make sense without the tax credit.” They’re inefficient; they kill birds and bats; they spoil views; they’re environmentally unfriendly – rare earth minerals from China; they’re hazardous; they’re expensive; they’re ugly (well I think they are....) And in few countries is the damage these monstrosities have done more obvious than in Germany, home of the hateful Energiewende. Energiewende means Energy Transition. It has been a disaster, as Rupert Darwall noted in a recent Telegraph article. In 2004, the Green energy minister, Jürgen Trittin, claimed that the extra cost of renewable energy on monthly bills was equivalent to the cost of a scoop of ice cream. Nine years later, CDU minister Peter Altmaier said Energiewende could cost around €1 trillion by the end of the 2030s. The cost of feed-in tariffs and other subsidies is currently €21.8bn a year; €20bn is being spent on a new north-south high voltage line and investment in other grid infrastructure is likely to double that number. They cause real people real misery. In 2013, 345,000 German households could not pay their electricity bills because Energiewende had made them so expensive. That’s the financial damage they’ve caused. What about the environmental damage? Here we are in Germany, the Greenest nation on earth. Aren’t Greens supposed to care about animals? Well they don’t about bats, clearly. Bats are special. The reason they’re so heavily protected by so many laws is that they are a K-selected species. That is, they reproduce very slowly, live a long time and are easy to wipe out. Having evolved with few predators – flying at night helps – bats did very well with this strategy until the modern world. But now we have all those eco-friendly wind turbines. Or as I call them bird-slicing, bat-chomping eco-crucifixes. A recent study in Germany by the Leibniz Institute for Zoo and Wildlife Research showed that bats killed by German turbines may have come from places 1000 or more miles away. This would suggest that German turbines – which one study claims kill more than 200,000 bats a year – may be depressing populations across the entire northeastern portion of Europe. Why would anyone put up such things. One reason and one reason only: follow the money. Where does the money come from? Us! Who made the decision to spend that money? Not us. Oh definitely not us. Had it been us we might have done a bit of basic due diligence. Like, OK, so these wind turbines are necessary you say to save the planet from the threat of catastrophic and unprecedented man-made global warming? Correct. So has the planet ever been as warm in human history as it is today? Well, only in the Minoan warming period and the Roman warming period and the Medieval warming period. Just those. Right. And presumably back then all that CO2 heavy industry was burning was a real problem? No just kidding...Out of interest how much has the planet warmed in the last few

years? About 0.8 degrees C since 1850. Right so since the end of the Little Ice Age (so called because it was characterised by unpleasant cold) and years like the infamous Year Without A Summer (1816), the planet has heated by less than the temperature increase you'd get on a spring day between say breakfast and mid-morning coffee time? Ah yes but the computer models... Indeed the computer models. Those amazing models which have been predicting catastrophic, runaway warming, when there has been no significant warming since 1998 – so for eighteen years there has been no global warming? Ah yes but the temperatures of February 2016.... Look I could go on like this forever. I've been listening to these increasingly desperate excuses for decades. Perhaps some of you here believe them – if so, there's a bridge I'd like to sell you... But it really doesn't matter whether you believe in global warming or not because here's the reality: All that money we're being to spend on the global warming industry – that \$1.5 trillion I mentioned earlier siphoned straight out of taxpayers' pockets – it isn't going to make the blindest bit of difference. No, I exaggerate. It will make a teeny weeny bit of difference. Bjorn Lomborg has done the calculations. You're going to love this, if you haven't heard this before. These figures are just amazing. So recently you'll recall there was a big UN climate conference in Paris COP 21 and all the leaders of the world flew in to save the planet from global warming. But before they turned up, each delegate nation made a voluntary agreement as to how much it was going to cut its carbon emissions. Not compulsory, note. So these countries are free at any stage to abandon their carbon reduction targets – as funnily enough South Korea did last week. This is how much – best case scenario – that various countries are prepared to do to combat climate change. So Lomborg added up all the countries INDCs – that stands for Intended Nationally Determined Contributions – and worked out, using the climate alarmists' own models, what effect all this would have on global temperature. Do you want to know how much? (Oh this is the optimistic scenario by the way, not the pessimistic one). If all the countries do their bit then the total reduction in global warming – by the year 2100 will be 0.170 degrees Centigrade. As a climate sceptic friend of mine pointed out at the time, you'd experience a bigger temperature increase than that just walking down from the top to the bottom of the Eiffel tower. So there's your deal folks: you – and taxpayers like you – are paying \$1.5 trillion a year to reduce the world's temperatures by the end of this century by 0.170. It's so perfectly ridiculous it's almost funny. And I suppose on a personal level I shouldn't complain. I call climate change “the gift that goes on giving” because day in day out I get an endless stream of stories to write about the corruption, incompetence, skullduggery of the climate alarmism industry. But, putting my career aside for the moment, is this really a world we'd like to live in? Can it be right that people who have worked hard for their money should have it taken from them and then wasted in so spectacular fashion? And it's not just the waste that's so bad it's worse than that. If it were simply a form of taxpayer-funded welfare scheme for otherwise unemployable environmental sciences graduates that would be one thing. But this is causing real, lasting harm in any number of ways. The corrupting effects on science – and the scientific method – which at times are almost redolent of Lysenkoism of the Stalin era. The brainwashing of schoolchildren such as you might have found with the Young Pioneers. The economic damage caused by the misallocation of resources, as so frequently happens in Communist countries. The pollution caused by diesel

(introduced, on EU recommendation, because it's supposedly more CO2-friendly) which calls to mind Chernobyl or the poisoning of the Aral Sea. The human suffering of those 345,000 German households I mentioned who can't pay their electricity bills. Does this authoritarianism and corruption and incompetence remind you of anything? Well it has often been said – and there is much anecdotal evidence to support this – that after the Berlin Wall came down the left had a bit of a problem. Capitalism had won the economic argument. Where could the left go next? But the solution was there waiting them – the green movement. In the guise of saving the world's environment they could advance all their usual obsessions – control, regulation, state intervention, puritanism, compulsory immiseration – though this time with a smiling, fluffy face. Watermelons they call them: green on the outside, red on the inside. So the Berlin Wall came down but it never really went away. And sometimes I look at the world and what has been happening with the rise and rise of green lunacy and I ask myself: did the right side really win the Cold War or is it just an illusion?

105: If Antonio Guterres Can't Get Basic Facts Right, Why Should We Believe the UN on Anything?

Last year the UN Secretary-General António Guterres visited the Pacific island of Samoa and was filmed by a deserted house that he claimed had been abandoned due to climate change-related sea level rises and increasing storms. It was a porkie that quickly put its hat on and travelled around the world. The journalist Ola Sandstig reporting on Swedish public radio recently tracked down the owner of the house and found the dwelling was abandoned due to the 2009 earthquake and tsunami. Sadly, Samoa is still experiencing sea level rises about six times higher than previous levels but scientists explain it is due to the after effects of the earthquake. There has been no increase in tropical storms in the area and earthquakes and tsunamis are not caused by humans. Guterres stood by the house and stated that “if we are not able to stop what is happening with climate change, the problem that we see in Samoa will not stay in Samoa”. The arrogance on display here is astonishing. Most Pacific islands have been inconveniently increasing in size of late due to natural forces such as sand and coral accretion along with land movement. The unfortunate case of Samoa was obviously chosen for maximum psychotic effect. This despite clear evidence that has been presented by the distinguished geophysicist Professor Shan-Chan Han that showed land subsidence in the wake of the 2009 earthquake was causing sea levels to rise up to six times faster. Sadly, this effect is “likely to continue for decades” leading to “regular nuisance flooding”. This arrogance, common to many climate activists, might be summed up by the attitude: “Come and check us, we don't care, what are you going to do about it?” It was on display at a recent World Economic Forum ‘disinformation’ seminar when the UN's chief publicity flak Melissa Fleming stated: “We are becoming more proactive, we own the science and the world should know it.” The science writer Roger Pielke Jr. was unimpressed with Guterres's Samoa stunt, stating that his photo op and press release “can only be described as an intentional effect to mislead”. Another misleading UN stat that has been doing the rounds for decades is the claim that women and children are 14 times more likely than men to die in a climate disaster. Needless to say, the claim has been a favourite staple of activists for

years. Last May, the alarmist echo chamber the Conversation headlined the 14 times claim and stated: “A growing body of evidence demonstrates women and gender-diverse people are disproportionately vulnerable to the changing climate and the consequences it brings.” Roger Pielke reports that the claim, which can still be found on the UN main website, along with the internet sites of many linked operations, has been debunked by Professor Henrik Urdal of the Peace Institute in Oslo, who called the 14 times figure a “mythical number”. In 2014, he traced the claim back to a 2013 Save the Children report, which in turn cited a 2013 Plan International report, which quoted an article published in Natural Hazards Observer in 1997. This article turned out to be two-page opinion piece authored by Pastor Kristina Peterson of the US-based Church World Service. The sleuthing Sandstig from Sveriges Radio tracked down Pastor Peterson in Louisiana, who expressed surprise that her unsourced opinion was being touted as scientific fact in 2024 by the UN as well as other mainstream organisations. The journalist is reported to have asked for a comment from the UN, but none was forthcoming, possibly because Ms Fleming was busy elsewhere claiming ownership of all the politically correct facts. Finally, Sandstig investigated Guterres’s claim in 2022 that the number of weather, climate and water-related disasters had increased by a factor of five over the last 50 years. This was covered by the Daily Sceptic at the time where the graph below up to 2022 was published. As the graph shows, there is no evidence that the number of major disasters going back to the turn of the century is becoming more frequent. In fact, the evidence presented suggests that recent disasters are around 10% less frequent than those recorded in the 2000s. In reality, the increase in disasters recorded by CRED EM-DAT from 1970 to 2000 was due to vastly improved reporting procedures. Deborati Guha-Sapir, who oversaw the widely-consulted database for decades, told Swedish Radio that you can argue that climate disasters or natural disasters have not actually substantially increased but the reporting has been “much, much” easier, better and quicker. Antonio ‘boiling’ Guterres’s constant hysterical pronouncements are risible. But he is still the head of the UN – the parent-organisation of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) – and Roger Pielke worries about the effect of all the false claims and bad science. “The climate science community should care that the UN has been systematically misrepresenting climate science, because it could affect how the IPCC is viewed, fairly or unfairly,” he noted. As reported by the Daily Sceptic in 2022, Pielke noted that he had seen “a concerted and successful” effort by climate advocates to create and spread disinformation about disasters, “knowing full well that virtually all journalists and scientists will stay silent and allow false information to spread unchecked – and sometimes will even help to amplify it”.

106: Antarctic sea ice falls to near record low as study reveals 'structural change'

Antarctic sea ice has again fallen to a near-record low as a new study shows the system is undergoing a significant 'structural change'. Scientists have been using satellite images over the past 45 years to track the extent of sea ice on the fringe of the continent. During that time, sea ice has fallen below 2 million square kilometres on four occasions — 2022, 2023, 2024 and 2025 — according to the Australian Antarctic Program Partnership (AAPP). This

year's data, captured on March 1, was the third-lowest annual daily minimum on record, it said. Will Hobbs, an AAPP sea ice researcher at the University of Tasmania, said the recent repeated lows were part of a downward trend observed since about 2016. 'What's alarming about it is how we're not alarmed anymore, because this is now the new normal,' Dr Hobbs said. 'It's another summer with really low sea ice and that's not surprising to us anymore, because we've seen it back-to-back. 'It's just really worrying that we're seeing this long-term structural change.' Scientists 'reconstruct' historical record of sea ice Dr Hobbs is part of an international research team that recently used a novel approach to ascertain the extent of Antarctic sea ice prior to satellite records. 'Obviously, we don't have a time machine, but what we can do is do something called 'reconstructions',' he said. Sea ice fluctuates significantly between summer and winter and is heavily affected by atmospheric conditions, including temperature, and wind speed and direction. 'Antarctic sea ice has historically been very slavish to the atmosphere,' Dr Hobbs said. 'If we can reconstruct what the atmosphere looked like going back to the early 20th century, then we can probably say something about what sea ice looked like at that time.' Using historical data from 30 weather stations across the Southern Hemisphere, the team was able to 'reconstruct' the likely extent of Antarctic sea ice back to 1899. 'It allows us to have a context for these extreme variabilities in Antarctic sea ice,' Professor Marilyn Raphael, from the University of California in Los Angeles, said. The results showed there was less than a 1-in-1,000 chance that the extreme minimums seen in recent years would have occurred during the 20th Century. 'The system has changed,' Professor Raphael said. 'And it's changed from one where we could normally look at the [long-term] average ... and have a sense of what will happen. 'We can no longer look at our average because we've tipped into a system of extremes.' Warmer ocean 'wielding an influence' on sea ice Dr Hobbs said the recent low levels of sea ice were likely linked to warmer ocean temperatures. 'The atmosphere alone is not enough to explain what we're seeing,' he said. 'The ocean has to be wielding an influence.' He said further research was needed to better understand the cause and effect of the altered conditions in the Southern Ocean. 'It's either because anthropogenic climate change has caused the ocean changes that are driving these events, or these kind of ocean events have happened in the past [prior to 1899].' Dr Hobbs said low levels of Antarctic sea ice could have significant flow-on effects, including reduced protection of ice shelves and glaciers, which could contribute to sea level rise if they melt. 'This is potentially a global problem,' he said. The study, titled A Twenty-First Century Structural Change in Antarctica's Sea Ice System, has been published in the journal Nature Communications, Earth & Environment.

107: The world has just experienced its hottest decade

CNN — A report considered the world's most trusted source of climate updates has laid out the parlous state of a planet that has recorded its 10 hottest years over the last decade. The World Meteorological Organization's State of the Global Climate report lists alarming records that scientists say should shock the world into taking drastic action – but they warn they probably won't, given the lack of urgency displayed by global leaders to date. The report found the atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide – as well as methane and

nitrous oxide – are at the highest levels in the last 800,000 years. Here are the report's main findings: 2024 set a new heat record. Last year was confirmed to be the hottest since records began 175 years ago, beating the previous record set in 2023. And 2024 was likely to be the first time global temperatures exceeded 1.5 degrees Celsius above the baseline set in 1850-1900, according to the WMO. Scientists say that doesn't mean that we've permanently crossed global limits set under the Paris Agreement – which the United States left on the first day of President Donald Trump's second term – but we're getting close. Record levels of greenhouse gases were mostly to blame for higher temperatures, aided by a short-term boost from El Niño, a weather pattern that creates warmer water in the eastern Pacific, the report said. Long-term global warming is estimated to be between 1.34 and 1.41 degrees Celsius up on the pre-industrial era, the WMO said. United Nations Secretary-General António Guterres said limiting the global temperature rise to 1.5 degrees Celsius was still possible, but "leaders must step up to make it happen." Each of the past eight years set a record for ocean heat. Rising global temperatures inevitably mean warmer water, as oceans absorb 90% of the surplus heat. New heat records have been set for each of the last eight years, and the rate of ocean warming over the past two decades is more than twice that recorded from 1950 to 2005. Warm water has caused severe bleaching of coral reefs over the past year, fueled tropical and subtropical storms and exacerbated the loss of sea ice. The rate of sea-level rise has doubled since satellite measurements began. The rate of global mean sea-level rise has doubled since the first satellite record in 1993, to reach a record high in 2024, the report said. The rise of 2.1 millimeters per year recorded between 1993 and 2002 has been dwarfed by a 4.7-millimeter increase between 2015 and 2024. Higher sea levels have knock-on effects for coastal communities, including flooding, erosion and the salinization of groundwater. Sea-level rise is exacerbated by sea ice melt, and there's no sign that's slowing. The three years since 2021 brought the biggest three-year loss of Glacier mass on record. "Exceptionally negative" losses were recorded in Norway, Sweden, Svalbard and the tropical Andes, the WMO said. 2024 saw the most people displaced due to climate impacts in 16 years. Tropical cyclones, floods, droughts, and other hazards in 2024 displaced the highest number of people since 2008, when 36 million people were forced from their homes. That year, around half – 15 million – were displaced in China after the Sichuan earthquake. Flooding also affected millions in India. In 2024, tropical cyclones and hurricanes brought destructive winds, severe rain and flooding. Dozens of unprecedented heatwaves were recorded including in Saudi Arabia where temperatures reached 50 degrees Celsius (122 degrees Fahrenheit) during the Hajj pilgrimage. Wildfires and severe drought also raged through some countries, displacing people and disrupting food supplies. In eight countries, at least one million more people faced acute food insecurity compared with 2023, the WMO said. Some of the turmoil could have been avoided with early-warning systems, though in parts of the world most vulnerable to climate impacts, there's very little advance notice of disaster. "Only half of all countries worldwide have adequate early-warning systems. This must change," said Celeste Saulo, WMO secretary-general. What scientists say Sarah Perkins-Kirkpatrick, a professor at the Australian National University's Fenner School of Environment and Society, said the world had reached a point where net zero emissions were no longer enough. "We need to

stop hitting snooze on our alarm, which is the now regularly occurring record-breaking global temperatures,” she said. “How much more do we need to scream and shout that climate change is happening, it’s because of us, and without any serious action, it’s only going to get worse? The longer this goes in, the harder it will be to make things better.” Linden Ashcroft, a lecturer in climate science at The University of Melbourne, said not enough attention had been paid to warnings. “Honestly, I’m not quite sure what to do next. Scream these findings from the tops of buildings? Write my comments in capitals? Saying all this while dancing on TikTok?” she said in a written statement. “Unless we see real climate leadership from governments and businesses, I will save this response and send it through again next year.”

108: Scientists alarmed as Antarctica hits sea ice low four years in a row

The United Nations warns Antarctic sea ice extent is beginning to decline in the face of climate change, after record-breaking temperatures in 2023 and 2024. For years the most remote continent on Earth had seemed largely immune to climate change, with satellites showing that sea ice extent grew despite global warming. But now scientists are growing concerned after evidence shows that Antarctica has suffered sea ice lows four years in a row. Between 1978 and 2015 Antarctic ice extent was seen to grow at a steady rate, despite the planet warming and levels of greenhouse gases increasing. One reason is that winds around the continent appear to have insulated it from warmer air. However, the World Meteorological Organisation (WMO), the Geneva-based UN agency, said in a report on Wednesday that the trend in ice extent appeared to be reversing. Celeste Saulo, the secretary-general of the WMO, said: ‘The frozen parts of Earth’s surface, known as the cryosphere, are melting at an alarming rate: glaciers continue to retreat, and Antarctic sea ice reached its second-lowest extent ever recorded.’ While East Antarctica has experienced a growth in sea ice in the past, the west of the continent is more vulnerable. One glacier in the west, Thwaites, is dubbed the ‘doomsday glacier’ because its loss could cause the collapse of other glaciers, causing 3.3 metres of global sea-level rise and threatening low-lying cities — including London. Before 2022, Antarctica’s minimum sea ice extent — the lowest it gets during the southern hemisphere summer — had never been lower than 2 million square kilometres. But it has now been below the threshold for four years running. 2025 tied with 2022 for joint second-lowest, at 1.98 million square kilometres. John Kennedy, the scientific coordinator of the report, said there had been warming below the surface in the Southern Ocean. The sea ice lows in recent years appeared to be related to some of that heat coming to the surface, he said. Scientists said it was too early to say if Antarctica had flipped into a new pattern. Karina von Schuckmann, an oceanographer at Mercator Ocean International, a French research institute, said: ‘There are many studies which are coming out, and there is no clear consensus yet. There are studies which have shown the impact of variability, the impact of changing winds, there are discussions about the warming on the ocean side.’ Kennedy said the changes mattered for people on the other side of the world because of their impact on sea level. ‘What happens in the poles doesn’t necessarily stay at the poles,’ he said. The sparse sea ice in Antarctica over the past two years may also have ‘played a role’ in the record-breaking global temperatures seen in 2024

and 2023, the WMO said. However, the main reason for the record heat was climate change, Kennedy said. The past ten years have all been in the top ten warmest on record. The agency's report found levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere are now at the highest they have been for 800,000 years, as the emissions produced by humanity have kept climbing higher. The result is that each of the past eight years set a new global record for heat in the oceans, which are absorbing much of our emissions. Sea levels are rising too, at twice the rate in the past ten years as they did between 1993 and 2002. Last year, the global average sea level hit its highest point since satellite records began in 1993. António Guterres, the UN secretary-general, said the new data showed 'our planet is issuing more distress signals'. The UK and nearly 200 other countries will head to a Brazilian port city in the Amazon rainforest in November for the Cop30 international climate talks, in an attempt to curb global emissions. 'This report shows that limiting long-term global temperature rise to 1.5C is still possible,' said Guterres. 'Leaders must step up to make it happen — seizing the benefits of cheap, clean renewables for their people and economies — with new national climate plans.'

109: Extreme Heat Could Make Older Adults Age Faster by Altering Their DNA, Study Finds

Extreme heat can increase the risk of cardiovascular disease, affect mental health and worsen asthma. And those negative health effects are particularly dangerous to elderly people: Now, a new study suggests extreme heat could even alter the DNA of older adults and accelerate biological aging. A pair of researchers at the University of Southern California analyzed blood samples from more than 3,600 adults over the age of 55. Their analysis found that those living in neighborhoods with frequent hot days showed faster biological aging than those living in cooler areas. Their findings were published in late February in the journal *Science Advances*. 'This is one of the first large-scale studies to link long-term heat exposure to biological aging in humans,' study lead author Eunyong Choi says to *New Scientist's* Carissa Wong. The research team focused on 'epigenetic clocks'—measurements of chemical modifications to people's DNA as they grow older—as a proxy for aging. Although scientists debate whether these are the most accurate measure of aging, the markers are often used to estimate 'how well the body is functioning at the molecular and the cellular level,' Choi says to Mohana Ravindranath at the *New York Times*. A person's biological age might not always match up to their chronological age—and a higher biological age can raise the risk of aging-related diseases. The researchers cross-referenced these epigenetic clocks with temperature data from across the United States in the six years before the blood samples were collected in a 2016 study. They found that someone living in an area with more than 140 extreme heat days per year—defined as days that surpass 90 degrees—could age up to 14 months faster than someone living in a cooler area with fewer than ten extreme heat days annually. The study accounted for race and ethnicity, as well as physical activity, education, income, smoking, obesity and alcohol consumption. 'Two people that had identical sociodemographic characteristics and similar lifestyles, just because one is living in a hotter environment, they experience additional biological aging,' says Choi to ABC News' Julia Jacobo. 'It's important, suggestive work,' Nancy Krieger, an

epidemiologist at the Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health who was not involved in the study, tells the New York Times. Many of the places with the most extreme heat days 'are also some of the states that have the worst health profiles.' When it comes to extreme heat, older adults are especially at risk, since aging decreases the body's ability to regulate its temperature. Certain medications taken by elderly people can also interfere with their tolerance for heat, writes Choi in an article for the Conversation. But heat is not necessarily the only factor that may be leading to negative health outcomes—and the study only establishes a link between extreme heat and biological age, not a causal relationship. The research also doesn't account for all the ways in which people might protect themselves from heat, like using air conditioning or staying indoors. 'What is clear, however, is that extreme heat is more than just an immediate health hazard—it may be silently accelerating the aging process, with long-term consequences for public health,' Choi writes in the Conversation. Future research can examine what other factors might make someone more vulnerable to faster biological aging, says senior author and gerontologist Jennifer Ailshire in a statement, which can then inform public health policies. She hopes that cities' infrastructure will be updated to reflect the importance of heat-resilient areas, such as by including shaded bus stops and sidewalks, planting more trees and increasing green space. 'If everywhere is getting warmer, and the population is aging and these people are vulnerable, then we need to get really a lot smarter about these mitigation strategies,' Ailshire adds.

110: Tackling climate crisis will increase economic growth, OECD research finds

Taking strong action to tackle the climate crisis will increase countries' economic growth, rather than damage their finances as critics of net zero policies have claimed, research from the world's economic watchdog has found. Setting ambitious targets on cutting greenhouse gas emissions, and setting out the policies to achieve them, would result in a net gain to global GDP by the end of the next decade, according to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), in a joint report with the UN Development Programme. The calculation of the net gain, of 0.23% by 2040, would be even greater in 2050, if it included the benefit of avoiding the devastation that not cutting emissions would wreak on the economy. By 2050, the most advanced economies would enjoy an increase of 60% in GDP per capita growth, while by the same date lower income countries would experience a 124% rise from 2025 levels. In the shorter term, there would also be benefits for developing countries, with 175million people lifted out of poverty by the end of the decade, if governments invest in cutting emissions now. By contrast, a third of global GDP could be lost this century, if the climate crisis were allowed to run unchecked. Achim Steiner, executive secretary of the UNDP, told a conference held by the German government in Berlin on Tuesday: "The overwhelming evidence that we now have is that we are not regressing if we invest in climate transitions. We actually see a modest increase in GDP growth, that may look small at first ... but quickly grows." Simon Stiell, the UN climate chief, also warned in a speech on Wednesday morning in Berlin that Europe would suffer economic devastation from the climate crisis, if strong action were not taken soon. Extreme weather would shave 1% from Europe's GDP before mid-century, and by 2050 would shrink

the economy by 2.3% a year. Although those figures may appear small, the crucial point is that the economic contraction would continue year after year. For comparison, the financial crisis of 2008-09 caused a contraction of 5.5% in the EU, but recovery began within a few years. The contraction owing to the climate crisis would be the equivalent of a serious recession occurring every year. By the end of two decades of such damage, the EU economy would cease to exist. "[Climate breakdown] is a recipe for permanent recession," said Stiell. "As disasters make more and more regions unliveable, and food production declines, millions more people will be forced to migrate, internally and across borders." He added: "The climate crisis is an urgent national security crisis that should be at the top of every cabinet agenda."

111: Plans for new marine nature reserve revealed

Plans to establish a new marine nature reserve off the east coast of the Isle of Man in a bid to protect blue carbon habitats have been revealed. The initiative aims to protect newly discovered eelgrass beds in Bulgham Bay near Laxey and saltmarsh habitat at Cornaa. Department of Environment, Food and Agriculture (Defa) has asked for views on three proposed options for reserve site, with differing levels of impact on boats and fisheries. Under the Manx Wildlife Act, the department has an obligation to protect eelgrass through creation of marine nature reserves and conservation zones. That enables further protections through restrictions on anchoring and certain fishing practices in the area. There are currently six known eelgrass beds in Manx coastal waters located at Carrick Bay, Derbyhaven, Fort Island, Laxey Bay, Ramsey Bay and Bulgham Bay. 'Combat climate change' The Bulgham Bay eelgrass meadow is the only site that is not designated under an existing protective measures. Options being considered by Defa are establishing a marine nature reserve around that bed, or extending protection from Skeirrig Rock to Cornaa Headland to include a saltmarsh there. The final option would be to expand the reserve to Maughold Head, to cover additional marine habitats and grey seal haul-out sites. Views have also been asked for on plans to update existing eelgrass conservation zones to reflect surveys showing their expansion beyond the current boundaries. Defa Minister Clare Barber said: 'By safeguarding these ecosystems, we not only help combat climate change but also create an environment we can be proud of.'

112: Schools and hospitals get £180m solar investment

Hundreds of schools and hospitals across the UK are set to receive £180 million for solar panels from the government's new state-owned energy company. The first major investment from Great British Energy was announced on Friday as part of government efforts to reduce the country's planet-warming emissions. The move was welcomed by the school leaders union and NHS providers who said it would also help to manage the 'enormous financial pressure' of energy bills. But Andrew Bowie, shadow energy secretary, said the government's net zero plans would make the country 'poorer'. GB energy firm would secure future jobs, says Labour Net zero by 2050 'impossible' for UK, says Badenoch If the UK has more renewable energy, why aren't bills coming down? 'Right now, money that should be spent on your children's education or your family's healthcare is instead being wasted on sky-high energy bills,' said Energy Secretary Ed Miliband. 'Great British

Energy's first major project will be to help our vital public institutions save hundreds of millions on bills to reinvest on the frontline,' he added. The government also hopes that the project, to provide solar panels for 200 schools and 200 hospitals, will reduce the use of fossil fuels across public property and help achieve its long-term climate goals. This is not the first time such a project has existed - the Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme, launched under the previous Conservative government, has been running for more than four years and distributed close to £3bn for green technologies. This project in the first instance will target less than 1% of schools. But Alex Green, head of Let's Go Zero - a national campaign to reduce the climate impact of schools - said it was a welcome first move. 'It is tough economic times, and to see this progress is a big step. [Whilst] acknowledging that 200 schools is a small starting point, to achieve this in one year is a good pace,' she said. The announcement has been strongly welcomed by schools, unions and NHS estate managers who have previously warned of the pressure of high energy bills. In 2022, the National Association of Headteachers (NAHT) had said that a third of its leaders were predicting a budget deficit following a spike in energy costs. Paul Whiteman, NAHT general secretary, said schools wanted to install solar panels as they provided cheaper energy than paying for gas, but the upfront cost could often be prohibitive. 'This announcement is therefore welcome and a step in the right direction. In the longer term, this should also help schools manage energy bills, which have been a source of enormous financial pressure in recent years,' he said. But the acting shadow energy secretary disagreed that the government's approach would save money. 'Labour's Net Zero zealotry is still set to make us poorer. The government is putting our very energy security at risk with their attacks on North Sea Oil and Gas - surrendering our energy independence to foreign powers like Russia,' he said. However, energy experts have said that investing in renewable energy could reduce this reliance on imports. Jess Ralston, energy analyst at the think tank Energy and Climate Intelligence Unit, said: 'This GB Energy funding is an investment into energy security as solar panels lower the amount of gas we need to import from people like Putin.' The first solar panels are expected to be installed by the end of the summer and the government said it would focus them in areas of 'highest need'.

113: Argentina's deadly rains more likely in a warming world, report says

The heavy rains that led to catastrophic flooding in central Argentina and killed 16 people earlier this month were partly fueled by climate change and could become more frequent in a warmer world, a team of international scientists said on Thursday. An analysis by the World Weather Attribution found that extreme heat in the region leading up to the floods caused a warmer and more humid mass of air that clashed with a cold front from Argentina's Patagonian region, causing the torrential rains in Bahia Blanca, a port city about 550 km (340 miles) south of Buenos Aires. 'The indicators of heat and humidity (leading up to the floods) would have been virtually impossible without climate change,' Juan Rivera, one of the report's authors and scientists at the Argentine Institute for Snow Research, Glaciology and Environmental Sciences (IANIGLA), said in a press conference on Wednesday. Rivera said that multiple days with temperatures surpassing 40 C (104 F) in northern and central Argentina, including a humid heat wave immediately preceding the

rains, combined with increased humidity from the Amazon led to an accumulation of moisture that dumped 300 mm (11.8 inches) of rain over Bahia Blanca in just over 6 hours. 'These floods have no precedent in the national meteorological service stations,' Rivera added, noting that the cold front lingered over the area for several hours before moving on. The study said that the extreme heat preceding the rains are still rare events, occurring every 50 to 100 years, but climate change is making these temperatures more frequent and intense. The year 2024 was the hottest on record as global temperatures exceeded 1.5 C (2.7 F) above pre-industrial levels for the first time and some scientists expect 2025 to also be among the hottest on record. The report noted while they were able to deduce a link to human-induced climate change and high temperatures, the link to heavy rainfall events was less conclusive due to discrepancies with global meteorological datasets. 'But don't be fooled by some of these uncertainties,' said Friederike Otto, co-lead of World Weather Attribution. 'As the world continues to warm, the chance of simultaneous or consecutive events hitting the same region will continue to increase – and we need to be prepared for it.' The report noted that Bahia Blanca had undergone rapid urbanization and did not have the necessary infrastructure to deal with the heavy rainfall. It added that the region will face increased hazards in a warming world and the aging population, combined with urban development and high population density, only add to the risks. Rivera noted the area had also experienced a devastating storm in 2023 that brought winds of over 150 kph (93 mph). 'Both extreme events had widespread impacts and common features linked to human-induced climate change: more frequent extreme heat and moister air, factors which fueled the storms,' Rivera said, adding that more studies are needed to understand the compounding risks of a warming world.

114: South Korea wildfires become biggest on record as disaster chief points to 'harsh reality' of climate crisis

Officials point to ultra-dry conditions as death toll reaches 27 and fires threaten Unesco heritage sites Authorities in South Korea are battling wildfires that have doubled in size in a day in the country's worst ever natural fire disaster. At least 27 people have died and hundreds of buildings destroyed in the south-eastern province of North Gyeongsang, with the country's disaster chief saying the fires had exposed the "harsh reality" of global heating. Pointing to ultra-dry conditions and strong winds that have worsened the damage, Lee Han-kyung, disaster and safety division chief, said: "This wildfire has once again exposed the harsh reality of a climate crisis unlike anything we've experienced before." The affected areas have seen only half the average rainfall this season, while the country has experienced more than double the number of fires this year than last. More than 36,000 hectares (88,960 acres) have been charred or were still burning in the largest of the fires, which began in the central Uiseong county, making it the biggest single forest fire in South Korea's history. About 37,000 people have been displaced, the Yonhap news agency said. "We are nationally in a critical situation with numerous casualties because of the unprecedented rapid spread of forest fires," the acting president, Han Duck-soo, told a government response meeting, adding that the high number of older victims, including those in nursing hospitals, was a particular concern. The military has released stocks of

aviation fuel to help keep firefighting helicopters flying to douse flames across mountainous regions in the province, where fires have been burning now for nearly a week. More than 300 structures had been destroyed, officials said. As of Thursday morning, authorities were mobilising more than 9,000 people and about 120 helicopters to battle the fires, the government's disaster response centre said. The country's disaster chief said the wildfires were now "the largest on record", having burned more forest than any previous blazes. The last major wildfire, in April 2020, scorched 23,913 hectares across the east coast. "The wildfire is spreading rapidly," Lee said. "The forest damage has reached 35,810 hectares, already exceeding the area affected by the 2000 east coast wildfire, previously the largest on record, by more than 10,000 hectares." The fatalities include a pilot whose helicopter crashed during efforts to contain a fire and four firefighters and other workers who died after being trapped by fast-moving flames driven by strong winds. Authorities have not disclosed details of the civilian dead, except that they are mainly in their 60s and 70s. They suspect human error caused several of the wildfires that began last Friday, including cases where people started fires while clearing overgrown grass from family tombs or with sparks during welding work. Last year was South Korea's hottest year on record, with the Korea Meteorological Administration saying that the average annual temperature was 14.5C – two degrees higher than the preceding 30-year average of 12.5C. Yeh Sang-Wook, professor of climatology at Hanyang University in Seoul, said the lack of rainfall had dried out the land "creating favourable conditions for wildfires". "This can be seen as one of the fundamental causes," he said. "We can't say that it's only due to climate change, but climate change is directly [and] indirectly affecting the changes we are experiencing now. This is a simple fact." The blazes were threatening two Unesco world heritage sites – Hahoe Village and the Byeongsan Confucian academy – in Andong city on Wednesday, a city official said, as authorities sprayed fire retardants to try to protect them. Andong and the neighbouring counties of Uiseong and Sancheong, as well as the city of Ulsan, have been hardest hit. On Wednesday night, strong winds and smoke-filled skies forced authorities in Andong, in the south-east, to order evacuations in two villages, including Puncheon, home to the Hahoe folk village, founded around the 14th-15th century. Hikers were advised to leave the scenic Jiri mountain as another fire spread closer. The wildfires originated in Uiseong and have been moving rapidly eastward, spreading almost to the coast, carried by gusty winds and with dry conditions aggravating the situation. The meteorological agency has forecast some rain for the south-west but precipitation is expected to be under 5mm for most of the affected areas. "The amount of rain is going to be small so it doesn't look like it'll be big help in trying to extinguish the fire," said the Korea Forest Service minister, Lim Sang-seop. Officials said earlier this week that firefighters had extinguished most of the flames from the largest wildfires in key areas, but wind and dry conditions allowed them to spread again. Houses, factories, vehicles and some historic structures have been destroyed in the fires. In Uiseong, about 20 of the 30 structures at the Gounsa temple complex – which was said to be originally built in the 7th century – have been burned. Among them were two state-designated "treasures" – a pavilion-shaped building erected overlooking a stream in 1668, and a Joseon dynasty structure built in 1904 to mark the longevity of a king. Experts have said the Uiseong fire showed extremely unusual spread in terms of its scale and speed, and

that climate change was expected to make wildfires more frequent and deadly globally. Higher temperatures amplified by human-caused climate change contributed to the existing seasonally dry conditions, “turning dry landscapes into dangerous fire fuel” in the region, said the Climate Central group, an independent body made up of scientists and researchers. With Reuters, Associated Press and Agence France-Presse⁴

115: Dutch MP: “If You Want to Control People, You Have to Control the CO2”

As farmer protests rage across Europe, Dutch MP Rob Roos sits down with The HighWire’s Del Bigtree to discuss the climate scam pushed by radical globalist elites in the Western world to seize more power and control. “They [elites] go against family values. They go against natural food. They go against freedom – because if you have to buy an electric car. They’re almost twice as expensive – and people cannot buy that – it’s not about the car – it’s about you can’t go anywhere and must depend on public transportation,” Roos explained. He said, “It’s also digitalization – what we see is the digital identity and central bank digital currency – this is all about a new form of communism.” “If you want to control the people, you have to control the CO2 – because everything we do in life, breathing, living, traveling, eating, and everything we do in life leads to CO2 emissions. And if you can control the CO2, you can control the people,” Roos said. He further explained that the ultimate control comes when globalists connect people’s digital identities to the central bank’s digital currency. Bigtree responded: “So much of this [globalist takeover of the West] was really fast-tracked during Covid.” He pointed out that WEF branded the Covid era as the “Great Reset.” We have cited 1,600 scientists, including two Nobel laureates, who have stated in a letter: “There is no climate emergency.” But under the guise of an imminent climate disaster, globalist elites, NGOs, governments, politicians, mega-corporations, and, of course, legacy media outlets push climate fear to usher in a reset of society. The most critical line to remember from Roos’ interview is: “If you can control the CO2, you can control the people.” So, the next time you find yourself concerned about radical progressive politicians and rogue billionaires, like Bill Gates, advocating for ‘green’ policies, consider asking yourself: Are these new policies resulting in any loss of freedoms?

116: The decades-long “climate change” plan to strip away personal freedom, wealth and property

The Rockefeller family and the Trilateral Commission have been orchestrating a sinister plan under the guise of “climate change.” This scheme raises serious threats to individual freedom, personal wealth and property rights. What’s really at stake in this agenda and how might it impact our way of life? Jesse Smith dives into the implications and uncovers the truth behind the headlines. Jesse Smith has been publishing a series of articles titled ‘Technocracy Ascending’. The following is Part 3. You can find other parts published so far by following the hyperlinks below: Technocracy Ascending – Part 1: Why It’s Crucial to Understand the End Game. Technocracy Ascending – Part 2: Trust Me, I’m a Technocrat. In Part 3, Smith describes how the Rockefeller family and the Trilateral Commission have been instrumental in advancing a new international economic order and global governance, aiming to establish a technocratic dictatorship. They co-opted the environmental

movement, using fear and misinformation to shift the blame for ecological damage from corporations to individuals, and promoting the concept of Sustainable Development as a means to control resources and populations. The Rockefeller family has created and funded various organisations, including The World Bank, the United Nations and the Club of Rome, to promote the theory of anthropogenic global warming and push for a sustainable future. The United Nations' Agenda 21 and Agenda 2030 are key plans to implement a technocratic system, to inventory and control all aspects of human life and nature, ultimately leading to the annihilation of individual rights and national sovereignty. The ultimate goal of the "green economy" is not environmental protection, but a wealth redistribution scheme that benefits multinational corporations and private banks, while stripping away individual freedom, wealth and property. Technocracy Ascending – Part 3: Green Sustainable Slavery. As detailed in Part 2 of "Technocracy Ascending," David Rockefeller, Zbigniew Brzezinski, and the Trilateral Commission achieved a great deal in moving the world toward a new international economic order and global governance (i.e., a new world order). Brzezinski understood the decline of nation states was a necessity for advancing a global order where the private banking cabal and transnational corporations assumed political dominance. In his book 'Between Two Ages: America's Role in the Technetronic Era', Brzezinski stated that: The nation state as a fundamental unit of man's organised life has ceased to be the principal creative force: International banks and multinational corporations are acting and planning in terms that are far in advance of the political concepts of the nation-state. Technocracy Inc. was one of the early movements campaigning for centralised control at the expense of democracy. Though their initial aim was to transform the North American continent into a scientific dictatorship, the Rockefeller clan pushed these ideas globally. Working through their vast, interwoven network of corporate, academic, political and philanthropic institutions, they advanced the globalist mindset with the United Nations ("UN"), often energising the ideas and formulating the strategies. More on the UN's role will be discussed later. While their agenda grew popular with elites of all stripes, they needed a way to sell the scheme to the masses and accelerate the groundswell for sweeping worldwide changes. Like the original technocrats, they sought a bloodless revolution and used fear and chicanery to usurp power. Technocracy Inc. used the stock market crash of 1929 and the resulting Great Depression to recruit those fearing total economic collapse into their camp. "Technocracy ... is being hailed as a solution to an economic condition which now threatens to disrupt our economic civilisation ... figures indicate that unless a vast change is made in the political and economic system of this country, we may soon face a collapse of our present social structure, the downfall of currency and utter chaos."—The Technocrats' Magazine, 1933. Decades later, the Rockefeller cabal turned to environmentalism and the threat of planetary destruction to enlist zealots fearing complete societal collapse. In the 1969 Rockefeller Foundation report, they boldly announced their claim, stating that: Man is now degrading his environment at a terrifying rate. The cumulative effects of advancing technology, massive industrialisation, urban concentration and population growth have all combined ... not only to create imminent danger to the quality of human life, but even to pose threats to life itself. (p.5) Co-opting a Grassroots Movement. The Rockefeller coterie conspired to reshape the world and gain greater control

of its wealth, resources and people under the guise of saving the planet. Their challenge involved getting the populace to support the destruction of free market capitalism, nationalism and democratic principles without noticing the end goal: the establishment of a global dictatorship ruled by public-private partnerships ("PPP"). The method of choice to undo the global order was none other than environmentalism. Their brand of environmentalism differed greatly from the grassroots movement spawned by indigenous and disenfranchised peoples who campaigned against the poisoning of air, water and land. With good intentions, these activists stood against nuclear fallout, harmful pesticides, pollution and destruction of natural habitats perpetrated by mega-corporations in the energy, transportation, defence and manufacturing industries. To crush the grassroots effort directed against industry titans (which accelerated after the 1970 Earth Day event in the US), Rockefeller-influenced environmentalists stealthily shifted the blame for catastrophic ecological damage onto each individual. They first sounded the alarm that an ice age was soon to overtake the Earth. Later, they claimed that modern conveniences like vehicle ownership and cheap energy powered by so-called fossil fuels contributed to dangerous increases in the Earth's temperature. Over the past fifty years, they have cleverly induced both individual and collective guilt, leading to attempts to dial back gains achieved through industrialisation and technological advancement. Rockefeller-captured institutions and governments agreed on a plan to march the world toward technocracy by undoing the "man-made" evils triggering global warming through a novel concept called Sustainable Development. The sustainability initiative was born in conspiracy and continues through an endless series of research, conferences, books, speeches, reports, propaganda, agreements, treaties, legislation and collusion within the public-private sphere. While it is true that the literal term "Sustainable Development" was not coined by the original Technocrats, most would be jealous that someone else beat them to it. The fact of the matter is that Sustainable Development is conceptually identical to Technocracy's "balanced load." "In short, the heartbeat of Technocracy is Sustainable Development. It calls for an engineered society where the needs of mankind are in perfect balance with the resources of nature." – Wood, Patrick. *Technocracy Rising: The Trojan Horse of Global Transformation*, Convergent Publishing. Kindle Edition, (pp. 80-82). M. King Hubbert was an original member of Technocracy Inc. and a major contributor to the Technocracy Study Course discussed in part 2. Hubbert believed in peak oil theory and thought that Earth's resources and energy were finite and if exhausted or destroyed, man would cease to exist. Growth, growth, growth – that's all we've known ... World automobile production is doubling every 10 years; human population growth is like nothing that has happened in all of geologic history. The world will only tolerate so many doublings of anything – whether it's power plants or grasshoppers." — M. King Hubbert, 1975. His theories would later lead to demands to transition the world to a new "green" economy based on sustainability principles. Engineering a New Green Economy. Whether acknowledged or not, the counterfeit green movement adopted Hubbert's ideas and called for a restructuring of the global economy, altering the function of industries and individual corporations to fit this new economic paradigm. Seemingly out of nowhere, as Brzezinski noted, the Rockefeller-financed shift to a "green economy" was sold to environmental organisations like Greenpeace, Friends of the

Earth and society as a whole under the guise of saving the planet, preserving wildlife and creating a more just world. However, when the altruistic façade is removed, it amounts to a technocratic takeover facilitated through a gargantuan civil society network operating within local, state and national governments to upend democratic pillars. The green scheme was designed to strip away individual freedom, wealth, property and resources. In short, the purpose of climate agenda policies was to shift the world to “a more controlled and directed society” as Brzezinski noted in ‘Between Two Ages’. In ‘Technocracy: The Hard Road to World Order’, Patrick Wood later explained that the sustainable development agenda “is not about the environment but rather about economic development.” Wood’s point can be seen in Principle 8 of the 1992 Rio Declaration at the UN Conference on Environment and Development (“UNCED”), where it indicated: To achieve sustainable development and a higher quality of life for all people, States should reduce and eliminate unsustainable patterns of production and consumption and promote appropriate demographic policies. By 2009, calls for a green economy rooted in technocratic concepts began to permeate the universal political landscape. In 2011, the UN Environmental Programme (“UNEP”) pushed the concept further, stating: In its simplest expression, a green economy is low-carbon, resource-efficient, and socially inclusive. In a green economy, growth in income and employment are driven by public and private investments that reduce carbon emissions and pollution, enhance energy and resource efficiency, and prevent the loss of biodiversity and ecosystem services.”—Towards a Green Economy, UN Environmental Programme (UNEP), 2011, p. 16 Technocrats relish efficiency often at the expense of human freedom, dignity and prosperity. Despite the fluffy UN jargon, the green economy is designed to punish wealthy nations by deliberately lowering living standards. Theoretically, the shift would help poorer nations advance economically. However, those in impoverished nations rarely benefit as wealth has continued to shift upward, benefitting the top one per cent. As of 2024, Investopedia noted that “there are 2,781 billionaires in the world with a cumulative wealth valued at \$14.2 trillion.” The green economy has nothing to do with the environment, it is simply a wealth redistribution scheme where the poor and middle classes in all nations are fleeced by multinational corporations and private banks. This fact has even been acknowledged by a former working group co-chair of the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (“IPCC”), who stated: “First of all, developed countries have basically expropriated the atmosphere of the world community. But 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, with problems such as deforestation or the ozone hole” (emphasis added).—Ottmar Edenhofer, Co-chair, UN IPCC, 2010. Financing and Controlling the Global Technocratic Shift. The Rockefeller foray into environmentalism was a multi-pronged attack aimed at subverting the goals of environmentalists wanting to protect the planet from being dumping grounds for disease-causing toxic waste. Largely unbeknownst to the public, they poured millions of dollars into research, opinion and policy-shaping, and education. From this flurry of activity, a new ideology was born proclaiming that mankind itself, through mere existence, was responsible for planetary degradation – not greedy, irresponsible and corrupt corporations.

In addition to previously noted organisations such as the Council on Foreign Relations (“CFR”) and Bilderberg Group, Rockefeller family members created and/or funded The World Bank, United Nations, Aspen Institute, International Union for the Conservation of Nature (“IUCN”), UN IPCC and the Club of Rome. Each of these deeply interrelated organisations plays a key role in pushing anthropogenic global warming (“AGW”), the theory that human activity in industry and agriculture causes the earth’s temperature to rise due to increases in greenhouse gases such as carbon dioxide (CO₂) and methane. This ideology was further cemented into the minds of men in ‘The First Global Revolution: A Report by the Council of the Club of Rome’ published in 1991. Under the heading ‘The Common Enemy of Humanity is Man’, it states: “In searching for a new enemy to unite us, we came up with the idea that pollution, the threat of global warming, water shortages, famine and the like would fit the bill ... All these dangers are caused by human intervention, and it is only through changed attitudes and behaviour that they can be overcome. The real enemy then is humanity itself.” (p. 115, emphasis added). Through their philanthropic and venture capital arms including the Rockefeller Foundation (1913), Rockefeller Brothers Fund (1940), Rockefeller Family Fund (1968) and Rockefeller Philanthropic Advisors Inc. (1991) they contributed (at least) hundreds of millions to dozens of environmental organisations. Some of the most prominent included the Tides Foundation, World Resources Institute, Worldwatch Institute, Wildlife Conservation Society, National Resources Defence Council, Alliance for Climate Protection, Environmental Defence Fund, National Resource Defence Council, Sierra Club and Union of Concerned Scientists. Through a 1974 Rockefeller Brothers Fund (“RBF”) grant leading to the creation of the Worldwatch Institute (whose mission was to accelerate the transition to a sustainable world), the Rockefellers extended their goals “beyond traditional stewardship and conservation to predicting and ameliorating environmental crises.” This was largely accomplished through the publication of Worldwatch’s ‘State of the World’ doomsday reports issued from 1984 to 2017, where they attempted to identify the world’s most pressing environmental challenges. Through their Quality of the Environment programme, also launched in 1974, the Rockefellers helped pioneer climate research at US universities such as the University of Michigan, University of California at Davis, Pennsylvania State University and Utah State University. They also played a key role in convening early climate conferences. Through foundation Fellowships in Environmental Affairs, they supported researchers who were instrumental in forging the alleged scientific consensus on man-made global warming. Those who opposed the theory often had their careers and lives destroyed by deliberate sidelining, censorship and cancellation of grants and other funding. The technocratic climate agenda steadily advanced through these NGOs operating in clandestine unison, but it took another Rockefeller minion to propel the faux climate crisis to the forefront as the most pertinent issue facing the world. His name was Maurice Strong. Maurice Strong, The Green Apostle. “I knew that what was said to be driven from the bottom up, from the grassroots, was actually being driven from the top down. I had come to this conclusion by following the interconnections among the NGOs active on the Agenda. Many of the NGOs shaping this environment debate were connected, like pearls on a thread. A central figure in all of these organisations was Maurice Strong, the secretary general of the Rio Summit.” —

Dewar, Elaine, *Cloak of Green*, James Lorimer & Company, 1995, p. 251. High school dropout Maurice Strong was born into a poor family in Manitoba, Canada in 1929. At age 18, he met UN Treasurer Noah Monod and stayed with him for a brief time in New York City. Monod helped Strong get a job at the UN as a junior officer in the Security Section. During his time in New York, Monod also introduced him to David Rockefeller and Strong soon became a protégé. By his late 20s, he became a multi-millionaire from employment in the oil industry and went on to have one of the most extraordinary business and political careers of all time. Strong was a Rockefeller (and Rothschild) made man through and through. In addition to his connection to David, Strong also forged close relationships with his brother Laurance and Steven Rockefeller, grandson of former US Vice President Nelson Rockefeller. Laurance, the third son of John D. Rockefeller Jr., is most remembered as a devout conservationist. He served as a longtime trustee, president and chairman of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund ("RBF"). He was also a member of the CFR, Trilaterals and Bilderbergs, which Strong was also connected to. Laurance was a founding member and trustee of The Conservation Foundation established in 1947. In 1985 the organisation became affiliated with the World Wildlife Fund ("WWF") started by transhumanist and eugenicist Julian Huxley, and fully merged with it in 1990. Strong, a lifetime affiliate, served as the WWF's Vice President in 1977, serving under Prince Philip, who once said that if he were reincarnated, he wished "to be returned to Earth as a killer virus to lower human population levels." Strong came to know Steven Rockefeller as a member of the Earth Charter initiative, which Strong created as part of the Earth Council during his stint as Secretary General of the Rio Earth Summit in 1992. Highlighting Strong's work in advancing the global environmental agenda, Steven wrote: In the mid-1980s, he became a member of the World Commission on Environment and Development. The Commission's report, *Our Common Future*, put the concept of sustainable development on the international agenda, and it included a recommendation that a new universal declaration or charter be drafted with the ethical imperatives and basic principles to guide a worldwide transition to a sustainable future... (emphasis added). Former Soviet Union leader Mikhail Gorbachev, a staunch globalist and founder of The Gorbachev Foundation and Green Cross International, was an instrumental partner in drafting the charter. It was launched in 2000 with the support of hundreds of organisations and thousands of individuals. The document served as the building blocks for constructing the UN Sustainable Development Goals ("SDGs") adopted in 2015 as part of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Furthering his partnerships with shadowy banking elites, Strong collaborated with Edmund de Rothschild in creating the World Conservation Bank, which later became the Global Environment Facility ("GEF"). Since its inception in 1991, the GEF has "provided more than \$26 billion in financing and mobilised \$149 billion for country-driven priority projects relating to climate change, biodiversity loss and pollution." Strong also has deep connections to Klaus Schwab and the World Economic Forum ("WEF"), serving a long tenure as its co-chairman. Schwab, himself a protégé of both David Rockefeller and Henry Kissinger, also credited Strong as a major influence, writing: He was my mentor since the creation of the Forum: a great friend; an indispensable advisor; and, for many years, a member of our Foundation Board. Without him, the Forum would not have achieved its present significance. As founder and current co-chairman of the WEF,

Schwab is recognised as the architect of globalist ideas like Stakeholder Capitalism, the Great Reset and the Fourth Industrial Revolution. In 2019, the WEF launched a strategic partnership with the UN to accelerate the adoption and funding for Agenda 2030 which spawned from Strong's leadership as a member of the Brundtland Commission, head of the 1992 Rio climate conference and role in creating Agenda 21, its precursor. Strong was the key figure spearheading the international environmental movement from the early 1970s until his passing in 2015. As the preeminent mouthpiece of global green technocrats, he advocated for the collapse of nation states, lowering the living standards of rich countries and Malthusian-influenced population reduction to "save the planet." In the 1992 essay 'Stockholm to Rio: A Journey Down a Generation', published by the UN Conference on Environment and Development ("UNCED"), Strong suggested that nations would have to surrender sovereignty to global dictates, saying: The concept of national sovereignty has been an immutable, indeed sacred, principle of international relations. It is a principle which will yield only slowly and reluctantly to the new imperatives of global environmental cooperation. It is simply not feasible for sovereignty to be exercised unilaterally by individual nation states, however powerful. The global community must be assured of environmental security (emphasis added). Two years earlier, Strong gave an interview where he described a "fiction book" he desired to write, asking: Isn't the only hope for the planet that the industrialised civilisations collapse? Isn't it our responsibility to bring that about?" — Interview in West Magazine, 1990. He reiterated the need for international degrowth in a 1 September 1997 edition of National Review magazine, proclaiming: "If we don't change, our species will not survive ... Frankly, we may get to the point where the only way of saving the world will be for industrial civilisation to collapse." While serving as Secretary General of the Earth Summit, he commented that: "... current lifestyles and consumption patterns of the affluent middle class, involving high meat intake, consumption of large amounts of frozen and convenience foods, use of fossil fuels, appliances, home and workplace air-conditioning, and suburban housing, are not sustainable." Regarding population control, Strong is credited with saying: "Either we reduce the world's population voluntarily or nature will do this for us, but brutally." He was able to spread his green gospel while holding key positions in a laundry list of organisations including the Aspen Institute, Rockefeller Foundation, Rothschild Foundation, International Panel on Climate Change ("IPCC"), UNEP, IUCN, World Future Society, Lindisfarne Association, Temple of Understanding (Lucis Trust) and many more. By now it should be obvious that Strong was a part of a powerful machine advancing an agenda that has deeply affected billions of people. His relations with globalist organisations like the UN, WWF and Club of Rome solidify his place atop the throne of those pushing the global environmental scheme. The Club of Rome and the "World Problematique". "The Earth has cancer and the cancer is Man." —The Club of Rome, 1974. Strong was also an influential figure within the Club of Rome, the organisation owing its existence to co-founders Aurelio Peccei and Alexander King in 1968, along with funding from the Rockefellers. The Club brought together an assembly of bureaucrats, scientists and business leaders with Rockefeller, Rothschild and Soros connections. In the early days, members discussed their plans at David Rockefeller's estate in Bellagio, Italy. Peccei, King and Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau would later co-establish the Canadian

Association for the Club of Rome (“CACOR”) in the early 1970s, followed by associations in many countries worldwide including the US. The Club of Rome posited that societal collapse was imminent due to “a cluster of intertwined global problems, be they economic, environmental, political or social,” defining them as the “World Problematique.” Their proposed solutions to man’s role in destroying the environment was dubbed the “World Resolutique.” Many of their recommendations were derived from MIT computer models (prone to human error and bias) as discussed in ‘The Limits to Growth’ report of 1972 and 1977’s ‘Goals for Mankind’. Interdependence, population reduction and a new global economic system were common themes in the Club’s reports and publications. They would reappear in a myriad of publications, speeches, papers, articles, books and meeting agendas. Consider the following excerpts from both the first and second reports to the Club as common examples (emphasis added throughout): “If the present growth trends in world population, industrialisation, pollution, food production, and resource depletion continue unchanged, the limits to growth on this planet will be reached sometime within the next one hundred years. The most probable result will be a rather sudden and uncontrollable decline in both population and industrial capacity. “Without such a goal and a commitment to it, short-term concerns will generate the exponential growth that drives the world system toward the limits of the earth and ultimate collapse. With that goal and that commitment, mankind would be ready now to begin a controlled, orderly transition from growth to global equilibrium.”—The Limits to Growth, The First Report to the Club of Rome, Universe Books, 1972, pp. 23, 184. “The transition from the present undifferentiated and unbalanced world growth to organic growth will lead to the creation of a new mankind. “Now is the time to draw up a master plan for organic sustainable growth and world development based on global allocation of all finite resources and a new global economic system. Ten or 20 years from today it will probably be too late ... “A world consciousness must be developed through which every individual realises his role as a member of the world community ... It must become part of the consciousness of every individual that “the basic unit of human cooperation and hence survival is moving from the national to the global level.”—Mankind at the Turning Point, The Second Report to the Club of Rome, Signet Books, 1974. pp. 9, 69, 154. (emphasis added). In 1995, the UNEP echoed these ideas in its Global Biodiversity Assessment, writing: The problems associated with population growth and distribution and loss of biodiversity are reaching critical proportions in many parts of the world ... population increases are likely to lead to higher deforestation, degradation of land and loss of biodiversity ... A reasonable estimate for an industrialised world society at the present North American material standard of living would be one billion. At the more frugal European standard of living, 2-3 billion would be possible” (p. 773, emphasis added). The Club of Rome has continued to produce doomsday literature promoting global governance and a new economic structure throughout its history. A small sampling of their many publications includes: Beyond The Limits to Growth (1989). Globalisation and Culture (2000). Humanity At the Crossroads (2001). World Economic and Environmental Order (2001). Globalisation, Governance and Sustainable Development (2002). A New World Order Without Ideologies (2003). Sustainable Development and Governance (2004). Globalisation And Civil Society (2005). Rethinking Civilisation (2006). Towards A Global

Ethic (2006). In 2017, Dennis Meadows, co-author of the 'Limits to Growth' report, argued that most of the world's population must be wiped out if the rest were to maintain a high standard of living, saying: If we have a very strong dictatorship which is smart ... and [people have] a low standard of living ... But we want to have freedom and we want to have a high standard of living so we're going to have a billion people. And we're now at seven, so we have to get back down. The Club's methodical work over the decades has led to many of the policies and technologies now being thrust upon society presumably "for the common good." Agenda 21 + Agenda 2030 = Global Technocracy. "The applied doctrines of Agenda 21, Sustainable Development and the energy Smart Grid that have resulted from Trilateral interactions testify to their ideological grounding in historic Technocracy." —Wood, Patrick. *Technocracy Rising: The Trojan Horse of Global Transformation*, 2014. Convergent Publishing. Kindle Edition, (p. 44). "Effective execution of Agenda 21 will require a profound reorientation of all human society, unlike anything the world has ever experienced – a major shift in the priorities of both governments and individuals and an unprecedented redeployment of human and financial resources. This shift will demand that a concern for the environmental consequences of every human action be integrated into individual and collective decision-making at every level" (emphasis added, Source). The plan put in place by men like Maurice Strong and organisations like the UN and Club of Rome to completely restructure the world is unprecedented in scope. Similar plans originating with Technocracy Inc. in the 1930s were often criticised and rejected. However, the Rockefeller-influenced ideologies of man-made climate change, global governance and a new international economic structure won over many who might have resisted these ideas in the past. If all their plans are successfully implemented, individual rights and national sovereignty will be annihilated. Since its inception, many have tried to describe Agenda 21 but the best definition comes from the late Rosa Koire, author of 'Behind the Green Mask'. Koire's book is a must-read for a detailed understanding of how Agenda 21 is implemented in local communities. While peering behind the green mask, she defined the agenda as follows: UN Agenda 21/Sustainable Development is the action plan implemented worldwide to inventory and control all land, all water, all minerals, all plants, all animals, all construction, all means of production, all energy, all education, all information and all human beings in the world. INVENTORY AND CONTROL. In less than fifty words, Koire perfectly penned the nightmare that is Agenda 21. Despite the noble pretence, it's simply an all-encompassing plan to control every aspect of human life and nature from cradle to the grave. It is the global extension of the "scientific control of all social functions" as described by early technocrats. To many, what's transpiring on the world stage resembles fascism, to others communism and to some, socialism. But the ring that rules them all is technocracy. Agenda 2030 is the overarching plan to implement what began in Agenda 21. Its goal is to have all mechanisms of societal transformation and control in place by the year 2030. It is the ultimate bait and switch designed to dupe humans into voluntarily giving up their rights to save the planet from climate-related disasters, though predictions of doom never materialise. Sustainable Development ideologues have created a de-facto religion surmising that the earth is dying, natural resources will soon become extinct and there are way too many people living. These factors have increased CO2 in the atmosphere from all the

breathing, farting and farming causing the Earth's climate to be out of whack, spelling doom for us all. See how this all works now? Now that the green mask has been completely removed, the "worldwide inventory and control" plan Koire mentioned should be evident. It is you and I that need to be reined in to save the planet. We are the CO2 emitters that need to be controlled and, if possible, eliminated! As I've stated previously: "Today's climate crusade is not grassroots, bottom-up movement. It's a top-down initiative seeking to redistribute wealth upwards and privatise all biodiversity and natural resources. Its real goal is captured in the infamous phrase, 'You will own nothing and be happy'." The good news is that many are now seeing through the mask of the environmental movement and are aggressively resisting. However, today's technocrats have stepped up their efforts to seize control and are actively embedding themselves in every facet of society, including government. Part 4 will explore this developing phenomenon where populism and technocracy have seemingly merged with the current Trump administration.

117: UN hails rare climate success story as emissions from construction stop rising

2024 represents only non-pandemic year when building emissions have stalled – but will the progress last? Emissions from the building and construction sector have stopped rising for the first time since 2020, a new United Nations report says. The annual review from the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), published on Monday, showed global emissions from construction in 2024 remained at the same rate as in 2023, despite continued urbanisation. The stagnation in emissions comes less than five years from a crucial global climate deadline to reduce emissions. However, the UN warned the progress towards 2030 goals still remains alarmingly slow. "The buildings where we work, shop, and live account for a third of global emissions and a third of global waste," UNEP's executive director, Inger Andersen, said. "The good news is that government actions are working. But we must do more and do it faster." Historically, increased construction activity has been closely linked to rising greenhouse gas emissions, primarily because the industry relies heavily on carbon-intensive materials such as cement and steel. The report found that stronger energy efficiency measures and the introduction of stricter building codes are starting to pay off. Over the past year, the energy intensity of the global building sector has dropped by nearly 10 per cent, while the share of renewable energy use has risen by almost 5 per cent. However, the report also highlighted a glaring gap: around half of all new buildings worldwide are still constructed without mandatory energy codes. These codes are critical policy tools for ensuring that new buildings meet minimum energy efficiency standards and significantly reduce emissions over their lifespan. This gap is especially pronounced in emerging economies, where more than half of new construction remains outside regulatory frameworks designed to limit emissions. Given that half the world's buildings expected by 2050 have yet to be constructed, the lack of stringent standards could lock in decades of unnecessary emissions, making global climate goals out of reach. The UN report sets out targets for governments to accelerate this action. It calls on major carbon-emitting nations to adopt mandatory zero-carbon building codes by 2028, with all other countries following no later than 2035. These energy codes would require new buildings to

produce zero net emissions, cutting future greenhouse gas output. The report further stresses the need to move beyond incremental changes. It calls for large-scale shifts to renewable energy sources and greater investment in circular construction practices. Such practices include using materials more efficiently, extending building lifespans, and improving recycling and reuse strategies to cut waste and pollution. The UN report highlights financing and workforce skill gaps as critical barriers holding back progress. To close these gaps, it recommends that governments and private sector investors adopt Extended Producer Responsibility measures, promoting material reuse, recycling, and longer-lasting construction methods. The new findings come in a year when countries are expected to present updated climate action plans and targets, known as Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs), ahead of this year's UN Climate Conference (COP30), set to take place in Belem, Brazil, later this year. With buildings still consuming 32 per cent of global energy and responsible for 34 per cent of global emissions, experts say a shift toward cleaner, greener construction methods is not only necessary but urgent. "I encourage all countries to include plans to rapidly cut emissions from buildings and construction in their new NDCs," Ms Andersen said.

118: Crucial Ocean-Current System Is Safe from Climate Collapse—for Now

The Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation likely won't completely collapse with global warming, but any weakening could have grave consequences worldwide. A crucial ocean-current system seems unlikely to collapse even in the face of severe climate change — despite predictions that it would disintegrate if Earth continues to warm. That's the finding of a study suggesting that the Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation (AMOC) will survive at least until the end of the century. The study found that the combined forces of various ocean currents and winds would keep the system stable even under the most pessimistic climate scenarios. The authors are confident that there is sufficient evidence to support this finding, even though the climate models they analysed do not perfectly mirror reality. "Unlikely isn't impossible," says Jonathan Baker, a co-author of the study and a climate scientist at the Met Office in Exeter, UK. "But we have confidence in our results." The work is published today in *Nature*. Water-moving machine. The AMOC is like a giant conveyor belt in the Atlantic Ocean: warm water travels in the upper layers from south to north. Once the water reaches its northernmost point, it sinks and travels southwards in a cold, deep layer until it reaches the southern oceans, where it rises back up to the surface. The AMOC therefore has a crucial role in the global distribution of heat, salt and other components of seawater. The intensity of the AMOC has declined over time, a trend traced to polar ice melt, changes in wind patterns and precipitation changes linked to climate change. Although scientists agree that the collapse of the AMOC would have devastating consequences for local and regional climates, they are divided on whether and when such an event would occur. Studies of the AMOC's future generally rely on analyses of its past behaviour and on models that simulate future scenarios under different climate conditions. Some have concluded that the AMOC would reach a tipping point sometime between 2025 and 2095, then abruptly shut down. Other research indicates that a collapse is unlikely before the end of the century, but scientists had not previously identified the factors that

might be stopping it from happening. A passel of models. Baker and his team used 34 climate models to examine how the AMOC might respond to two extreme scenarios: a four-fold increase in carbon-dioxide levels from pre-industrial levels; and the addition of massive amounts of freshwater, consistent with the melting of the Greenland ice sheet. The team found that the AMOC would weaken in both scenarios, but not collapse. Key to the stability, Baker and his team suggest, are powerful winds in the Southern Ocean that help to drive deep water in the region towards the surface. This “upwelling” has a crucial role in maintaining the AMOC because it balances out the “downwelling” in the northern Atlantic. Baker and his team also found that the AMOC would collapse if a Pacific Meridional Overturning Circulation developed and increased the amount of downwelling. And although this circulation pattern does develop in all their models, it is too weak to counteract the rising water, Baker says. “It’s a very impressive and intriguing study,” says René van Westen, a climate scientist at the Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute in De Bilt. But he adds that, although Baker’s results reaffirm that collapse is unlikely, even a weakening could have harmful consequences. “It doesn’t mean that we can sit back and relax again, it’s still a worrying effect,” van Westen says. Peter Ditlevsen, a climate physicist at the University of Copenhagen and co-author of the study suggesting that the AMOC would collapse before the end of this century, agrees. Like Baker, he emphasizes that reducing greenhouse-gas emissions is crucial to prevent catastrophe. “Time matters,” he says. “We do not want to hit any tipping point. And this is one of the dangerous ones.”

119: 1 in 5 People Say Climate Change Has Had a Big Impact on Their Daily Lives

From December 2024 to February 2025, the effects of human-induced climate change were evident in nearly all regions of the world, new analysis from Climate Central has found. The report, which examined how climate change influenced temperatures around the world over the past three months, found that about one in five people globally—or 1.8 billion people—experienced temperatures that were strongly influenced by climate change every single day. And in half of the analyzed countries, and 287 cities around the world, the average person experienced temperatures strongly influenced by climate change for at least one-third of the three-months. The findings come as the planet breached 1.5°C of warming above pre-industrial temperatures last year—a critical threshold that nations were striving to avoid under the Paris Agreement. “We found that there were warmer than normal temperatures caused by climate change almost everywhere around the planet,” says Kristina Dahl, vice president for science at Climate Central. This January ranked as the warmest in the 176-year global climate record, according to data from the U.S. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s National Centers for Environmental Information. Temperatures in Europe, Canada, South America, Africa, and much of Australia and Antarctica were above average, according to data from Europe’s Copernicus Climate Change Service. Within the same three-month period analyzed, about 394 million people experienced 30 or more “risky heat days.” These are defined as days where the local temperature was hotter than 90% of daily temperatures observed between 1991-2020. Risky heat days are “associated with a temperature threshold that carries additional risks for human health,” says Dahl. “Above that temperature, you start to see increased heat

related mortality.” In February, parts of Kenya, Uganda, South Sudan, and the United Republic of Tanzania all saw temperatures soar during a heat wave. Hospitals in Uganda reported an increase in heat-related illnesses, including dehydration and heat stroke, according to local news sources. The research showed that a high number of risky heat days is far more common in the Global South: 74% of people who experienced 30 or more days of risky heat lived in Africa, while those living in Brazil, Indonesia, and Papua New Guinea also saw 30 or more risky heat days. “[It] really reinforces something that we see consistently with climate change, [which] is that the people who have contributed the least to the problem are often disproportionately exposed and impacted,” says Dahl. In the U.S., around 45% of cities analyzed experienced average temperatures that were normal or warmer-than-normal, while 14 cities, mostly in the west, experienced at least three weeks’ worth of days where average temperatures were twice as likely to be impacted by climate change. “These [findings] are just the latest reminders that climate change is happening here and now it’s not something of the future,” says Dahl. “People are experiencing it every day in their lives around the world.”

120: The American Beef Industry Understood Its Climate Impact Decades Ago

New research finds the industry’s campaigns to confuse the public about beef’s climate impact go back longer than previously recognized. The American beef industry knew that raising cattle was a significant source of planet-warming emissions as early as 1989, but scrambled to discredit public efforts to lower beef consumption in the following years, according to new research. The livestock industry’s impact on climate change became widely known with a bombshell United Nations report published in 2006, called *Livestock’s Long Shadow*, which was the first major effort to calculate the greenhouse gas emissions from livestock production. The report made clear that reducing emissions from cattle and dairy production was crucial for slowing the climate crisis. But a pair of recent studies, one published Tuesday, says the American livestock industry was aware of its climate impact much earlier than the mid-aughts, and like the oil industry—which was similarly aware of its impacts decades earlier than its first public acknowledgments—attempted to obfuscate its role in heating the atmosphere. “We failed to appreciate how long the meat industry’s been involved in climate obstruction,” said Jennifer Jacquet, a primary author on both of the new studies whose previous work has tracked the industry’s efforts to distance itself from its climate impacts. Jacquet, a professor of environmental science and policy at the University of Miami, noted that the 2006 UN report represented an inflection point, not only making the public aware of livestock’s climate impact, but putting the industry on notice that it could potentially be targeted for regulation. The report said that livestock’s climate emissions—which come from converting forests to pasture, growing feed, methane-emitting cow burps and manure storage—were about 18 percent of the global total, more even than the transportation sector. After that report’s publication, the livestock industry funded research that challenged the UN report’s findings. UN researchers revised the number to 14.5 percent in a subsequent report, and some said they had been pressured by industry lobbyists to reexamine the initial report’s findings. But Jacquet and her colleagues began to suspect that the livestock industry was likely aware of its emissions well before

the UN report, so she began digging into government records and the industry's own archives. "I didn't really understand the history of the science, so I began looking into that," she says. In 1989—the year after NASA's James Hansen famously told Congress that climate change posed a global threat—the Environmental Protection Agency held a workshop focusing on methane emissions from livestock and, soon after, published a report, "Reducing Methane Emissions from Livestock." The report said that livestock were a major source of methane and estimated that a 50 percent decrease in global emissions from livestock would yield huge benefits for stabilizing this especially potent greenhouse gas. Tucked into an appendix was the following suggestion: "Reducing methane emissions from ruminants should be pursued as part of an overall investigation into alternatives for reducing future global warming and its impacts." Current figures say that agriculture is the largest source of anthropogenic, or human-caused, methane emissions—roughly 40 percent—and most of that comes from livestock. While not as abundant in the atmosphere as carbon dioxide, methane's heat-trapping capacity is 80 times greater over a shorter time frame. Jacquet and her co-authors note that representatives from the meat and dairy industry attended the 1989 EPA workshop, including a member of the National Cattlemen's Association. Several months and a handful of planning meetings later, the association, which is the country's biggest beef lobby and now known as the National Cattlemen's Beef Association, or NCBA, developed a "Strategic Plan on the Environment" to counter anticipated public relations problems or regulations related to climate change. The plan included suggestions to reach out to "key influencers" with research and positive messaging about the industry's environmental benefits. The NCBA did not respond to requests for an interview. While the EPA report made no explicit recommendation to reduce beef consumption, advocacy groups soon did. In the early 1990s, a group called the Greenhouse Crisis Foundation, which consisted of a broad range of nonprofits and civil society groups, suggested that consumers reduce meat consumption. The group's president, Jeremy Rifkin, published a book called *Beyond Beef: The Rise and Fall of the Cattle Culture* in 1992, urging people to reduce beef consumption by 50 percent. Rifkin then became the head of the Beyond Beef Coalition, which organized protests at McDonald's restaurants across the country, among other actions. The cattlemen's association responded, the new study says, with an orchestrated effort to push back on the book, the coalition and attempts to influence nutrition or environmental policy in ways that might curtail beef or dairy consumption. Along with other industry groups, it formed a "Food Facts Coalition," which attempted to debunk claims made in Rifkin's book and launched a campaign to not "blame the cows." Rifkin was attacked on call-in shows and eventually cancelled a book tour. An association executive dismissed the coalition as having a "radical social agenda." Other industry groups hired PR heavies to craft campaigns, including one called "Beyond Belief." The Beef Industry Council, in 1992, launched the campaign "Beef. It's What's for Dinner." "This campaign is not about beef, it's about Rifkin's desire to police American stomachs," said Rick Perry, then the commissioner of agriculture in livestock-heavy Texas, according to one newspaper report. "It'll take more than stomach police to convince the public that the hamburger is responsible for everything from sexual discrimination to racism." The cattlemen's association denied that it was behind the Rifkin attacks. But it was clear immediately that

any suggestion of reducing meat intake among American consumers was going to be met with huge pushback from the industry, which successfully fired up the “meat police” rhetoric that reverberates today. In a separate study, published this week, Jacquet and another University of Miami researcher, Loredana Loy, trace the meat industry’s efforts to derail advocacy groups’ attempts to persuade the public to eat less meat as a climate strategy. These attempts include the Beyond Beef campaign and others, including Diet for a New America and Meatless Monday. Looking at records from 1989 to 2023, the researchers outline how the industry hired scientists to produce reports downplaying meat’s climate impact and waged campaigns, like “#yes2meat,” in the wake of a major report that recommended people in Western countries eat less meat for personal and planetary health. The industry’s strategy was so successful, Loy and Jacquet write, that advocacy groups tweaked their own campaigns, either tamping down their suggestions—for example, going from suggestions to cut meat consumption in half to suggesting people “eat more plants” — or cutting their campaigns altogether. “There was a shrinking of ambition,” Jacquet says. The study says the livestock industry took a different approach than the oil and gas industry, which tried to convince the public it was only continuing to develop fossil fuels because consumers called for them. The livestock industry, on the other hand, tried to convince consumers that their dietary choices would make no difference. To that end, Jacquet and her colleagues attached a climate consequence to the industry’s attempts to hinder dietary recommendations—to see, in fact, just how impactful the advice to eat 50 percent less meat would have been had the Beyond Beef campaign gained traction. They found that if American consumers had cut their beef consumption in half starting in 1992 and replaced it with other foods, including other meat, as much as 13 gigatonnes of climate-warming gases could have been avoided between 1992 and 2023. This “low-tech and immediately available option of halving U.S. beef and veal consumption,” they write, would have been up to 80 times more effective in reducing greenhouse gas emissions than all the steps taken to curb methane emissions from the oil and gas industries over a similar timeframe. “What would our consumption look like today?” Jacquet wondered. “It could be radically different.”

121: Florida is now a solar superpower. Here’s how it happened.

The Sunshine State built more large-scale solar than California last year and was again No. 2 for residential, despite state leadership opposed to climate action. Last May, Florida enacted a law deleting any reference to climate change from most of its state policies, a move Republican Gov. Ron DeSantis described as “restoring sanity in our approach to energy and rejecting the agenda of the radical green zealots.” That hasn’t stopped the Sunshine State from becoming a national leader in solar power. In a first, Florida vaulted past California last year in terms of new utility-scale solar capacity plugged into its grid. It built 3 gigawatts of large-scale solar in 2024, making it second only to Texas. And in the residential solar sector, Florida continued its longtime leadership streak. The state has ranked No. 2 behind California for the most rooftop panels installed each year from 2019 through 2024, according to data the energy consultancy Wood Mackenzie shared with Canary Media. “We do expect Florida to continue as No. 2 in 2025,” said Zoë Gaston, Wood Mackenzie’s

principal U.S. distributed solar analyst. Florida is expected to again be neck and neck with California for this year's second-place spot in utility-scale solar installations, said Sylvia Leyva Martinez, Wood Mackenzie's principal utility-scale solar analyst for North America. Overall, the state receives about 8% of its electricity from solar, according to Solar Energy Industries Association data. The vast majority of its power comes from fossil gas. The state's solar surge is the result of weather — both good and bad — and policies at the state and federal level that have made panels cheaper and easier to build, advocates say.

"Obviously in Florida, sunshine is extremely abundant," said Zachary Colletti, the executive director of the Florida chapter of Conservatives for Clean Energy. "We've got plenty of it." The state is also facing a growing number of extreme storms. Of the 94 billion-dollar weather disasters that federal data show unfolded in Florida since 1980, 34 occurred in the last five years. "Floridians have long understood that not only is solar good for your pocket, it's also good for your home resilience," said Yoca Ardití-Rocha, the executive director of The CLEO Institute, a Miami-based nonprofit that advocates for climate action. "In the face of increasing extreme weather events, having access to reliable energy is a big motivator." The tax credits available under former President Joe Biden's Inflation Reduction Act have also made buying panels cheaper than ever before, she said. "A lot of people took advantage of that. I'm one of them," Ardití-Rocha said. "As soon as I saw that the federal government was going to give me 30% back on my taxes, I decided to make the investment and got myself a solar system that I could pay back in seven years. It was a win-win proposition."

But solar started growing in Florida long before Democrats passed the IRA in 2022, and that's thanks to favorable state policies. Municipalities and counties have little say over power plants, giving the Florida Public Service Commission ultimate control over siting and permitting. Plus, solar plants with a capacity under 75 megawatts are exempt from review and permitting altogether under the Florida Power Plant Siting Act. The latter policy in particular has made building solar farms easy and inexpensive for the state's major utilities, said Leyva Martinez. Companies such as NextEra Energy-owned Florida Power & Light, the state's largest electrical utility, have for years patched together gigawatts of solar with small farms. "We're seeing this wave of project installations at gigawatt scales, but if you look at what's actually being built, it's a small 74-megawatt [project] here or 74.9-megawatt project there," she said. "It's just easier to permit in the state, and developers have realized that they can keep installations at this range and they don't need to go through the longer process." The solar buildout has prompted some backlash in rural parts of the state. A bill Republican state Sen. Keith Truenow filed last month proposes granting some additional local control over siting and permitting solar farms on agricultural land. "You're starting to see a lot more complaining about the abundance of solar installations in more rural areas," Colletti said. The legislation, he said, "would add some hurdles and ultimately add costs" but "wouldn't necessarily reverse the state's preemption" of local permitting authorities.

NextEra and Florida Power & Light did not respond to an email requesting comment. Nor did Truenow return a call. While the bill is currently making its way through the Legislature, DeSantis previously vetoed legislation that threatened Florida's solar buildout. In 2022, the governor blocked a utility-backed bill to end the state's net metering program, which pays homeowners with rooftop solar for sending extra electricity back to the grid

during the day. “The governor did the right thing by vetoing that bill that would have strangled net metering and a lot of the rooftop solar industry in Florida,” Colletti said. “I know Floridians are much better off for it because we are able to offset our costs very well and take more control and ownership over our households.” A telephone survey conducted by the pollster Mason-Dixon in February 2022 found that among 625 registered Florida voters, 84% supported net metering, including 76% of self-identified Republicans. “It’s not about left or right,” Arditi-Rocha said. “It’s about making sure we live up to our state’s name. In the Sunshine State, the future can be really sunny and bright if we continue to harness the power of the sun.”

122: Deadly Botswana rains made more likely by climate change, rapid urbanization

Unusually heavy rainfall struck southern Botswana and eastern South Africa from Feb. 16-20, flooding cities and killing at least 31 people. In Botswana, the government said nearly 5,500 people were affected, and more than 2,000 people evacuated. A new rapid study by the World Weather Attribution (WWA), a team of international climate scientists analyzing extreme weather events, has found that such heavy rainfall events are becoming more likely due to human-induced climate change. By looking at historical weather observations from the region between southern Botswana and South Africa, the researchers found an increasing trend in very wet five-day rainfall events over the last few decades. The team also estimated that similar five-day rainfall events are about 60% more intense in today’s world, which has warmed by 1.3° Celsius (2.3° Fahrenheit) on average since preindustrial times, before the widespread use of fossil fuels. The researchers were, however, unable to quantify how much human-induced climate change contributed to the latest February deluge, because the climate models they used produced inconsistent results. “We haven’t been able to quantify the effect, but as the world is warming, we are seeing more extreme rainfall events like this one,” report co-author Ben Clarke, a researcher at the Centre for Environmental Policy at Imperial College London, U.K., told Mongabay in an online briefing. “Indeed, as our climate continues to warm, it’s understood that this climate is likely to hold more water, and so it’s likely to cause intense rainfall,” said Joyce Kimutai, a climate scientist at Imperial College. This “is likely to overwhelm many systems,” she added, especially drainage infrastructure that hasn’t kept pace with growing populations and rapid urbanization. For cities like Botswana’s capital, Gaborone, there’s an urgent need to make the infrastructure flood-resilient, said report co-author Piet Kenabatho, an environmental science professor at the University of Botswana. Simple nature-based solutions can be effective, such as those focusing on absorbing more water into the ground during high flow periods, Kenabatho told Mongabay by email. This can be done by greening bare areas that have lost vegetation due to urbanization, he said, adding that nearly all green spaces in Gaborone have been converted to built-up areas. But these solutions alone aren’t enough, Kenabatho said. What the city urgently needs is to expand and upgrade its aging stormwater drainage system to quickly channel water out of the city during floods, he added. “Decisions will have to be made as to where some of these waters could be stored.” Kenabatho said some other African countries use managed aquifer recharge schemes, that

channel stormwater into underground aquifers using various methods. “These concerted efforts will go a long way to improving flood management in Gaborone and similar environments,” he said.

123: Why is a Peruvian farmer taking Germany’s RWE to court over climate change?

BERLIN, March 13 (Reuters) - A Peruvian farmer is getting his day in court in a landmark climate case against German energy giant RWE that could shake up how the effects of companies' emissions are litigated. The Higher Regional Court of Hamm will start a hearing on Monday between farmer Saul Luciano Lliuya and RWE. Lliuya is suing RWE for some 21,000 euros, arguing the company's emissions have contributed to the melting of Andean glaciers, causing a lake above his hometown to swell to dangerous levels. What is the case about? What is its legal foundation? And what does it mean for future climate lawsuits?

WHAT IS THE CASE ABOUT? In 2015, Lliuya, backed by activist group Germanwatch, filed a lawsuit claiming RWE's greenhouse gas emissions have contributed to the melting of an Andean glacier which has raised the water level at Laguna Pacacocha, creating a significant flood risk to his home in the nearby town of Huaraz. Lliuya is demanding RWE contribute some 21,000 euros to an estimated \$3.5 million cost of a flood defence project. He contends the company has contributed nearly 0.5% of global manmade greenhouse gas emissions since the industrial revolution, and should pay the equivalent fraction of flood protection costs in the area.

WHY DID IT TAKE 10 YEARS TO COME TO A HEARING? The case was first filed at a regional court in the German city of Essen, where RWE is based. The court dismissed the claims, saying there were countless emitters of carbon dioxide worldwide and any risks from potential flooding as a result of the melting of glacial ice could not stem solely from RWE. Lliuya appealed against the decision with the higher regional court in Hamm, which admitted the case in 2017 and said it would seek evidence. A visit by court-appointed experts to study flood risks around the glacier was delayed until 2022 due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Over a year later, a 200-page expert opinion was available, which had to be examined by the two parties.

WHAT IS THE LEGAL BASE OF THE CASE? The case is based on section 1004 of the Civil Law Code which states that if a property is interfered with, the owner may require the disturber to remove the interference. If the court confirms that the flood risk claimed by the plaintiff is real, it must determine in a second phase to what extent RWE's CO2 emissions have contributed to the risk of a glacial lake outburst flood. As a first step, the upcoming hearing will focus on the assessment of experts commissioned by the court.

WHY HAS THE CASE GAINED SUCH INTEREST? If the court finds that glacier melting poses a flood risk and holds RWE responsible for its share of climate change, it would set a precedent for holding companies legally accountable for climate change. 'The sum in dispute may be less than 20,000 euros but the precedent-setting potential is clear,' according to Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer's website, the law firm representing RWE in the case. Roda Verheyen, Lliuya's lawyer, said even if the court does not conclude there is a flood risk, its verdict would provide a base for further cases.

WHAT DOES SCIENCE SAY ON THIS? In 2021, scientists at the University of Oxford and the University of Washington proved that the melting of a glacier in the Peruvian Andes was

being caused by man-made global warming and was raising flooding risks for nearby residents. 'As things are, there is ample proof that the science does apply in the Andes; we have absolutely no evidence to the contrary,' Friederike Otto, a climate scientist at the Grantham Institute for Climate Change and the Environment. WHAT DOES RWE SAY ON THE CASE? RWE says Lliuya's complaint is unfounded, arguing a single emitter cannot be held responsible for global warming. The company has been transitioning from coal-fired power but still operates 7 lignite or brown coal power plants, accounting for 26.7% of its total power generation, down from 20 plants in 2020. It also runs 21 gas power plants across Germany, the Netherlands, the UK and Turkey. RWE's CO2 emissions almost halved to 60.6 million tons in 2023 from 118 million tons in 2018, with further reductions expected, the company said. It aims to fully phase out lignite by 2030.

124: London's Blade Runners: Climate, Class War and the Corruption of Science

The UK papers carried stories recently about the punishing penalties that London's drivers have paid under Mayor Sadiq Khan's Ulez (ultra-low emission zone) scheme. Under this scheme, a daily fee of £12.50 is charged on older petrol and diesel cars which enter the zone. The GB News headline reads: 'Sadiq Khan's Ulez sees motorists fork out millions in penalties despite pleas it's "not about making money".' A Freedom of Information request revealed that more than £70 million has been raised through Ulez penalties from drivers living in London. The Ulez scheme was introduced in 2019 covering Central London. The increase in Ulez penalties followed the expansion of the scheme in 2021, to include both the North and South Circular roads covering an area of 3.8 million people. Ulez coverage then grew further in 2023 to include the whole of Greater London. It now covers over 1,500 square kilometres and approximately nine million people. A search on X – the least censored of social media outlets by far — on 'Blade Runners' yields many entries with videos of activists in London, who sabotage, vandalise or remove Ulez cameras, sometimes in broad daylight. Gadfly social media commentator Katie Hopkins made a parody that went viral on YouTube about how people are using cheap filling foam to vandalise Ulez cameras. Sadiq Khan claims that he is fighting for climate justice, Londoners' health and a better future for everyone. Do you believe him? Follow the Science The Nobel Laureate for Physics in 2022 John Clauser said that "[t]he popular narrative about climate change reflects a dangerous corruption of science that threatens the world's economy and the well-being of billions of people. Misguided climate science has metastasised into massive shock-journalistic pseudoscience". With Elon Musk's DOGE revelations, the corruption of science by USAID and other agencies channelling US taxpayers' money for climate agencies and NGOs is now documented with receipts. In an increasingly technocratic age, policies under governments get justified by the mantra of 'following the science'. The most drastic public policies in the West, curtailing civil rights ranging from the right to travel to the right to free speech, were imposed only a few short years ago. This was for the 'novel' Covid virus pandemic, which caused not much harsher fatalities than a severe flu, with a median infection fatality rate of 0.24% (0.05% for people under the age of 70). Mayor Sadiq Khan is an avowed environmentalist and co-chair of C40, an organisation that "has consistently prioritised the support for cities in the Global South, which are often most acutely affected

by the climate crisis". In the 'fight against climate change', a similar posture of 'following the science' is taken against all criticism by sceptical constituents and dissident experts who are vilified as climate deniers. The war on private cars is in keeping with the World Economic Forum's ambitions for governments to reduce the number of automobiles in the world by 75% by 2050 to reduce carbon emissions from the transport sector. In the WEF's deep green agenda, there is little if any recognition of what the loss of affordable private transport entails for ordinary people. Tradesmen like plumbers and electricians who depend on their vans for work, mothers who drive their children to and from school or go shopping, disabled or older people who need to visit their loved ones or go to hospital matter little in the elite's war on cars. Claiming global climate change and an alleged impending climate catastrophe was too broad and amorphous it seems for the introduction of London's anti-motorist policies that put such an onerous burden on the little people of Greater London. The London Mayor's office required a more effective and plausible public relations approach in justifying its Ulez and other urban transport regulations. The public relations approach of the Mayor's office in pushing for the Ulez expansion along with all the other secondary anti-car actions have focused on the health effects of polluted air. It's not just Ulez but the entire repertoire of actions in the war against working- and middle-class motorists that needed justification. This includes the imposition of low traffic neighbourhoods, raising the cost of parking, the narrowing of roads for bicycle lanes, the putting up of bollards and planters to restrict car traffic altogether and experimenting with zoning restrictions for '15-minute cities'. These regulations are now ubiquitous across towns and cities in England such as Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, Canterbury, Glasgow and Oxford. The average speed of cars in London during a typical weekday averages eight miles per hour in central London, 12 in inner London and 20 in outer London. According to AI ChatGPT, "based on historical accounts and estimations", the speed of a Roman chariot was likely around 20 to 25 miles per hour on well-maintained roads in ancient Londinium. Would it be unfair to blame Mayor Khan and his fellow climate alarmists for the lack of progress in the speed of London urban transport over two millennia? The Linear No-Threshold (LNT) model is used by the World Health Organisation (WHO), an agency of the United Nations, as a guiding principle in setting urban air pollution limits. The model assumes that any exposure to a pollutant, no matter how small, carries health risks that require a public policy response. The model accords with the deep ecology instincts of the Church of Climate according to which the only tolerable 'sustainable' environment is one which is pristine and free from the cancer that is human civilisation. The LNT model is commonly applied in radiation protection and toxicology, but it also influences air quality regulations, particularly for pollutants that allegedly have no known safe threshold. The model undergirds the WHO fact sheet which lists the policies recommended to reduce air pollution such as making us walk, cycle or use public transport instead of cars and cramming us into compact '15-minute' cities and high-rises. For Mayor Khan, urban air pollution is a social justice issue: "For me the issue is very simple: it's one of social justice. ... It's the poorest people, least likely to own a car, least likely to cause the toxic air problems, who are most likely to suffer the consequences." Khan's office claims that since 2019, there has been a fall of 46% in nitrogen oxides and a 41% reduction in PM 2.5 (particulate matter

smaller than 2.5 micrometres in diameter). Yet this comparison is based on questionable counterfactual modelling of what “would have occurred” if there were no Ulez in operation. Ross Clark of the Spectator “smells a rat” here and refers to a study by Imperial College which examined air pollution data for 12 weeks before and 12 weeks after the original Ulez was implemented in 2019. It found that there was no significant reduction in PM 2.5 pollution and nitrogen oxides fell by a mere 3%. A report by the Committee on the Medical Effects of Air Pollutants claimed that air at Hampstead station, the deepest Tube station in London, had a particulate matter concentration 30 times worse than that of standing by a busy road in the capital. A 2017 estimate of the social costs of air pollution from cars in the UK found that it amounted to £25 a year or less for each car. In other words, just two entry fees for the Central London Ulez would cover the social cost of this pollution for a whole year. The constant refrain from the London mayor’s office that the city has a toxic air quality ‘emergency’ that is dangerous to people’s health is questionable. Like much of the propaganda that pervades mainstream media coverage of the ‘climate emergency’ it is unconvincing. London’s air pollution levels have dramatically declined over the past few decades, along with that of other major cities such as Tokyo, Los Angeles and New York, which were known for their smog-filled skies in the 1950s and 1960s. The reduction of coal burning in households and old power plants, more efficient vehicles using better quality diesel and petrol and the use of natural gas for power generation, home heating and cooking are among some of the factors that have led to far cleaner air in most cities in the developed OECD countries. These cities have cleaner air now than ever before in their histories. This is in keeping with the broader generalisation that never has the world’s population lived longer or healthier or been less poor than now (with the exceptional blip caused by the hysteria-induced Covid lockdowns). London’s Class Warfare It would seem that some sort of urban class war has been waging in London over the past few years. This includes both passive resistance in the form of the non-payment of fines by penalised drivers and active sabotage and vandalism of Ulez cameras by activists across the boroughs of London. Political opposition to virtue-signalling green schemes has been growing across Europe and London’s motorists are leading the country’s first real anti-green citizen’s revolt. According to a report by the BBC, TfL had installed 1,900 cameras in outer London and there were some 3,400 cameras across the Ulez in August 2023. A FOI request reported that there were more than 3,700 Ulez cameras in London as of July 2024. The SWLondoner reported in May 2024 that “There have been more than 4,500 counts of vandalism of Ulez cameras in little over a year, according to data crowd-sourced by the minds behind one of Facebook’s biggest anti-Ulez groups.” According to an anonymous spokesman of ‘Julie’s map’, an anti-Ulez group, “he feels he was forced to retire when Ulez’s expansion would have forced him to buy a new van in order to avoid fines for work related travel”. A more passive form of resistance is in the form of non-payment of Ulez fines. A recent story by the Express cites critics of Mr Khan, who “has not listened to sense or reason as he faces a backlog of nearly half a billion pounds in unpaid Ulez fines”. According to the paper, new research suggests that only one in five drivers are paying the fee on time. Keith Prince, the Conservative Group’s transport spokesperson on the London Assembly, told the Express that “By the time you finish reading this quote, TfL will have issued another fine to a Londoner struggling to

afford to upgrade their car, who is four times more likely to not be able to pay it on time". Joe Coughlin of MyLondon reports that a single car has been fined over 1,000 times since the Ulez expansion was introduced in 2023, racking up a massive bill for the driver. He cites recent data that show that over 100,000 cars have garnered five or more unpaid fines since the expansion of Ulez. Sir Sadiq Khan, it seems, has little time to listen to his middle- and working-class constituents about the onerous burdens imposed by Ulez and other anti-motorist regulations. The Robin Hood of legend used superior archery and detailed knowledge of local forests to rob from the rich to distribute to the poor against the depredations of the ruling class and its representative, the corrupt and tyrannical Sheriff of Nottingham. The common folk of London today seem to face a similar oppression, this time under an environmentalist sheriff (Mayor). The contexts are vastly different — one from medieval England, the other from contemporary London — but the fight against perceived injustices is universal.

125: Renewable energy production falls in Northern Ireland

The amount of renewable electricity generated in Northern Ireland has fallen again, prompting calls for action to help meet legally binding climate change targets.

By law, 80% of Northern Ireland's electricity must come from renewable sources by 2030.

Renewable generation in Northern Ireland reached a peak of 51% in 2022 but it has fallen each year since.

That can be due to weather fluctuations, but also to the process of "dispatch down", when wind turbines are switched off because the grid is unable to use the amount of renewable energy being produced.

New figures from the Department for the Economy show that 43.5% of electricity consumption came from renewable sources in the calendar year 2024.

That is down 2.3 percentage points on 2023.

Onshore wind farms provide more than 80% of the renewable electricity generated here. 'From leaders to laggards'

Steven Agnew from RenewableNI said while weather-related variations were to be expected, the figures "should be a warning alarm" for policy makers.

"Northern Ireland is going from leaders to laggards," he said.

"In levels never before seen, dispatch down averaged 30% in 2024, double what could have reasonably been expected."

Mr Agnew said that construction of the north-south interconnector was urgently needed to allow Northern Ireland to send electricity across the border, and he called for delivery of long duration energy storage and a new renewable energy support scheme.

He continued: "We now have a programme for government suggesting NI can be an energy exporter. The executive need to work together to benefit the Northern Ireland consumer and environment."

126: Unexpected' rate of sea level rise in 2024: NASA

Earth's oceans rose faster than expected last year as the world experienced its hottest year on record, NASA says.

Sea levels rose faster than expected around the world in 2024 – the Earth's hottest year on record, according to new findings from the United States' NASA space agency, which attributed the rise to warming oceans and melting glaciers.

"With 2024 as the warmest year on record, Earth's expanding oceans are following suit, reaching their highest levels in three decades," NASA's Nadya Vinogradova Shiffer, head of physical oceanography programmes and the Integrated Earth System Observatory, said on Thursday.

Josh Willis, a sea level researcher at NASA, said the rise in the world's oceans last year was "higher than expected," and while changes take place each year, what has become clear is that the "rate of rise is getting faster and faster."

According to the NASA-led study of the information sourced via the Sentinel-6 Michael Freilich satellite, the rate of sea level rise last year was 0.59cm (0.23 inches) per year – higher than an initial expected estimate of 0.43cm (0.17 inches) per year.

Satellite recordings of ocean height started in 1993, and in the three decades up to 2023, the rate of sea level rise has more than doubled, with average sea levels around the globe rising by 10cm (3.93 inches) in total, according to NASA.

Rising sea levels are among the consequences of human-induced climate change, and oceans have risen in line with the increase in the Earth's average surface temperature – a change which itself is caused by greenhouse gas emissions.

NASA said trends from recent years showed additional water from land due to melting ice sheets and glaciers to be the biggest contributor, accounting for two-thirds of sea level rise.

In 2024, however, the increased rise in sea levels was largely driven by the thermal expansion of water – when ocean water expands as it warms – which accounts for about two-thirds of the increase.

The UN has warned of threats to vast numbers of people living on islands or along coastlines due to rising sea levels, with low-lying coastal areas of India, Bangladesh, China and the Netherlands flagged as areas of particular concern, as well as island nations in the Pacific and Indian Oceans.

127: Bill Gates, Jeff Bezos want 'climate vaccines' laced into the food supply

Billionaires Jeff Bezos of Amazon and Bill Gates of Microsoft are scheming up plans to mass-'vaccinate' the population with 'climate vaccines' hidden in food.

In order to stop 'global warming,' Bezos and Gates feel as though livestock animals raised for meat need to be jabbed with God-knows-what in order to reduce their 'methane emissions,' aka flatulence, or farts.

According to Bezos and Gates, cows and other meat animals are passing too much gas, which is making temperatures too warm. As such, Bezos is personally investing nearly \$10 million to develop a 'climate vaccine' that will stop meat animals from farting and save the planet from a changing climate.

'The vaccine is designed to reduce the number of methane-producing microbes in a cow's stomach,' reports explain.

'The funding comes from his Bezos Earth Fund, a philanthropy he established with \$10 billion in 2020 ... The fund intends to distribute all of its money by 2030.'

According to Bezos, all \$10 billion in the Bezos Earth Fund will be used to 'fight climate change and protect nature.'

(Related: Earlier this year, Bezos demonized farming while promoting his \$1.27 billion fake food investment.)

Stopping cow farts to save the planet

Among the groups receiving cash from Bezos to develop climate vaccines for meat animals include the Pirbright Institute out of the United Kingdom, the Royal Veterinary College, and New Zealand's AgResearch. The researchers, in short, are busily looking for new ways to stop cows from farting after they eat.

'Vaccines have proven to be an incredibly cost-effective way to deliver global health solutions,' announced Bezos Earth Fund president and CEO Andrew Steer, whose last name is truly ironic considering the purpose behind his group.

'If we can apply this approach to vaccinate cattle and reduce emissions, the scalability and impact could be phenomenal.'

For more than four decades, the more deranged elements of modern science have tried but failed to develop anti-farting vaccines. Untold billions of dollars, many of them clutched from U.S. taxpayers, have been wasted trying to stop meat animals from 'cutting cheese,' but to no avail.

'This grant is a moonshot for proof-of-concept,' Steer commented about the project with a straight face. 'Risky bets like this are essential to tackling the climate crisis.'

Back in August when the Bezos Earth Fund first announced that it was funding an anti-farting vaccine for cattle, ArkeaBio, an ag-biotech startup company, announced that it had secured \$38.5 million to develop a methane jab of its own.

ArkeaBio's investors include Breakthrough Energy Ventures, a group funded by Gates, as well as Rabo Ventures and the Grantham Foundation.

The funding that ArkeaBio announced this past summer was technically its second round. The first involved \$12 million in secured funding via Breakthrough Energy, which was first created in 2015 to fund startup companies focused on reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

For many years, Gates, a deranged eugenicist with too much time and money at his disposal, has been fearful of livestock rearing and farming in general. He wants both practices to stop in order to prevent the idea of 'climate change' from upsetting him any more than it already does.

Gates is busily working on trying to create artificial meat grown in a lab, which would make him even richer while eventually eliminating all real meat from the food supply.

One way to tackle the 'problem' of animal farts, according to Gates, is to 'vaccinate the cows in a way that their gut bacteria that emit the methane, which is also called natural gas or CH₄, which is the second most important greenhouse gas, you can vaccinate them and that species of bacteria isn't there,' he said.

There is no such thing as global warming.

128: State of the Planet: Better Than Ever

Think about this: There is no time in the history of mankind that would be a better time to be alive than today. Although most people resist this message, and perhaps it is natural to have a yearning for the simpler times of yesteryear, nearly every objective measure of the state of the planet and the state of human progress shows vast improvement over time. You can find proof of this in about 30 seconds on your iPhone, which has about as much computing power than every computer used by all the nations of World War II. Why is there so much pessimism about the state of our planet? I recently watched the Earth Day

speeches on the Washington Mall and they were drenched with Chicken Little tales of a coming apocalypse. Here is the way CNN explained what we have to look forward to: "Think super droughts, rising seas, mass extinctions, and acidifying oceans." Then it warned: "Disappearing coasts," and "bye bye, animals." President Barack Obama sounded the alarm when he warned of climate change: "This is not a problem for another generation. Not anymore. This is a problem now. It has serious implications for the way we live right now. Stronger storms. Deeper droughts. Longer wildfire seasons." He claims it is already happening. It reminds me of those campy 1970s buttons: "Stop the planet, I want to get off." Forty five years ago when the first Earth Day was held, the catastrophe that awaited us was mass starvation, lost farmland, overpopulation, our supplies of oil and gas running on empty, early death, nuclear winter, and believe it or not, a coming second ice age. Every single one of those predictions was not just wrong, but spectacularly wrong. The opposite occurred. But the doomsday machine rolls on. The declinism on the state of our planet and the well-being of our species, permeates our schools, our churches, our malls, radio, TV, the Internet and our whole culture. In sum, our planet is in a miserable state, we're told over and over. Ladies and gentlemen, this is the single greatest misinformation campaign in world history. The state of our planet and the state of humanity has never been stronger. Nature has never been more bountiful. I recently wrote of the following six statistics which go a long way to proving how well we are doing. The response from the greens was vitriol and even threats to my physical safety for writing these truths. But no one refuted the facts, because, well facts are facts. Here they are: 1. Natural resources are more abundant and affordable today than ever before in history. Short term volatility aside, the price of almost all natural resources - from cocoa to cotton to coal - is cheaper today in real terms than 50, 100, or 500 years ago. This has happened even as the world's population has nearly tripled. Technology has far outpaced depletion of the earth's resources. 2. Energy resources are growing. Energy is the master resource; and it is super abundant. Remember when people like Paul Ehrlich nearly 50 years ago and Barack Obama just three years ago warned that we were running out of oil and gas? Today, in the new age of oil and gas thanks to fracking, the United States has hundreds of years of petroleum and an estimated 300 years of coal. We're not running out of energy, we are running into it. 3. Air and water is cleaner than ever. Since the late 1970s, pollutants in the air have plunged. Lead pollution plunged by more than 90 percent, carbon monoxide and sulfur dioxide by more than 50 percent, with ozone and nitrogen dioxide declining as well. By nearly every standard measure it is much, much, much cleaner today in the United States than 50 and 100 years ago. The air is so clean now that the EPA worries about carbon dioxide, which isn't even a pollutant. (And, by the way, carbon emissions are falling too, thanks to fracking). One hundred years ago, about one in four deaths in America was due to contaminants in drinking water. But from 1971-2002, fewer than three people per year in the United States were documented to have died from water contamination. 4. There is no Malthusian nightmare of overpopulation. Birth rates have fallen by about one-half around the world over the last 50 years. Developed countries are having fewer kids, not too many. Even with a population of 7.3 billion people, average incomes, especially in poor countries, have surged over the last 40 years. The number of people in abject poverty fell by 1 billion between 1981 and 2011, even as global population

increased by more than 1.5 billion. That's just short of a miracle. 5. Global per capita food production is 40 percent higher today than as recently as 1950. In most nations the nutrition problem today is obesity - too many calories consumed - not hunger. The number of famines and related deaths over the last 100 years has fallen in half. More than 12 million lives on average were lost each decade from the 1920s-1960s to famine. Since then, fewer than 4 million lives on average per decade were lost. When famine does happen, it's primarily a result of political corruption or malice, not nature growing too little food. Furthermore, the price of food has fallen steadily in the United States - and most other nations steadily for 200 years. 6. The rate of death and physical destruction from natural disasters or severe weather changes has plummeted over the last century. Loss of life from hurricanes, floods, hurricanes, heat, droughts, and so on is at or near record lows. This is because we have much better advance warning systems, our infrastructure is much more durable, and we have things like air conditioning to adapt to weather changes. We are constantly discovering new ways to harness and even tame nature. Again, these are just standard facts - though not very well known. But you could look them up. The point is that human advance and growth of the economy leads to a steadily improving and bountiful planet. And the growth comes as a result of free enterprise. The environmentalists have declared free-market capitalism a near-treasonous pursuit. In reality, free markets with reasonable and sane regulation, will save the planet from extinction. Meanwhile, the socialists, the communists, the Sandinistas, the Stalinists, are the ones who did the greatest damage to the planet - with such avoidable catastrophes as the Chernobyl nuclear accident. The environmentalists still believe that command and control rules and regulations - on how much water can be flushed from our toilets, what kind of light bulbs we can use, the temperature setting of our thermostats, the amount of solar and wind energy we must use, the type of energy efficiency we get from our household appliances, the amount of water we can use to water our lawns (as in California), even limits on how many kids we can have (as in China) - will save the planet. They won't. Freedom will. This is very good news for those who believe that one of our primary missions as human beings is to make life better over time and to leave our planet better off for future generations. That's just what we are doing.

129: You Almost Got It Right, New York Post, Subsidence Is Sinking Coastal Cities, Climate Change Isn't Raising Seas

A recent New York Post (NYP) article, "Scary Map Reveals Major Coastal Cities Rapidly Sinking into Sea", reports that a study from NASA claims that several major coastal cities are sinking at alarming rates due to a combination of land subsidence and rising sea levels. The NYP specifically mentions sea level problems in New York City, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and other cities, suggesting that their problems are due to a combination of subsidence and rising seas, the latter exacerbated by climate change. The latter point is misleading. Land subsidence is a well-documented problem in some cities, largely driven by local human activities such as groundwater extraction, poor urban planning, and natural geological processes. Subsidence is not due to climate change. However, despite NASA's claim, long-term sea-level rise trend data does not support claims that seas are rising at historically unusual rates. In fact, seas have been rising at a modest and steady rate for over a century,

with no significant acceleration linked to human-caused emissions. "In many parts of the world, like the reclaimed ground beneath San Francisco, the land is moving down faster than the sea itself is going up," writes Marin Govorcin, the lead author of the NASA study. who specializes in remote sensing at NASA's Propulsion Laboratory. Commenting on the study, Alexander Handwerger, another researcher at NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory said, "The speed is more than enough to put human life and infrastructure at risk." "Accounting for this descent, sea levels — which are on the rise due to climate change — could creep up more than twice as much as previously forecast in Los Angeles and San Francisco in 25 years," the NYP commented, but the key to the statement and the study itself is land subsidence, not rising seas. Land subsidence is a localized issue caused primarily by excessive groundwater extraction, infrastructure issues, sediment compaction, and tectonic shifts. Climate change is not a factor in subsidence. The study, published in *Science Advances*, cites short term data from satellites to imply that global sea-level rise is accelerating, an implication the NYP fails to question. However, real-world tide gauge data does not support this claim. Long-term records from tide gauges—considered the gold standard for measuring local sea-level changes—show no evidence of unusual acceleration. For example, NOAA's tide gauge data from New York City's Battery Park station, which has recorded sea levels since 1856, shows a steady rise of about 2.85 millimeters per year—a rate that has remained consistent for more than a century. This aligns closely with global tide gauge records, which show that average sea levels have been rising at a rate of 1-3 millimeters per year since the 1800s. Importantly, this gradual rise is not accelerating, despite increasing CO₂ emissions over the past several decades. See Figure 1 below: Similarly, tide gauges in San Francisco show a steady sea level rise trend that is even lower than that found in New York City. (See Figure 2, below) Los Angeles's rate of sea level rise, shown in Figure 3 below, is lower and slower still. These three tide gauges from cities mentioned in the NYP article show no short- or long-term acceleration in sea level rise. Globally, in fact, there is little if any acceleration of sea level rise as data presented in *Climate at a Glance: Sea Level Rise*, demonstrates. Even if recent increases in the rate of rise recorded by some satellites are fully attributable to man-made climate change, it adds only 0.3 inch per decade more to the preexisting historic trend, and is still lower than the rate of rise that has occurred across many periods since the Earth entered its most recent interglacial 18,000 to 12,000 years before present. Recent modest sea level trends contradict claims that climate change is making sea levels rise at "scary" and accelerated rates. In fact, multiple studies have shown that sea-level rise has remained relatively constant since the end of the Little Ice Age in the 19th century, here, here, here, and here, for example. If greenhouse gas emissions were truly driving an acceleration, we would expect to see a sharp upward trend in tide gauge records over the past 50 years—but we don't. A 2022 study highlighted in *Climate Realism* found that media claims of accelerating sea-level rise are often based on cherry-picked satellite data that fails to align with ground-based tide gauge measurements. By conflating land subsidence with sea-level rise, all too often media outlets like the NYP mislead the public into believing that climate change is primarily or even solely responsible for coastal flooding threats. This is scientifically inaccurate and distracts from the real issues with subsidence that cities face. By focusing

their efforts on the causes of land subsidence, such as ground water extraction issues, and compaction of unstable soil and fill used to add land to city oceanfront, rather than being distracted by the minimal or non-existent role greenhouse gas emissions are having in on sea level rise, policy makers could have far more direct and substantial impact on preventing flooding and losses. The New York Post got the story half right. Its reporting would have been better had it eschewed any mention of climate change as a factor in the problems facing certain coastal cities.

130: Wrong, Associated Press, Climate Change is not Triggering More Extreme Weather

The Associated Press (AP) recently published an article, titled "From Deluges To Drought, Climate Change Speeds Up Water Cycle, Triggers More Extreme Weather." The article is false. Evidence clearly indicates that no changes in extreme weather trends are found in the data and, as such, no changes can be tied to climate change. "Scientists have warned for decades that rising global temperatures would juice the water cycle, leading to more intense storms, worse droughts, and more chaotic shifts between the two," says the AP's article. This tired trope assumes climate change drives individual weather events, a point factually refuted repeatedly in rebuttals at Climate Realism. Examining actual data blows down the AP's extreme weather "juicing" fantasy faster than a house of cards in a windstorm. Let's start with floods. For example, the Climate Realism piece "No, Reuters, Climate Change Is Not Increasing the Impact of Floods", cites NOAA's historical flood records to prove these events have ebbed and flowed naturally for centuries—long before SUVs roamed the earth. Then there's drought: Climate at a Glance: Drought lays out the U.S. Palmer Drought Severity Index, showing no long-term trend toward worsening conditions over the past 120 years, despite rising atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO₂). The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, often the go-to for climate alarmists, even admits low confidence in linking extreme weather shifts to human CO₂ emissions—a nuance the Seattle Times, which carried the AP's story, conveniently skips. But it doesn't stop there. The AP's obsession with a "juiced" water cycle glosses over natural climate drivers like El Niño and La Niña, which have dictated weather swings for millennia. Strong evidence for this comes from the study "Variability of El Niño/Southern Oscillation activity at millennial timescales during the Holocene epoch", published in Nature. This research analyzed a 10,000-year sediment record to reconstruct variability over the Holocene (the last ~11,700 years). The study found that El Niño and La Niña (ENSO) events—marked by changes in precipitation and sediment deposition—have occurred for at least 10,000 years, with their frequency and intensity fluctuating naturally over decades, centuries, and millennia. "ENSO variability has been a persistent feature of the tropical Pacific climate system throughout the Holocene," state the authors of the study. They link these cycles to significant weather swings, such as flips from wetter to drier conditions. The Seattle Times uncritically republished the AP article. What about the Pacific Northwest's wet-to-dry cycles affecting Seattle? Historical records—detailed in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences in 2011, titled "Drought variability in the Pacific Northwest from a 6,000-yr lake sediment record," analyzed a sediment core from Castor Lake in Washington to reconstruct 6,000 years of

deluge/drought history in the Pacific Northwest. It found that wet and dry cycles have fluctuated naturally over millennia, with some dry periods lasting decades, driven largely by natural climate patterns like El Niño/La Niña. Getting back to the AP's article, it also claims: Oceans absorb most of the planet's extra heat. That causes the water to expand and ice to melt at the poles, raising sea levels. The warmer water also provides fuel for larger hurricanes and cyclones that can dump massive amounts of water in a short time. Those claims are easily refuted. Data presented in *Climate at a Glance: Hurricanes* demonstrates definitively that global cyclone activity has remained stable, with no climate change fingerprint to be found. Also, Sea levels have been naturally and gradually rising long before "climate change" was ever a twinkle in the eye of the media. Other data reveal that wilder swings in extreme weather occurred during the early 20th century, and before, like during the 1930s Dust Bowl, when CO2 levels much lower than at present. Floods in the past, like the devastating 1911 Green River Valley inundation, or the Great Mississippi Flood of 1927, dwarf many modern events, yet we're supposed to believe this is all new? The AP also ignores inconvenient truths, like how improved infrastructure, better forecasting, and improved warning systems have reduced weather-related deaths by more than 90 percent over the last century. A 2021 World Health Organization report confirms deaths from extreme weather have declined dramatically. "Thanks to improved early warnings and disaster management, the number of deaths decreased almost three-fold," reported the WMO. Above the AP's article, next to a donate button, is the statement: "AP SETS THE STANDARD FOR POLITICAL REPORTING. SUPPORT INDEPENDENT, FACT-BASED JOURNALISM." Yet the evidence is clear that while the AP is hyping claims of a 'juiced' water cycle based on unsubstantiated, vague experts claims, the agency ignored government studies and peer reviewed reports that undermine such a conclusion. For example. NASA's Global Precipitation Climatology Project, examined global precipitation trends and determined that current variability is well within historical norm; no water cycle juicing is in evidence. Also, Climate Realism has published dozens of articles citing real-world data which demonstrate that neither wildfire nor hurricane nor tornado trends are worsening at all, much less worsening in response to purported climate change, here, here, and here, for example. "Fact based?" Hardly, since the agency routinely, as its "reporters" did in this story, ignores mountains of easily found data that undermine claims the world faces a climate crisis. Shame on the Associated Press for this journalistic malpractice. The Fourth Estate is supposed to inform, not indoctrinate. In this story, the AP gets an "F" for false reporting.

131: 3 ways the EPA's rollback of environmental regulations could affect Americans' health if air pollution worsens

When the Environmental Protection Agency was formed in 1970, its mission was to protect the environment and human health. Since then, scientists, health experts and advocates have worked to implement regulations aimed at protecting and cleaning the air we breathe and the water we drink. Many of these regulations, which were aimed at cleaning up the air, also helped reduce carbon emissions, which can contribute to climate change – so it was a win for our bodies and the planet. But all this effort, experts say, might have been for

naught, as this week the EPA – the department tasked with monitoring the nation's pollutants – announced the rollback of a wide swath of environmental regulations, many of which could worsen air quality. And experts say that could have implications for health. More than 30 rules – including ones on emission standards for industrial air pollutants, passenger vehicles and coal-fired power plants – have been slashed. The EPA also said on Wednesday it would formally reconsider a landmark 2009 finding by the agency that greenhouse gases are a danger to public health and should be regulated. "We are driving a dagger straight into the heart of the climate change religion to drive down cost of living for American families, unleash American energy, bring auto jobs back to the U.S. and more," EPA Administrator Lee Zeldin said in a video statement. The reasoning behind the deregulation, according to Zeldin, is about economics, arguing in a Wall Street Journal op-ed that, "These actions will roll back trillions of dollars in regulatory costs and hidden taxes." Scientists, advocates and experts who have spent decades compiling the research needed to propel the regulations don't agree with Zeldin's assessment. Without the regulations, experts say, the U.S. could experience levels of air pollution seen in countries such as India, China or Saudi Arabia, exacerbating health issues for Americans. "EPA Administrator Lee Zeldin today announced plans for the greatest increase in pollution in decades," said Amanda Leland, executive director of the Environmental Defense Fund, an environmental advocacy group. "The result will be more toxic chemicals, more cancers, more asthma attacks, and more dangers for pregnant women and their children. Rather than helping our economy, it will create chaos." All of Zeldin's efforts to roll back such a wide variety of regulations will be challenged in court and could take years to litigate. "This is a cluster bomb of moves to demolish a broad swath of environmental regulations. We'll see if it explodes in EPA's face when the inevitable barrage of lawsuits hits the courts," says environmental law expert Michael Gerrard. Here are three ways a possible rise in air pollutants stemming from the rollback of environmental regulations could affect Americans' health.

Memory loss in Alzheimer's, brain disease: Air pollution effects go far beyond the lungs and can create memory loss in the brain, and contribute to other diseases, scientists at Scripps Research found in research published in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences last month. Scientists discovered that pollutants found in environmental toxins, including automobile pollution and wildfire smoke, can result in elevated nitric oxide levels in the brain. These elevated levels can create a chemical change in the brain and accelerate brain aging and Alzheimer's. "We've revealed the molecular details of how pollutants can contribute to memory loss and neurodegenerative disease," senior author and professor Stuart Lipton, a clinical neurologist, said in a statement.

Miscarriages, stillborns and maternal health: Numerous studies have shown how air pollution can affect maternal health and lead to miscarriages, stillborns and low birth weight. Further evidence shows that racial minority groups exposed to pollutants suffer from poor maternal health groups more than others in the United States. A 2023 review of hundreds of studies on the topic showed that Blacks and Hispanics were more likely to have babies with low birth weight and preterm births, with medical consequences that would extend through adulthood due to exposure to air pollution. Another 2025 study by researchers at Emory University's Rollins School of Public Health showed exposure to pollution might cause difficulty for those trying to get

pregnant through IVF. Exposure to organic carbon showed negative impacts with oocyte survival, fertilization and embryo quality, the study said. "Air pollution is certainly an exposure of concern for those who are seeking to reproduce and conceive," said study author Dr. Sarah LaPointe in a statement. Researchers at Harvard found in a 2024 study that pregnant women's "exposure to fine particulate air pollution was associated with altered immune responses that can lead to adverse birth outcomes." "The study found that PM2.5 exposure can influence the histone profiles of pregnant women, disrupting the normal balance of cytokine genes and leading to increased inflammation in both women and fetuses," a news release said. "In pregnant women, this increase in inflammation can correspond with adverse pregnancy outcomes." Asthma hits children hardest: Air pollutants have long been linked to asthma, with children often suffering from the most adverse conditions. A 2024 study published in JAMA, a medical journal, found children exposed to air pollution during the first three years of life were more likely to get asthma in their elementary and middle school years. The risk of developing asthma can climb significantly for minority families living in urban communities because of air pollutants, the study found. The EPA has long supported research on children's health regarding asthma, which is among the most prevalent diseases in children worldwide. The agency found in 2009 that asthma affected 7.1 million (about 10%) of children in the United States. Another 2020 study published by researchers from Aarhus University in Denmark and published in the BMJ, a U.K. peer-reviewed medical journal, found children exposed to air pollutants are much more likely to develop asthma and persistent wheezing than those with limited exposure. American Lung Association President and CEO Harold Wimmer said rollbacks will increase pollution, more people will get sick, more children will have asthma attacks, and lives will be lost. "Through this suite of actions, EPA is certainly creating a historic legacy: one of disregard for America's health," Wimmer said.

132: Best Response to Global Warming Is to Do 'Nothing,' MIT Climate Scientist Says

MIT climate scientist Dr. Richard Lindzen said this week that humanity should do nothing about global warming and should focus instead on resilience. In a March 21 interview with Andrew Bolt of Sky News Australia, Lindzen — an atmospheric physicist and emeritus professor of meteorology at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) — declared that climate alarmism "is exploiting people's ignorance to promote fear and use it as a lever." U.N. Secretary-General António Guterres said last week, for instance, that "warp speed climate action" is urgently needed to stave off the coming climate Armageddon. Every country "must massively fast-track climate efforts," Guterres declared, because the "climate time-bomb is ticking." "We need climate action on all fronts — everything, everywhere, all at once," Guterres urged. According to Lindzen, such alarmism is not shared by the bulk of the scientific community. "A large number of scientists are saying, yes, indeed, it's warming," Lindzen acknowledged. "And they might even add that perhaps there is a matter of concern. Relatively few that I know of who even support the narrative would ever say that this is involving an existential threat." Asked point blank, "What do you think we should do about global warming?" Lindzen replied: "Nothing."

Lindzen, known for his research on the dynamics of the atmosphere, including the study of atmospheric tides and the interactions between the atmosphere and the oceans, said that there is “pretty universal agreement” that “if the whole Anglosphere and the European Union were to shut down completely, bury all industrial activity so we don’t generate CO2 ... its impact on climate would be negligible.” “The rest of the world is going to continue and they’re now dominating emissions,” he explained. “So no matter what you believe about climate, our actions will do nothing about climate.” The professor went on to say that in terms of policy, “If you truly believed that it was an existential threat, then the only thing you could do is build up your resilience.” Building up your resilience “means making more, having people wealthier, because we see throughout the whole world if you are a poor country, if you’re not resilient, natural disasters cause immense damage, pain, suffering, so on,” he said. “In the developed world, similar disasters cause much less damage,” he added. “So your aim would be resilience. Instead, we’re choosing to make ourselves less resilient. And that makes no sense at all, no matter what you believe.” “Point of fact, I don’t think there’s any threat on the horizon. And the best thing to do is to make society wealthier,” he concluded. Lindzen has argued forcefully that the human-induced effects of greenhouse gases on the climate are overstated and that natural variability plays a larger role in climate change than is typically acknowledged. He has also contended that the scientific community is too quick to attribute changes in the climate to human activity and that more research is needed to fully understand the complexities of the earth’s climate system.

133: Biden Suggested Jailing Fossil Fuel Executives to Fight Climate Change in 2019

Former Vice President Joe Biden suggested last year that, if elected, his administration would seek to fight climate change by any possible measure, including jailing fossil fuel executives for excessive pollution. Biden, who is under fire for his position on fracking in the closing days of the presidential contest, made the comments during a campaign swing through New Hampshire in 2019 ahead of the state’s first in the nation primary. During an event with supporters in Peterborough, the former vice president was asked about what the consequences to America would be if the country did not stop using fossil fuels in the future—to which Biden responded, “we’re all dead.” “We have to set sort of guide rails down now, so between the years 2021 and 2030, it’s irreversible, the path we set ourselves on. And one of which is doing away with any substance for fossil fuels – number one,” Biden said during the event. “Number two, holding them liable for what they have done,” the former vice president said of fossil fuel executives, “particularly in those cases where your underserved neighborhoods and – you know the deal, okay. And by the way, when they don’t want to deliver, put them in jail. I’m not joking about this.” Biden’s comments from 2019 come back into the spotlight as the Democrat nominee is facing criticism from Republicans and voters, alike, over his shifting stance on fracking. During the final presidential debate of the general election earlier this month, the former vice president asserted that he did not support a ban on fracking, but did admit that the United States would have to transition from oil at some point in the near future. The remarks quickly were

seized upon by Republicans, who claim that the Democrat nominee's position on energy is in line with more progressive elements of his party, which favor banning fracking and programs like the Green New Deal. Despite Biden's assertion on fracking, the former vice president's climate change proposal states that, if elected, his administration would adopt a 100 percent clean-electricity standard by 2035. A similar idea was initially raised by Gov. Jay Inslee (D-WA) last year during his own ill-fated run for the Democrat nomination. If implemented, it would ensure that all electricity produced in the United States would be "carbon-free." This would likely have a massive impact on the coal and natural gas industries that, according to the Energy Information Association, produce around 63 percent of all electricity in the country. Biden's climate change plan also calls for the creation of a new division within the Department of Justice to combat pollution and advance "environmental and climate justice." The division will be responsible for cracking down on the businesses and corporations, including their executives, that contribute to pollution. It will be empowered to pursue pollution "cases to the fullest extent permitted by law and, when needed, seek additional legislation to hold corporate executives personally accountable—including jail time when merited."

134: Silicon Valley Lectures Us Again: Zillow Adds 'Climate Risk Data' to Home Listings

Zillow is now providing homebuyers with "climate change risk data" when they look up house prices on the website, Silicon Valley's latest attempt to lecture regular people about their environmental obsession. CNBC reports that Zillow, one of the nation's leading online real estate marketplaces, has partnered with climate risk firm First Street to incorporate "climate risk data" into its for-sale property listings. This new feature claims to empower homebuyers with the knowledge they need to make informed decisions when purchasing a home, as the company feels climate change may threaten some homeowners. Each for-sale listing on Zillow now displays First Street risk scores for flood, fire, wind, air, and heat. These scores not only reflect the current risk levels but also provide projections for the next 15 and 30 years, corresponding to the standard lengths of fixed-rate mortgages. By incorporating the effects of climate change into its risk assessments, First Street's data often shows an increase in risk over time, particularly for flood risk, as the company believes climate change intensifies the severity of rainfall events. Skylar Olsen, chief economist at Zillow, emphasized the role climate risks believed to play in home buying decisions by the company, stating, "We're providing buyers and sellers with clear, property-specific climate data so they can make informed decisions. As concerns about flooding, extreme temperatures, and wildfires grow, this tool also helps agents inform their clients in discussing climate risk, insurance, and long-term affordability." In addition to the risk scores, the new feature includes recommendations on whether homeowners should obtain flood insurance and provides a link to the First Street site, which helps estimate insurance costs. This is particularly important given that many people believe they are safe from flooding if they are not in a FEMA flood zone, a misconception that can have severe consequences. Ed Kearns, chief science officer at First Street, noted, "I think that's going to be the most direct impact of having scores on homes that quantify risk is that there may be

some direct impact on real estate values, but a lot of that is going to go through the amount of insurance necessary to cover that home.”

135: Left-wing dark money groups ramp up pressure on House and Senate

Dems against key industry: No Immunity

Environmental groups with ties to anti-Israel groups, the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) and billionaire mega-donors are pressuring Democratic congressional leadership to pursue an agenda of no immunity for the fossil fuel industry. We write to urge Democratic members of the House and Senate to proactively and affirmatively reject any proposal that would shield fossil fuel companies from the growing number of legal and legislative efforts to hold them accountable for their role in the climate crisis, a letter from almost 200 environmental groups to Sen. Chuck Schumer, D-N.Y., and Rep. Hakeem Jeffries, D-N.Y., reads. The signers include the Westchester Peoples Action Coalition (WESPAC), a fiscal sponsor of Students for Justice Palestine, a pro-Palestine group that has orchestrated dozens of anti-Israel protests since the Oct. 7 terrorist attack. Fox News Digital previously reported on the financial ties between WESPAC and liberal megadonor George Soros. WESPAC, whose funding is largely unknown, has espoused anti-Israel rhetoric for years, including accusing the government of apartheid, ethnic cleansing, collective punishment and war crimes according to NGO Monitor. More than 100 climate groups are calling on Democrats in Congress to provide no immunity to the fossil fuel industry. (Getty) Another letter-signer was the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), one of the nation’s largest environmentalist groups, which has been accused by Republican members of congress of having substantial ties to the CCP. NRDC’s president and CEO, Manish Bapna, is a council member of the China Council for International Cooperation on Environment and Development, a platform for cooperation and policy development between Chinese and international researchers. Sen. Ted Cruz and Rep. James Comer sent a letter to the attorney general in 2023 to investigate NRDC, saying it acts as a mouthpiece for Chinese propaganda, signaling that it either takes direction from the CCP or that it is willing to self-censor to maintain a positive relationship with the Communist regime. BIDENS ‘WOKE GREEN AGENDA’ ON CHOPPING BLOCK AS EPA ANNOUNCES ‘MOST CONSEQUENTIAL DAY OF DEREGULATION’ Rep. Hakeem Jeffries Rep. Hakeem Jeffries, a Democrat from New York, speaks during a news conference at the U.S. Capitol in Washington, D.C., on Thursday, Feb. 6, 2025. (Tierney L. Cross/Bloomberg via Getty Images) Bob Deans, spokesman for NRDC, told Fox News Digital in a statement, “This letter affirms a simple principle: the polluter pays for the harm they cause. The fossil fuel industry shouldn’t be let off the hook for the damage its pollution causes; same as any other industry. Working families shouldn’t have to pay the price for that pollution, in the havoc it wreaks on our homes, pocketbooks, health and farms. The NRDC is an independent, non-profit, public-interest group working to confront the climate crisis and protect the environment and public health. When developing our institutional positions—in the United States, China, and anywhere else in the world—we rely on our U.S.-based senior leadership and board of independent trustees, and no one else. We do the bidding of no government, in this country or any other. Foreign-funded groups Extinction Rebellion and the Center for Climate Integrity (CCI) joined in on the letter to Democratic leadership. CCI, in their 2022

990 form, promoted the idea that climate polluters should be held financially responsible for the climate damage they've deliberately caused at the center of the climate debate. The group, which received a grant of over \$1 million from the billionaire-fueled Rockefeller Family Fund in 2018, said that they support congressional investigations designed to expose the oil and gas industry's historic and ongoing climate deception. The Children's Investment Fund Foundation, co-founded by European billionaire Christopher Hohn, donated \$7 million to CCI from January 2018 through September 2020 in an effort to accelerate climate action by supporting litigation that promotes climate mitigation, adaptation and resilience. Extinction Rebellion has been responsible for a long list of attempts to disrupt the public life of innocent bystanders, including blocking an airstrip, blocking traffic and interfering with the tennis U.S. Open in 2023. Another environmental advocacy group, 350.org, is funded by Bloomberg Philanthropies, a group owned by billionaire businessman Michael Bloomberg who, in October, became the second-largest individual donor to then-Vice President Kamala Harris presidential campaign. Senate Minority Leader Chuck Schumer (D-NY) is seen ahead of votes on a Continuing Resolution, which would avert a government shutdown, in Washington, D.C. on March 14, 2025. (Nathan Posner/Anadolu via Getty Images) The group is funded by the Tides Foundation, a group that fiscally sponsors pro-Palestine groups, such as the Adalah Justice Project, a Palestinian-led advocacy group. Fox News Digital has previously reported that the Tides Foundation has given millions to liberal organizations who have organized pro-Palestinian protests. The foundation financially backs several groups listed as signatories on the letter to Jeffries and Schumer. Tides is aware of the letter that was sent to Rep. Jeffries and Sen. Schumer to hold fossil fuel companies accountable for their role in the climate crisis, a Tides Foundation spokesperson told Fox News Digital. Our community of fiscally sponsored projects, donors, and grantees hold a wide range of perspectives, including on how to best protect and care for our planet. The statement continued, At Tides, we value and support diverse approaches to advancing equity. We work closely with our partners to ensure they adhere to the guidelines outlined in our handbook and we condemn hate speech, violence, antisemitism and Islamophobia in any form. Tides has never received money from Open Society Foundation or any other donor to fund the student protests on college campuses. We believe that every life lost to violence is a profound injustice. Fox News Digital reached out to the offices of Sen. Schumer and Rep. Jeffries.

136: Physicist: Climate Scientists Are Giving Science a Bad Name

Climate scientists are giving science a bad name, says a leading atmospheric physicist in an essay on the global warming debate. Professor Garth Paltridge, formerly a chief scientist with Australia's Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO) Division of Atmospheric Research, says that the behavior of certain members of the climate science establishment is "seriously threatening the public's perception of the professionalism of scientists in general." Many climate scientists are much less sure about man-made global warming than they will admit in public, he says. But rather than reach out to skeptics in order to open up the debate and explore the uncertainties, they have instead closed ranks and rubbished anyone who disagrees with them: Some of the more vocal of

the establishment climate researchers have fallen into a mode of open denigration of climate sceptics (“deniers” is the offensive popular terminology of the day). They insist that only researchers directly within the climate-change community are capable of giving authoritative advice. They insist that one can find true and reputable science only in peer-reviewed climate literature. But most significantly, they seem to have evolved a policy of deliberately excluding sceptics from climate-change forums of one sort or another, and indeed of refusing to take part in any forum where sceptics may share the podium. Their high-handedness, Paltridge says, is redolent of “medieval religion”: The priests of that time opposed translation of the written scriptures from Latin into the local languages. They believed that only people fully trained in the theology of the time were capable of interpreting the scriptures correctly. They believed it would be highly dangerous to allow non-trained people to have direct access to the word of God because the chances were high that they would get it wrong. They were not backward in applying their peculiarly nasty forms of denigration on those who thought otherwise about the matter. But the medieval priests eventually lost the battle. As will the climate alarmists because the public simply do not trust them: The modern equivalent with regard to AGW is that, despite the claim that 95% or more of climate scientists support the AGW establishment position, support for the position among the general public (of the western nations anyway) is only of the order of 50%. The reputation of climate science, and as a consequence the reputation of science in general, seems to have lost a good deal of its public gloss. It is not even certain that climate science qualifies as an actual science. Being driven by a political agenda rather than by experimentation and evidence, it is more akin to post-modernism: Post-modern science is a counterpart of the relativist world of post-modern art and design. It is a much more dangerous beast, where results are valid only in the context of society’s beliefs, and where the very existence of scientific truth can be denied. Post-modern science envisages a sort of political nirvana in which scientific theory and results can be consciously and legitimately manipulated to suit either the dictates of political correctness or the policies of the government of the day. At a more mundane level, there is little doubt that some players in the climate research establishment – not many, but enough to have severely damaged the reputation of climate scientists in general – have stepped across the boundary of what is generally regarded as acceptable scientific behaviour. Scientists — even climate scientists, Paltridge generously argues — are not generally “wicked, idiotic or easily suborned.” But they do have to eat, and almost all the research money right now is available for scientists pushing the alarmist side of the argument, not the skeptical one. Also, the whole field is mired in such uncertainty that is quite impossible for anyone — whether skeptic or alarmist — to prove their position. Climate research has to rely on spectacularly inaccurate data for information on Earth’s climate of more than a century or two ago; it has to rely on proxy information from tree rings and ice cores and corals and so on, and abstracting a coherent story from it all is something of a statistical nightmare. Even for the most recent century, the huge data sets of directly measured surface temperatures have their problems, and the stories that these data tell are revised in one way or another as new ideas about the correct method of analyzing the data appear on the scene. Such revisions make for tremendous arguments and competing claims about whether cherry picking of data has been used to

support the predictions of the AGW theoretical models. Climate science is an example of what Funtowicz and Ravetz call 'post-normal science' in which 'the facts are uncertain, values are in dispute, stakes are high and decisions are urgent'. In such circumstances it is virtually impossible to avoid sub-conscious cherry-picking of data to suit the popular theory of the time. Even Isaac Newton and Albert Einstein were not immune from the problem. It is nonetheless the case that once freed of the burden of having to earn a living or retain their tenure in an academe in thrall to the man-made global warming narrative, scientists do seem much more ready to take a skeptical position: There are many examples where the transition from paid employment in climate research to retirement has been accompanied by a significant change of heart away from acknowledging the seriousness of global warming. It seems that scientists too are conscious of the need to eat, and like everyone else must consider the consequences of public dissent from the views of the powers-that-be. One example was Dr Brian Tucker. He was the Director of the Australian Numerical Meteorology Research Centre, and subsequently became Chief of the CSIRO Division of Atmospheric Research. He was heavily involved in the development of the IPCC. During his time with CSIRO he was the 'go to' man for journalists and radio programmers seeking stories on matters to do with climate change. On retirement he became a writer and speaker for the Institute of Public Affairs, and greatly surprised his former colleagues with his very public change to an openly sceptical view on the subject.

137: Climate change is shrinking glaciers faster than ever, with 7 trillion tons lost since 2000

Climate change is accelerating the melting of the world's mountain glaciers, according to a massive new study that found them shrinking more than twice as fast as in the early 2000s. The world's glaciers lost ice at the rate of about 255 billion tons (231 billion metric tons) annual from 2000 to 2011, but that quickened to about 346 billion tons (314 billion metric tons) annually over about the next decade, according to the study in this week's journal Nature. And the last few years, the melt has accelerated even more, hitting a record 604 billion tons (548 billion metric tons) lost in 2023, the last year analyzed. The study drew on an international effort that included 233 estimates of changes in glacier weight. In all, the world's glaciers have lost more than 7 trillion tons of ice (6.5 trillion metric tons) since 2000, according to the study. "The thing that people should be aware of and perhaps worried about is that yes, the glaciers are indeed retreating and disappearing as we said they would. The rate of that loss seems to be accelerating," said William Colgan, a glaciologist for the Geological Survey of Denmark and Greenland and one of about 60 authors of the study. Glaciers in Alaska are melting at the fastest rate of any of the 19 regions studied, losing about 67 billion tons (61 billion metric tons) of ice a year, producing the biggest net ice loss, the study found. In the past 24 years, Central Europe's glaciers have lost the highest percentage of ice of any region, now 39% smaller than they were in 2000, the paper said. Colgan said he worries most about the Alps because "elevated summer temperatures have been hammering the Alps." Fifteen years ago, scientists were worried most about the Andes and the Patagonia glaciers, but the Alps have shrunk so fast they could eventually disappear, Colgan said. "Glaciers are apolitical and unbiased sentinels of

climate change, and their decline paints a clear picture of accelerated warming,” said Gwenn Flowers, a professor of Earth Sciences at Simon Fraser University in Canada, who wasn’t part of the study. University of Colorado ice scientist Ted Scambos, who also wasn’t part of the study, said glaciers shrank and grew in the past for local, well-understood reasons that were not climate change. What’s happening now is different and clear, he said: “It’s due to greenhouse gas increases caused directly by coal, oil, and natural gas burning. ... No amount of rhetoric, tweeting, or proclamation will change that.” Scambos, Flowers and other outside scientists called the assessment sobering and accurate but not surprising. Colgan said that many places — such as those in the U.S. West — are seeing extra water now from fast-melting glaciers and benefiting from that boost, but that will soon disappear as the glaciers melt beyond a point of no return. Melting glaciers contribute more to sea level rise than ice loss in either Greenland or Antarctica. Only the expansion of water as it warms plays a bigger role in sea level rise, the paper said. The overall glacier loss rate is similar, if maybe slightly less, than that found by earlier and less comprehensive studies. But this new work will probably trigger new predictions that will be even gloomier in the future because of better information and worsening warming, Colgan said. “If you’re losing 5.5% of the global ice volume in just over 20 years, clearly that’s not sustainable,” Colgan said. “That’s going to catch up with you.” The more than 600 billion tons of glacier loss in 2023 “sounds incredible now, but it might sound pretty normal in 10 years from now,” Colgan said. “Mountain glaciers as a whole can flip into collective ice loss pretty darn quick.”

138: Ambitious climate action could boost global 2040 GDP by 0.2%, says OECD study

BERLIN, March 25 (Reuters) - Accelerated climate action could boost global GDP by 0.2% by 2040 compared with current policies, a study showed on Tuesday, as delegates from 40 countries meet in Berlin to shape the agenda for the COP30 summit in Brazil later this year. An analysis by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and United Nations Development Programme said that well-designed climate policies not only cut emissions but could enhance efficiency, productivity and innovation - potentially raising output by an amount equivalent to the size of Sweden’s economy. Investing in clean energy and efficiency drives productivity and innovation, offsetting the economic impact of policy-driven price and consumption changes, the study found. Reinvesting carbon revenues could further boost GDP and build public backing for climate action, it said. As countries prepare to submit updated Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) by September - the national plans each country makes towards global climate goals - the study said NDCs provided policy certainty, giving markets the confidence to mobilise resources toward sustainable growth. Unclear climate policies could delay private investment and cut GDP by 0.75% as early as 2030, the study warned. The study comes as ministers from around 40 countries gather in Berlin for the Petersberg Climate Dialogue, which will focus on preparations for the UN climate conference in Belem, Brazil in November. The Petersberg conference will be the first major ministerial climate meeting since the Trump administration withdrew the U.S. from the Paris Agreement. Anyone who dismisses climate action in these turbulent times as being expensive, onerous or superfluous cannot

count, German Foreign Minister Annalena Baerbock said in a statement. Baerbock said the Petersberg conference would focus on implementing the global goals set at the 2023 Dubai climate summit, including the summits deal to transition away from fossil fuels, and an agreement to triple global renewable energy capacity by 2030.

139: 1 in 8 Californians now face extreme fire danger, Post analysis shows

One in 8 Californians now live in places at risk for the kinds of devastating wildfires that tore through Los Angeles this winter, according to a Washington Post analysis of state fire maps released Monday. The maps, drawn by Cal Fire, the state's forestry and fire protection agency, reveal the threat from wildfire is greater than previous state estimates showed. They reflect the effects of soaring temperatures on California, where hotter, drier weather has primed a landscape filled with vast acres of forest and shrubland for explosive fires — even in winter, during what should be the state's rainy season. When factoring in areas where state and local firefighters are responsible for fighting blazes, the maps show there are now about 5.1 million people living in the two highest fire severity zones in the state, The Post found. That's around one in 8 Californians. The updated maps take into account California's fire history, local weather patterns, terrain and new models showing how embers can travel miles away from a forest fire, spreading the danger into densely populated neighborhoods. They cover only cities and towns where local fire departments manage wildfire response, assigning a hazard score based on the likelihood of a future blaze, separating communities into "very high," "high" and "moderate" zones. "Hazard mapping by itself does not tell you: 'Do these eight things to make your community fire-safe,' but it really does help raise the level of awareness," said Chris Anthony, a former chief deputy director of Cal Fire who retired in 2023. In the aftermath of the urban firestorms that swept through Los Angeles County in January, the redrawn maps are likely to have the most immediate impact in Altadena, one of the two places that suffered the greatest losses. The Eaton Fire devastated Altadena, killing 17 people and destroying more than 9, 000 structures. Under the old maps, only a small percentage of Altadena was in a fire hazard zone. An analysis by The Post found that 80 percent of homes that were damaged or reduced to ash were outside of Cal Fire's "very high" fire hazard severity zone. The new maps place about 33 percent of the homes that burned in the "very high" or "high" hazard zones, meaning that residents planning to rebuild will have to follow California's strictest-in-the-nation wildfire building standards and real estate disclosure rules. Those in the highest hazard zone will be subject to landscaping rules like clearing flammable brush from around their home. The maps might also shape decisions about where to construct more housing and evacuation routes — and where to put fire breaks so communities can defend themselves more easily. Los Angeles County, like other municipalities, has 120 days to accept public feedback on the maps and begin enforcing them. As many middle-class residents in Altadena grapple with whether to rebuild, the rules that come with living in fire-prone areas could add further financial strain. Those in the highest hazard zones might face additional construction costs for fire-resistant windows, doors and siding, vents that embers can't pass through and other required design features. Citizen volunteers help put out a fire in Altadena on Jan. 8. (Jen Osborne/For The Washington Post) An analysis by the

research group Headwaters Economics found that replacing a 2,000-square-foot home under the state's fire building requirements increases the cost by, at most, \$15,000. Anish Saraiya, who is directing Altadena recovery efforts for Los Angeles County Supervisor Kathryn Barger, said there is an obvious safety benefit to making new homes fire-resistant. Still, he said, "there is concern that the expansion of these fire maps is going to mean the rebuilding cost for many hundreds, if not thousands, of people is going to go up." Throughout Altadena, many homeowners are finding they are underinsured, he said, meaning their policies will not cover the full cost of rebuilding. Others are wondering whether a new home would even be insurable. The question of insurability is "the elephant in the room at the moment," Saraiya said. A home burns as the Eaton fire rages on Jan. 8. (Jen Osborne/For The Washington Post) Some residents and elected officials fear the updated maps could make home insurance unaffordable, or impossible to find. But Karen Collins, a vice president at the American Property Casualty Insurance Association, an industry trade group, said home insurance carriers in California do not use the state's fire hazard maps in deciding whether to renew policies or what to charge for coverage. Instead, they rely on data held by private analytics companies, which provide a more granular look at properties' fire risk. Collins said that if the new maps compel more people to build fire-resistant homes in Altadena, it could make the area more attractive to insurers. But Saraiya said that insurance companies have been noncommittal about returning to Altadena in conversations with the supervisor's office. "They're in a wait-and-see mode," Saraiya said. "A lot of insurance companies claim they don't utilize these maps ... I think they will have an impact." In the past, California fire officials only mapped "very high" severity zones for cities. The new maps add "high" and "moderate" zones, a requirement passed by state lawmakers that helps explain why the number of acres now inside the boundaries of a fire hazard zone has grown considerably. New maps of Southern California increase the size of the two highest fire hazard zones in Los Angeles County by more than 50 percent, adding tens of thousands of acres in the high desert and cities such as Santa Clarita and La Cañada Flintridge that abut the mountains. Cal Fire officials emphasize that these maps are intended to tell counties and cities where to enforce stronger building codes and brush clearing rules, among other regulations — not to give homeowners an understanding of their risk. Multiple studies have found that homes have a better chance of surviving a wildfire when they are built with noncombustible materials and people keep the area immediately around their properties clear of flammable items like sheds, wood piles and mulch. Yet persuading people to make changes, such as replacing wooden fences, can be difficult — even in communities recently devastated by wildfires. Homes destroyed by the Tubbs Fire on Oct. 11, 2017, in Santa Rosa, California. (Justin Sullivan/Getty Images) In 2017, when the Tubbs Fire burned through Sonoma County, it leveled more than 5,000 properties and killed 22 people. Some of the worst destruction was in Coffey Park, a middle-class neighborhood in Santa Rosa that was not in a fire hazard zone. As residents there set about rebuilding, the city decided not to require them to follow the wildfire building code. The new maps more than double the amount of land in Santa Rosa that's located in the two highest fire hazard zones, though there are fewer "very high" acres now. Assistant City Manager Jason Nutt said the city plans to evaluate any boundary changes. Under the new maps,

Coffey Park is still unzoned. Cal Fire officials say this does not mean there is no risk of wildfire. In Marin County, on the northern end of San Francisco Bay, the new maps decreased the amount of land in the “very high” severity zone. But fire officials aren’t celebrating the change. Mark Brown, executive officer for the Marin Wildfire Prevention Authority, said he found the decrease surprising and out of sync with the county’s own fire hazard models, which he said factor in more precise local information on vegetation and weather patterns. As a result, he said, it’s likely that many cities in Marin will opt to increase the size of the fire hazard zones, going beyond the state’s recommendations. “We’re going to have to be able to convince our residents that’s the right thing to do,” Brown said, particularly when it comes to tougher landscaping rules the state expects to finalize this year. “We’re going to have people on both sides of the equation,” Brown said, with some wanting the landscaping rules to apply to all properties and others relieved theirs are exempt. Intense opposition Like flood maps, fire maps can fuel political fights. When Oregon released the first draft of its fire maps in 2022, the backlash was swift. “There was pretty intense public and political opposition,” said Andy McEvoy, a faculty research assistant with the College of Forestry at Oregon State University, who was among those who helped to develop a set of statewide fire risk maps. Protesters have marched at the state capital, waving signs that read, “Abolish the fire maps.” Some Oregon lawmakers have introduced legislation to repeal the maps, saying they could harm property values and unduly burden residents in rural parts of the state. Angry homeowners saw the maps as tied to a steep jump in property insurance rates. The criticism that the maps themselves would drive up insurance rates is “unfounded,” McEvoy said, as state law says insurance companies are not allowed to determine rates based on the maps. But that hasn’t quelled the antipathy. “Insurance has remained the most persistent concern,” he said. Last month, Oregon Gov. Tina Kotek (D) directed the state forestry department to halt any further action on the maps until the legislature decides how to proceed. California politicians have also fought over whether and how to reshape the state’s fire hazard maps — and the role that cities and counties should play in the process. In 2020, lawmakers passed new requirements for clearing an ember-resistant zone, dubbed “zone zero,” within 5 feet of structures in the highest severity fire zone. Five years later, those rules have still not been finalized. In early February, Gov. Gavin Newsom (D) signed an executive order directing the state Board of Forestry to finish its work on the long-delayed regulations. The order also instructed the state fire marshal’s office to release updated fire hazard maps, which had not been redrawn for locally controlled areas since 2011. “We are living in a new reality of extremes,” Newsom said in announcing the changes. “Mother Nature is changing the way we live, and we must continue adapting to those changes. California’s resilience means we will keep updating our standards in the most fire-prone areas.

140: Why Won’t the Climate Change-Wildfire Link Die?

While fires raged across California, the world’s press was on scene to find the footage required to sustain the climate narrative. And waiting in the wings for their moment in the spotlight, naturally, were the experts. This ghoulish spectacle is now part of the climate politics calendar, as various parts of the world experience the seasonal conditions that

make fires possible. Yet plenty of evidence speaks against the claim that climate change is having any influence on wildfires. So why does this story now dominate so much of the news agenda? There is no denying the very basics of the phenomenon. The images produced by news agencies are absolutely terrifying. And it is hard not to see them and put oneself in such a maelstrom. And this seems to be the point. News producers are attracted to such drama, and drawn to augmenting the reality with the climate narrative. Indeed, TV news producers are among the most tragic victims of ideological narratives, their tendency to amplify 'experts' on the fringes tending to destroy rather than inform public debate. After all, debate is boring, compared to the sensation of harnessing their audiences' sympathy for the helpless victims of unstoppable infernos.

141: Oxford's Continued Descent into Green Hell

Oxfordshire's green lunatics are at it again. The fuss has only just died down since the County Council's experiment with Low Traffic Neighbourhoods and the so-called '15 minute city' agenda drew worldwide attention. Now, the ambitious council has, according to the Oxford Mail, become "the first local authority in the U.K." to commit "to go beyond [the] Net Zero target", which it will achieve on behalf of its 750,000 population "by removing carbon emissions from the atmosphere". According to the council itself, it had taken "specialist advice" from one Prof. Steve Smith, who is "Arnell Associate Professor of Greenhouse Gas Removal" at the University of Oxford's Smith School of Enterprise and Environment. This should strike us as odd, for several reasons.

142: How the Climate Agenda Weaponises Science to Erode Democracy

A petition started last year on Parliament's website calls on MPs to "Repeal the Climate Change Act 2008 and Net Zero targets". Now exceeding 10,000 signatures, the petition has had a response from the Government. The text of the petition is identical to an earlier version that was submitted in the previous Parliamentary term but closed because of the General Election. That petition also received a response from the then Government, as we reported here. However, there are some revealing differences in the replies given by the respective administrations. If there is a shortcoming in the petition, it is that it allows the Government to hide its ideological agenda behind scientific authority. This is an ongoing problem with criticisms of the green agenda broadly, because arguments that rest on scientific authority are often alienating, and seemingly mirror the excesses of the green agenda's apparent deference to technocrats. The petition states, not inaccurately, that "many hundreds of scientists up to the highest Nobel Laureate level have jointly declared 'There is no climate emergency'". This is a reference to Clintel's petition of 1,900 experts. (Listen to my podcast with Clintel's co-founder, Marcel Crock here.) But this is then undermined.

143: To Use Terms Like "Global Boiling" Is Clearly Absolute Nonsense

"Don't believe what Wikipedia writes about me," Professor Ian Plimer emails me when I arrange an interview with him. Of course, the first thing to do in this case is to check the Wikipedia article about him. "Ian Rutherford Plimer (born February 12th, 1946) is an Australian geologist and Professor Emeritus at the University of Melbourne. He rejects the

scientific consensus on climate change. He has been criticised by climate scientists for misinterpreting data and spreading misinformation,” are the first sentences of the Wikipedia article about him. Plimer is indeed an Australian geologist and Emeritus Professor of Earth Sciences at the University of Melbourne, where he once was Professor and Head of Earth Sciences. During his long academic career, he has also been a professor at the University of Newcastle, University of Adelaide, Ludwig Maximilians Universität in Munich, Germany, and has work relations with several other universities. He has published more than 130 scientific articles and was one of the editors of the comprehensive five-volume Encyclopedia of Geology. Of course, not all of this information needs to be included in the first paragraph of the Wikipedia article about a renowned scientist, but the editor’s choice to include a clear accusation that Plimer is somehow linked to “spreading misinformation” is not surprising, to say the least. Wikipedia’s ‘tiny’ error. The humorous thing is, however, that the editors of the Wikipedia article about him have in fact made an embarrassing mistake in the very first sentence. “They’ve got my birth date wrong. And if they can’t get my birth date right, which you can get on common knowledge, then everything else has got to be ignored,” Plimer comments. In fact, he was born in August of the same year. However, raising the topic of ‘misinformation’ issue at the beginning of a Wikipedia article about a scientist is most probably deliberate – the editors probably think that the first thing the reader should know is that the person in question has a different, even dubious, view of generally accepted positions. This approach is not at all unique to Plimer or even to climate science. The same applies, for example, to the doctors and scientists who, during the Covid crisis, were critical of the panic-mongering, and lockdowns, recommended cheap drugs available to treat the disease like ivermectin, and questioned the efficacy and safety of vaccines (see e.g. [here](#) and [here](#)). Although Wikipedia still calls many of them spreaders of misinformation, it is clear, especially in retrospect, that their claims had a solid factual basis, while those claims that were continuously propagated did not. As for Plimer, despite the possible attempt to cast doubt on his credibility, the claims that he rejects the scientific consensus on climate change and that he has been criticised by climate scientists, are factually accurate. Plimer backs this up with his characteristic humorous remark. “I thank Wikipedia for telling me that I’m a true scientist. I’ve never followed this consensus and the scientists have to use evidence. We don’t use what our peers say,” he says. ‘Global boiling is absolute nonsense’. But precisely this ‘scientific consensus’ is always being cited when the world’s most influential people talk to us about anthropogenic global warming and the catastrophe it represents. For example, at the end of July last year, UN Secretary-General António Guterres said that the era of global warming was over and the era of “global boiling” had arrived. “And for scientists, it is unequivocal – humans are to blame,” he said. “I’ve been told many things in my life,” Plimer comments on this. “I’ve been told there was Father Christmas. I’ve been told, and this was a long long time ago, by young women that they love me. So you learn to be sceptical,” he says, again with his trademark humour, and reiterates that he’s always interested in the evidence. “To use terms like ‘global boiling’ is clearly absolute nonsense. This is a clear hyperbole to try to frighten us because by frightening us you then don’t have to present evidence,” Plimer points out. Plimer has been criticising climate catastrophe predictions for decades. As a geologist, he

says, he has been trained to observe and then analyse whether and how the observations relate to previous observations. Therefore, it is not possible for him to simply believe anything or anyone without evidence. Belief is also the wrong word when talking about science. "Belief is used in politics, it's used in religion," Plimer says. You can believe, for example, in the end of the world, which is also predicted for us because of climate change. "We've had thousands of years of people telling us the world is going to end. If just one of these predictions was correct, we wouldn't be here," Plimer points out. Science and belief don't mix. "Science is married to evidence and we come to conclusions based on evidence," Plimer says, adding that as new evidence comes to light, conclusions have to change. He cites the example of how he has had the pleasure to correct his own scientific conclusions as some of the research he had published years ago has subsequently had to be refuted by new data and a better understanding of the research topic at hand. "I've criticised myself and I think that's what science is about. It's all about criticism," he says. However, as soon as someone uses exaggerations about climate change, such as the oceans are boiling or so on, or talks about believing or not believing in climate change, it is not science, but propaganda, he explains. What drives climate change? But climate change, and even conditions that could be considered a climate crisis, are facts, Plimer says. He cites the example of the 'Little Ice Age', which began around 1300 and lasted until around mid-19th century, depending on the source of the estimate. This was a serious crisis. Long, cold winters meant reduced yields and famines. Malnourished people were in poorer health and, for example, Europeans' growth also declined physically during this period. Scarcity led to more wars and few would disagree with Plimer who says that our lives today are incomparably better than they were then. Canals and rivers in Great Britain and the Netherlands were frequently frozen deeply enough to support ice skating and winter festivals during the 'Little Ice Age'. (Dutch painter Hendrick Avercamp, 'A Scene on the Ice' from the first half of the 17th Century.) But if you look back thousands, hundreds of thousands, and millions of years, climate change has been happening on our planet all along. According to Plimer, the planet's climate changes cyclically and is influenced by a variety of factors – tectonic changes, astronomical changes, cosmic radiation, orbital cycles, changes in the distance and activity of the sun, changes in ocean currents, etc. According to Plimer, we have known and measured these natural cycles for a long time, but the climate is also influenced by phenomena we do not understand so well. "A massive volcanic eruption can change climate and we've seen this a number of times in the past," he says. At the same time, 70% of the Earth is covered by ocean, in fact, most volcanoes are underwater, and underwater volcanic activity directly affects the oceans by warming them and adding CO₂. Plimer says we don't know exactly how this affects the climate. "Climate is very complicated. It's not based on a simple gas, carbon dioxide," Plimer says, adding that the main greenhouse gas in the atmosphere is actually water vapour, and the clouds it creates directly affect our climate. CO₂ does not drive climate change But as for CO₂, which Western countries are working to reduce in an effort to supposedly prevent climate change, Plimer says that although it does have some warming effect as a greenhouse gas, it cannot change the climate. In fact, the more CO₂ that is added to the atmosphere, the less each molecule that is added warms the atmosphere because the atmosphere gets saturated with it. Plimer also points out that ice

core studies have shown that every time the climate warms, the temperature rises first, and only then does the CO₂ level in the atmosphere rise. The reason why more CO₂ is getting released is because the ocean is warming – colder water withholds more CO₂, and as the ocean warms more CO₂ is released. “We’ve had six great ice ages in the history of our planet and six out of these six great ice ages started when there was more carbon dioxide in the atmosphere than now,” Plimer explains. Three of these ice ages were when we had 20% CO₂ in the atmosphere. Today, that level is about 0.04%. It is important to note that 97% of the CO₂ cycle is a natural process, and that anthropogenic CO₂ emissions account for only 3%, according to Plimer. So to prove that anthropogenic CO₂ causes global warming, it would also have to be shown that 97% of CO₂ does not. “The whole argument is ridiculous from the start. It has never been shown that human emissions of carbon dioxide drive global warming. And why would we want to get rid of this carbon dioxide? It is plant food,” Plimer says. “The only thing about renewable energy is that the subsidies are renewable”. But it is precisely this man-made CO₂ that is at the heart of climate policies, and for this people will have to give up the reliable energy sources they have, replace them with less reliable ones, and be forced to limit their lives in other ways. “I don’t think it’s got anything to do with the environment. I don’t think it’s got anything to do with looking after your fellow man. I think it’s where unelected elites have seen a mechanism whereby they can make a huge amount of money and where they can control the average person, yet they don’t have to face an election,” he adds. Part of this, Plimer says, has been the constant talk and scaremongering that fossil fuels are about to run out. “We’ve had that argument going on for 60 years now about peak oil. I don’t know about your country, but we have 3,000 years of coal in Australia, we have about 2,000 years of gas and we have more than 50 million years of uranium. It will take a very, very long time before we run out and by then we may be extinct or we may have different energy systems altogether,” he says. Only recently, oil reserves larger than 50 years’ worth of North Sea production were found off Antarctica, and this has already got the major world powers arguing about who should own them. So according to Plimer, we won’t run out of fossil fuels just yet. “What we’ve run out of is common sense. And they’re trying to make us run out of money,” he says, referring to the ‘green transition’ and Net Zero, in other words replacing fossil fuels with renewable energy such as wind turbines and solar panels. “The only thing about renewable energy is that the subsidies are renewable. The subsidies just keep coming. If we had no subsidies, we would have no so-called renewable energy. And if we had wind and solar competing on a level playing field with nuclear, with coal, with gas, with hydro, then we probably wouldn’t see a wind turbine or solar facility anywhere in the world,” Plimer says. The environmental damage of a ‘green turnaround’. Another important factor that cannot be overlooked is the real environmental impact, or real environmental damage, of wind turbines, solar panels, electric vehicles and other ‘green technologies’ that are said to save the climate. Plimer gives some examples. Solar panels are made using metals such as lead and cadmium, which are toxic and are very likely to end up in the soil and groundwater after a relatively short life cycle as a solar panel. Because they do not decay, they create persistent pollution. He gives another one for wind turbines. A toxic chemical called ‘bisphenol’ is used in the construction of wind turbine blades. The use of bisphenol is banned in almost all Western countries, according to Plimer.

For example, continuous exposure to this chemical increases the risk of cancer. Now, when the wind turbines reach the end of their life cycle – which again is not very long, about 15 years – the blades will be removed from the wind turbines and can not be reused or recycled. Instead, it is customary for them to be buried. From there the poison also ends up in the soil and groundwater. In addition to the direct poisoning of groundwater and soil, wind farms and solar farms also have harmful effects on wildlife and animals. “If you love wind turbines, you are quite happy to slice and dice birds and bats. And if they’re offshore, to kill whales,” Plimer says, noting that protecting the environment has nothing to do with any of this. Plimer cites the production of electric vehicles (EV) as another example. He points to the fact that it takes six times as much mining to produce an EV as it does to produce an internal combustion engine car. And there is a considerable shortage of the minerals needed, such as rare earths, cobalt, lithium, copper, etc. This means that we have to go deeper and deeper in mining. In the case of copper, for example, we could previously expect to find ore of 10% practically at the surface. Now, however, the ore is being mined deeper and the copper content in the ore has also dropped by a factor of 20 – to 0.5%. Plimer says this means that a lot more material is being excavated from the ground, which is then simply left aside – quite clearly, much more damage is being done to the ground than before. The factories where copper is extracted from the ore also have more material left over. “By increasing the amount of resources we use for the renewables we are actually creating a massive environmental problem,” Plimer says. It has financial impact as well – the price of copper has almost doubled on the world market in the last five years.

Dependence on authoritarian China. In addition, the materials we need for ‘green technologies’ are coming from third-world countries and we are simply turning a blind eye to the damage caused there. “If you are driving an electric vehicle and you are feeling morally superior to those monsters driving around a diesel or a gasoline vehicle, then you should know that for an electric vehicle, you use a lot of cobalt. That cobalt is mined by slave children in the Congo. And China controls the world’s cobalt industry,” Plimer says. He adds that China controls the global market for rare earths, which are needed to make wind turbines, solar panels and EVs as well. And the fact is that China now largely controls the production of all these things. So if you like all these things, you are directly supporting Communist China and the development of their economy, which in some places – for example, with regard to the Uighurs – uses forced labour. Similarly, it should be borne in mind that China itself is not engaged in the same kind of CO2 emission reduction as the West, for in 2022, for example, the country was commissioning new coal plants at the rate of two per week. China imports most of its coal from Indonesia and Plimer’s home country Australia. “We have about a dozen power stations and there’s huge pressure to close them down. China has 12,200 coal-fired power stations and is building two power stations a week. India is doing the same sort of growth,” Plimer says. “If coal was so bad, we wouldn’t export coal, which happens to be our biggest export at present. We would go broke trying to save the world,” he adds. Plimer says that literally, the whole of the West’s economic growth has relied on coal and, later, other fossil fuels. This is linked to the development of industry, transport, medicine and other sectors that are vital to society. In addition, every day we use some 6,000 essential chemicals that we get from processing coal or oil. In addition,

abandoning fossil fuels would also mean abandoning cheap and reliable energy production. Indeed, if we do this, we will create major problems for ourselves in terms of energy dependence, while at the same time making ourselves totally dependent on authoritarian China. In Plimer's view, this is all just very stupid. Geologist accused of relation to mineral exploration? While Wikipedia tries hard to show that there are some climate scientists who think he has been spreading misinformation, there are of course others who try ad hominem arguments on him. One of them suggests that his positions on climate change are somehow influenced by his involvement with various mining companies. "Well, what a surprise! Geology involves doing mineral exploration and involves taking those minerals out of the ground. We wouldn't have energy, we wouldn't have metals, we wouldn't have anything in today's world without geology. This smartphone of mine – there are about 70 elements in the periodic table that are in that phone. If you want to have that criticism, then you should be giving me that criticism from the entrance to your cave. But if you live in the modern world, you are a beneficiary of geology," he says. Yes, Plimer has connections with companies extracting coal, oil or natural gas, but alongside that, others associated with him mine iron, copper, gold, lead, silver and anything else you can find in the ground. Shouldn't his association with, say, a copper-mining company make him a great lover of 'green transition' technologies and a preacher of the climate crisis?

144: Extra funding for council's climate change plans

A council has agreed to spend an extra £6m on reducing greenhouse gas emissions at a faster rate. It will bring Dorset Council's target to become a carbon neutral authority forward by five years to 2035. With the new funds total spending on climate projects at the council over five years is likely to reach £25m, much of which is expected to come from the government. Council leader Nick Ireland, who leads the authority's climate change programme, said he was 'confident' it could meet its own targets five years early. The decision, made by cabinet on Tuesday, will mean more solar panels, switching street lights to lower energy bulbs, more support for house owners with insulation and more efficient heating systems. A target of £500,000 could be saved at Charminster Highways Depot through changes to heating systems and insulation. Replacing old lights with LEDs in council buildings could also save £600,000. While £2.12m could be saved by installing an extra 2.25MW of solar panels. Ryan Hope, Liberal Democrat councillor for Weymouth, said it was good to be 'an ambitious council' that was aiming to 'lead on climate change'. He added that the sooner the investments were made, the quicker the savings. But former portfolio holder for climate Ray Bryan said advances in technology might achieve the targets without the additional investment. Blandford councillor Nocturin Lacey-Clarke raised doubts about what he claimed was the lack of detail for some of the work. He questioned whether property leased to others by the council, including farms, came under the scope of the council's own plans. 'I wouldn't want us to sign a blank cheque. I would exercise caution, he said.

145: Winter is here, but it's losing its cool

CNN— Winter is here, but for most of the United States, it's feeling less and less like it. At 10:27 p.m. ET on Thursday, Earth's Northern Hemisphere will be at its greatest tilt from the

sun, marking the winter solstice: the shortest day of the year and the official start of the coldest season. But winter is warming rapidly because of human-caused climate change and it's having an impact on snow, tourism, winter sports, local economies, dinner plates and even allergies. The winter period from December to February is now the fastest-warming of the three-month seasons for nearly 75% of the US, according to an analysis of NOAA temperature data by Climate Central, a nonprofit climate research group. The analysis looked at average winter temperatures for 240 locations across the US and found the winter warming trend covers every corner of the map — temperatures had warmed in 97%, or 233, of the spots since 1970. Winter temperatures increased by 3.8 degrees Fahrenheit on average since 1970 in these warming locations. Winters in the fastest-warming cities have warmed by as much as 7 degrees. The Northeast and Upper Midwest are the regions warming fastest, and are running a nearly 5-degree winter fever. This includes some ski towns like Burlington, Vermont, (7.7 degree increase) and Concord, New Hampshire (6.6 degree increase). Winter in notoriously cold Milwaukee is now 6.7 degrees warmer on average. For many, a little extra winter warmth may sound nice. But milder winters come with consequences. "Wintertime plays important roles in the life cycles of plants, animals, and insects, the recharging of freshwater supplies, and sustaining snow and ice for winter recreation, which supports local economies," said Lauren Casey, a meteorologist at Climate Central. A warmer winter doesn't mean it's sweltering like summer all season long — there will still be cold days in a warmer climate. But the cold of winter will become less frequent and less extreme. As average temperatures rise, it will leave less room for extreme cold swings. Cold snaps across the US are now an average of six days shorter than they were in 1970, Climate Central's data shows. And though cold temperatures will still occasionally set records, they are far more likely to be outpaced by warm records. There are double the warm temperature records as cold ones in 2023. At night, the discrepancy grows, and there is triple the number of record warm low temperatures compared to record cold ones, NOAA data shows. Overnight minimum temperatures are warming faster in winter than in any other season since records began in 1896. Winter's overnight temperatures have been warming at a rate of 1.78 degrees per century since 1900 — 25% faster than the rate for winter's daytime highs, according to CNN analysis of NOAA data. A separate Climate Central analysis of overnight low temperatures at 231 US locations found 88%, or 204 cities, experienced a long-term decrease in the average number of freezing nights each year since 1970. Reno, Nevada, now has 91 fewer freezing nights each year on average, losing more than any other location the list. Cities in Nevada, Arizona, California and Florida that used to see an occasional night below freezing no longer feel the chill at all. Even cities known for cold outbreaks — like Buffalo, New York, Chicago, New York City, Boston, and Detroit — now no longer experience two-to-three weeks' worth of freezing nights each year. These changes are bad news for several industries that rely on a predictable chill. A study by the International Olympic Committee found rising temperatures may cause ski season to "start up to a month later and finish up to three months earlier," a finding that threatens to take \$1 billion out of the US economy, according to a 2018 study by the climate advocacy group POW and REI. On US farms, the \$27 billion fruit and nut industry is losing out on chilling time as winters warm — a necessary exposure for the crops to chilly temperatures which

allows them to properly bloom in the spring, another Climate Central analysis found. For example, viable chill time in California's fertile Central Valley, where 40% of the US' fruits and nuts are grown, could drop by 25% by the end of the 21st century, the US Department of Agriculture said. With less chill time, there could be less produce like walnuts, pistachios, and cherries to go around, and what's left is more likely to be of poorer quality, the USDA said. "That, of course, could lead to impacts for food companies, as well as increased food prices which can contribute to or worsen food insecurity," Casey told CNN. The warmer, longer growing season also increases exposure to pests and pollen, worsening allergies. Worse yet, for winter lovers: The season of sniffles and sneezes will also be here sooner than you might expect — warming winters are causing spring to start weeks ahead of schedule.

146: Federal scientist cooked climate change books ahead of Obama presentation, whistle blower charges

A whistleblower claims the flawed study was a major influence in the 2015 Paris climate summit; Doug McKelway has the latest for 'Special Report' A key Obama administration scientist brushed aside inconvenient data that showed a slowdown in global warming in compiling an alarming 2015 report that coincided with the White House participation in the Paris Climate Conference, a whistle blower is alleging. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), in a major 2013 report, concluded global temperatures had shown a smaller increase from 1998 to 2012 than any similar period over the past 30 to 60 years. But a blockbuster, June 2015 paper by a team of federal scientists led by Thomas Karl, published in the journal Science in June 2015 and later known as the 'pausebuster' paper sought to discredit the notion of a slowdown in warming. karlpic Karl was director of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National Centers for Environmental Information when the report was published. (NOAA) 'Our new analysis suggests that the apparent hiatus may have been largely the result of limitations in past datasets, and that the rate of warming over the first 15 years of this century has, in fact, been as fast or faster than that seen over the last half of the 20th century,' Karl, who was at the time director of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National Centers for Environmental Information, said at the time. smithpic1 Smith, R-Texas, questioned the timing of the report. The report argued that evidence shows there was no "hiatus" in rising global temperatures and that they had been increasing in the 21st century just as quickly as in the last half of the 20th century. Rep. Lamar Smith, R-Texas, chairman of the House Science Committee, questioned the timing, noting the paper was published just before the Obama Administration's Clean Power Plan was submitted to the Paris Climate Conference of 2015. ' In the summer of 2015, whistleblowers alerted the Committee that the Karl study was rushed to publication before underlying data issues were resolved to help influence public debate about the so-called Clean Power Plan and upcoming Paris climate conference,' Smith said in a statement. 'Since then, the Committee has attempted to obtain information that would shed further light on these allegations, but was obstructed at every turn by the previous administration's officials.' Karl denied the paper was released to boost the plan. Karl's neglect of the IPCC data was purposeful, according to John Bates, a recently retired

scientist from the National Climactic Data Center at the NOAA. Bates came forward just days ago to charge that the 2015 study selectively used misleading and unverified data – effectively putting NOAA’s thumb on the scale. In an interview with the Daily Mail, Bates said Karl was “insisting on decisions and scientific choices that maximized warming and minimized documentation... in an effort to discredit the notion of a global warming pause, rushed so that he could time publication to influence national and international deliberations on climate policy.” For example, Karl allegedly adjusted temperature data collected by robot buoys upward to match earlier data from ocean-going ships. That was problematic, Bates said, because ships generate heat and could cause readings to vary. “They had good data from buoys,” Bates told the Daily Mail. “And they threw it out and ‘corrected’ it by using the bad data from ships. You never change good data to agree with bad, but that’s what they did – so as to make it look as if the sea was warmer.” Bates, who could not be reached for comment, but has published some of his allegations in a blog, claims to have documentation of his explosive charges and indicated more revelations are coming. A NOAA spokesman, in an email to The Washington Times, said NOAA “stands behind its world-class scientists” but also that it “takes seriously any allegation that its internal processes have not been followed and will review the matter appropriately.” Bates is not the first to question Karl’s conclusions. A paper by Canadian climate modeler John Fyfe questioned the 2015 study. As he put it, in a 2016 article from the journal *Nature Climate Change*, “there is a mismatch between what the climate models are producing and what observations are showing. We can’t ignore it.” Climate scientists have closed ranks around Karl. A study published last month in *Science Advances*, by Zeke Hausfather of University of California Berkeley and five others, claims to confirm Karl’s findings. In addition, climate scientist Peter Thorne, who has worked with the NOAA, said Bates wasn’t involved in the work that he’s criticizing. Bates disputed the assertion. While Karl, and other scientists who believe man-made climate change poses a major threat had the ear of the Obama administration, President Trump has shown signs of skepticism. It remains to be seen from which scientists he will take his cue.

147: China's glacier area shrinks by 26% over six decades

HONG KONG, March 26 (Reuters) - China's glacier area has shrunk by 26% since 1960 due to rapid global warming, with 7,000 small glaciers disappearing completely and glacial retreat intensifying in recent years, official data released in March showed.

Glaciers around the globe are disappearing faster than ever, with the largest glacial mass loss on record taking place in the last three years, according to a UNESCO report.

As the important water towers continue to shrink, less availability of freshwater is expected to contribute to greater competition for water resources, environmental groups have warned. Glacier retreat also poses new disaster risks.

China's glaciers are located mainly in the west and north of the country, in the regions of Tibet and Xinjiang, and the provinces of Sichuan, Yunnan, Gansu and Qinghai.

Data published on March 21 on the website of the Northwest Institute of Eco-Environment and Resources of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, showed that China's total glacier area was around 46,000 square kilometres, with around 69,000 glaciers in 2020.

This compares to around 59,000 square kilometres and around 46,000 glaciers in China between 1960 and 1980, the study showed.

To save its melting glaciers, China has used technology including snow blankets and artificial snow systems, to delay the melting process.

The Tibetan plateau is known as the world's Third Pole for the amount of ice long locked in the high-altitude wilderness.

The dramatic ice loss, from the Arctic to the Alps, from South America to the Tibetan Plateau, is expected to accelerate as climate change, caused by the burning of fossil fuels, pushes global temperatures higher.

This would likely exacerbate economic, environmental and social problems across the world as sea levels rise and these key water sources dwindle, the UNESCO report said.

148: Manmade Climate Change Based on 'Imagination & Assumptions' — Study

A recent study indicated that manmade anthropogenic climate change, formerly called 'global warming' and previous to that 'global cooling', is not based in reality, rather, it is based on imagination and assumptions.

"Rather, such claims are based on imagination and climatic models full of assumptions. However, as shown in [22] the causality direction in time series produced by climatic models is opposite to that of the real-world data," the study said in the 'Conclusions' section.

The researcher said that the narrative of human-generated CO₂ emissions affecting temperatures is essentially fake science.

"The premise of this study is that the climatic system is very complex and subject to perpetual change due to numerous processes, either internal or external to it," the study said in the 'Abstract' section. "The fact that one of them, namely the relationship of climate with atmospheric CO₂, is highlighted in the last decades does not correspond to its actual importance as a climate driver. The promoted importance is a non-scientific issue, related to the narrative that humans, through their emissions by fossil fuel burning, are responsible for the changes we see in climate."

The study stated that there are political and economic forces driving the propagation of the anti-CO₂ narrative under the guise of science.

"While causality is a fundamental notion in science and life, there also exist fundamental problems on philosophical, scientific and practical grounds, in its essence and its identification [1]. These problems are manifested in controversies, which are not only theoretical but have important social, political, and economic implications. Some of the most controversial issues of our time are related to Earth's climate, not excluding the causal relationship between atmospheric temperature (T) and carbon dioxide (CO₂) concentration," the study said in the 'Introduction' section.

Also discussed is the dramatic changes in climate over massive amounts of time, far greater than the time since the introduction of 'fossil fuel' burning technology.

"Earth's climate has varied in all times and on all time scales. Its variability should not be regarded a puzzle, given the huge complexity and the connections of the climatic system with numerous agents of change, internal, such as atmospheric composition, hydrological processes, and biosphere evolution, or external, such as geologic activity and tectonic

changes, solar activity, galactic cosmic ray flux, and orbital changes,” the study said in the ‘Introduction’ section. “Rather, the puzzling issue is the relative stability (small variation) of Earth’s climate. Specifically, geological evidence presented by Veizer [2,3,4] suggests the presence of running water as far back as we have a record, up to 3.8 or even 4.2 billion years, while it was thought that Earth would be in an ice ball state up to about 1 billion years ago because of the much smaller solar irradiance. This is known as the faint young sun puzzle.”

Chiefly, the study deduced the real relationship between CO₂ and temperature fluctuations. “The strong conclusion of the study is that the causality direction certainly shows the temperature changes lead and CO₂ changes lag on yearly, decadal, centennial and millennial scales,” Kevin Hughes wrote in Natural News.

The method taken to conduct the research was analyzing previous geologic periods and comparing their CO₂ and temperature trends to try and identify any corollary data.

“I use temperature and [CO₂] data series for all these time frames, namely proxy data for the Phanerozoic, the Cenozoic, the late Quaternary and the Common Era, and instrumental data for the last seven decades. In Section 3, I explain the inappropriateness of deterministic methodologies for detecting causality and I adapt the stochastic methodology proposed in [1,21] to be used with the above data series,” the study said in the ‘Introduction’ section.

149: Why climate change is good for the world

Don't panic! The scientific consensus is that warmer temperatures do more good than harm

Climate change has done more good than harm so far and is likely to continue doing so for most of this century. This is not some barmy, right-wing fantasy; it is the consensus of expert opinion. Yet almost nobody seems to know this. Whenever I make the point in public, I am told by those who are paid to insult anybody who departs from climate alarm that I have got it embarrassingly wrong, don't know what I am talking about, must be referring to Britain only, rather than the world as a whole, and so forth.

At first, I thought this was just their usual bluster. But then I realised that they are genuinely unaware. Good news is no news, which is why the mainstream media largely ignores all studies showing net benefits of climate change. And academics have not exactly been keen to push such analysis forward. So here follows, for possibly the first time in history, an entire article in the national press on the net benefits of climate change.

There are many likely effects of climate change: positive and negative, economic and ecological, humanitarian and financial. And if you aggregate them all, the overall effect is positive today — and likely to stay positive until around 2080. That was the conclusion of Professor Richard Tol of Sussex University after he reviewed 14 different studies of the effects of future climate trends.

To be precise, Prof Tol calculated that climate change would be beneficial up to 2.2°C of warming from 2009 (when he wrote his paper). This means approximately 3°C from pre-

industrial levels, since about 0.8°C of warming has happened in the last 150 years. The latest estimates of climate sensitivity suggest that such temperatures may not be reached till the end of the century — if at all. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, whose reports define the consensus, is sticking to older assumptions, however, which would mean net benefits till about 2080. Either way, it's a long way off.

Now Prof Tol has a new paper, published as a chapter in a new book, called *How Much have Global Problems Cost the World?*, which is edited by Bjorn Lomborg, director of the Copenhagen Consensus Centre, and was reviewed by a group of leading economists. In this paper he casts his gaze backwards to the last century. He concludes that climate change did indeed raise human and planetary welfare during the 20th century.

You can choose not to believe the studies Prof Tol has collated. Or you can say the net benefit is small (which it is), you can argue that the benefits have accrued more to rich countries than poor countries (which is true) or you can emphasise that after 2080 climate change would probably do net harm to the world (which may also be true). You can even say you do not trust the models involved (though they have proved more reliable than the temperature models). But what you cannot do is deny that this is the current consensus. If you wish to accept the consensus on temperature models, then you should accept the consensus on economic benefit.

Overall, Prof Tol finds that climate change in the past century improved human welfare. By how much? He calculates by 1.4 per cent of global economic output, rising to 1.5 per cent by 2025. For some people, this means the difference between survival and starvation.

It will still be 1.2 per cent around 2050 and will not turn negative until around 2080. In short, my children will be very old before global warming stops benefiting the world. Note that if the world continues to grow at 3 per cent a year, then the average person will be about nine times as rich in 2080 as she is today. So low-lying Bangladesh will be able to afford the same kind of flood defences that the Dutch have today.

The chief benefits of global warming include: fewer winter deaths; lower energy costs; better agricultural yields; probably fewer droughts; maybe richer biodiversity. It is a little-known fact that winter deaths exceed summer deaths — not just in countries like Britain but also those with very warm summers, including Greece. Both Britain and Greece see mortality rates rise by 18 per cent each winter. Especially cold winters cause a rise in heart failures far greater than the rise in deaths during heatwaves.

Cold, not the heat, is the biggest killer. For the last decade, Brits have been dying from the cold at the average rate of 29,000 excess deaths each winter. Compare this to the heatwave ten years ago, which claimed 15,000 lives in France and just 2,000 in Britain. In the ten years since, there has been no summer death spike at all. Excess winter deaths hit the poor harder than the rich for the obvious reason: they cannot afford heating. And it is not just

those at risk who benefit from moderate warming. Global warming has so far cut heating bills more than it has raised cooling bills. If it resumes after its current 17-year hiatus, and if the energy efficiency of our homes improves, then at some point the cost of cooling probably will exceed the cost of heating — probably from about 2035, Prof Tol estimates.

The greatest benefit from climate change comes not from temperature change but from carbon dioxide itself. It is not pollution, but the raw material from which plants make carbohydrates and thence proteins and fats. As it is an extremely rare trace gas in the air — less than 0.04 per cent of the air on average — plants struggle to absorb enough of it. On a windless, sunny day, a field of corn can suck half the carbon dioxide out of the air. Commercial greenhouse operators therefore pump carbon dioxide into their greenhouses to raise plant growth rates.

‘The foxes round here are so urban that they go to the country at weekends.’

‘The foxes round here are so urban that they go to the country at weekends.’

The increase in average carbon dioxide levels over the past century, from 0.03 per cent to 0.04 per cent of the air, has had a measurable impact on plant growth rates. It is responsible for a startling change in the amount of greenery on the planet. As Dr Ranga Myneni of Boston University has documented, using three decades of satellite data, 31 per cent of the global vegetated area of the planet has become greener and just 3 per cent has become less green. This translates into a 14 per cent increase in productivity of ecosystems and has been observed in all vegetation types.

Dr Randall Donohue and colleagues of the CSIRO Land and Water department in Australia also analysed satellite data and found greening to be clearly attributable in part to the carbon dioxide fertilisation effect. Greening is especially pronounced in dry areas like the Sahel region of Africa, where satellites show a big increase in green vegetation since the 1970s.

It is often argued that global warming will hurt the world’s poorest hardest. What is seldom heard is that the decline of famines in the Sahel in recent years is partly due to more rainfall caused by moderate warming and partly due to more carbon dioxide itself: more greenery for goats to eat means more greenery left over for gazelles, so entire ecosystems have benefited.

Even polar bears are thriving so far, though this is mainly because of the cessation of hunting. None the less, it’s worth noting that the three years with the lowest polar bear cub survival in the western Hudson Bay (1974, 1984 and 1992) were the years when the sea ice was too thick for ringed seals to appear in good numbers in spring. Bears need broken ice.

Well yes, you may argue, but what about all the weather disasters caused by climate change? Entirely mythical — so far. The latest IPCC report is admirably frank about this,

reporting 'no significant observed trends in global tropical cyclone frequency over the past century ... lack of evidence and thus low confidence regarding the sign of trend in the magnitude and/or frequency offloads on a global scale ... low confidence in observed trends in small-scale severe weather phenomena such as hail and thunderstorms'.

In fact, the death rate from droughts, floods and storms has dropped by 98 per cent since the 1920s, according to a careful study by the independent scholar Indur Goklany. Not because weather has become less dangerous but because people have gained better protection as they got richer: witness the remarkable success of cyclone warnings in India last week. That's the thing about climate change — we will probably pocket the benefits and mitigate at least some of the harm by adapting. For example, experts now agree that malaria will continue its rapid worldwide decline whatever the climate does.

Yet cherry-picking the bad news remains rife. A remarkable example of this was the IPCC's last report in 2007, which said that global warming would cause 'hundreds of millions of people [to be] exposed to increased water stress' under four different scenarios of future warming. It cited a study, which had also counted numbers of people at reduced risk of water stress — and in each case that number was higher. The IPCC simply omitted the positive numbers.

Why does this matter? Even if climate change does produce slightly more welfare for the next 70 years, why take the risk that it will do great harm thereafter? There is one obvious reason: climate policy is already doing harm. Building wind turbines, growing biofuels and substituting wood for coal in power stations — all policies designed explicitly to fight climate change — have had negligible effects on carbon dioxide emissions. But they have driven people into fuel poverty, made industries uncompetitive, driven up food prices, accelerated the destruction of forests, killed rare birds of prey, and divided communities. To name just some of the effects. Mr Goklany estimates that globally nearly 200,000 people are dying every year, because we are turning 5 per cent of the world's grain crop into motor fuel instead of food: that pushes people into malnutrition and death. In this country, 65 people a day are dying because they cannot afford to heat their homes properly, according to Christine Liddell of the University of Ulster, yet the government is planning to double the cost of electricity to consumers by 2030.

As Bjorn Lomborg has pointed out, the European Union will pay £165 billion for its current climate policies each and every year for the next 87 years. Britain's climate policies — subsidising windmills, wood-burners, anaerobic digesters, electric vehicles and all the rest — is due to cost us £1.8 trillion over the course of this century. In exchange for that Brobdingnagian sum, we hope to lower the air temperature by about 0.005°C — which will be undetectable by normal thermometers. The accepted consensus among economists is that every £100 spent fighting climate change brings £3 of benefit.

So we are doing real harm now to impede a change that will produce net benefits for 70

years. That's like having radiotherapy because you are feeling too well. I just don't share the certainty of so many in the green establishment that it's worth it. It may be, but it may not.

Disclosure: by virtue of owning shares and land, I have some degree of interests in all almost all forms of energy generation: coal, wood, oil and gas, wind (reluctantly), nuclear, even biofuels, demand for which drives up wheat prices. I could probably make more money out of enthusiastically endorsing green energy than opposing it. So the argument presented here is not special pleading, just honest curiosity.

150: Pope Francis Says Alcoholics, Autistic and Disabled People Should Be Euthanized To 'Fight Climate Change'

Pope Francis has thrown his weight behind the World Economics Forum's campaign to euthanize people with autism, alcoholism and other minor illnesses and disabilities to help humanity fight so-called "climate change."

According to Francis, reducing the world population will help solve what he claims is the existential problem of climate change and restore nature to its position of primacy in the world order.

Pope Francis's comments have caused a storm in the Vatican, but should we really be surprised by his support for the Klaus Schwab's Nazi-style eugenics program? As an Agenda Contributor at the World Economic Forum, Pope Francis is fluent in blasphemy and is actively working to subvert the church and Christianity in general.

Before we dive in, subscribe to the channel if you haven't already, and join the People's Voice Locals community for uncensored and exclusive news and views.

While Pope Francis has declared that we should not judge pedophiles because they have a mysterious illness and a special place in heaven, he is not so lenient when it comes to people with autism, alcoholism or other minor illnesses.

But should we really be surprised by Francis's position?

This is the Pope who takes every opportunity to declare the Bible is wrong, after all. He kicked off his papacy by declaring evolution and the big bang theory were real.

This is the pope who informed his flock that "relationships with Jesus are dangerous and harmful." Breaking with centuries of Christian tradition, Pope Francis sparked fears that he is an illegitimate pope with a sinister agenda when he told a crowd of 33,000 pilgrims in St. Peter's Square in Rome that "a personal, direct, immediate relationship with Jesus Christ" must be avoided at all costs.

Pope Francis' upside-down version of Christianity is puzzling for many, however his dark

agenda becomes much easier to understand when you realize who the pontiff is really serving. To quote French presidential candidate Marine Le Pen, Pope Francis is a “globalist bulldog” who is loyal to the New World Order.

In 2017, Pope Francis called for a “one world government” and “political authority”, arguing that the creation of the one world government is needed to combat issues such as “climate change.”

Speaking with Ecuador’s El Universo newspaper, the Pope said that the United Nations does not have enough power and must be granted full governmental control “for the good of humanity.”

According to the pope, Americans must be ruled by a world government “for their own good,” as a matter of urgency.

Now, Pope Francis is actively defying Biblical scripture by working to create a “one world religion,” known as Chrislam.

In 2019, Pope Francis signed a historic covenant with leaders of the world’s major faiths, pushing us all much closer to a one-world religion, one of the major goals of the New World Order.

According to the document produced by Pope Francis and published on the Vatican’s official website, all religions must be considered equal, and Islam is as acceptable to God as Christianity.

Klaus Schwab’s agenda to normalize state euthanasia, supported by Pope Francis, has real-world consequences. People are now dying against their will, joining the long list of millions of people murdered by far-left governments in history.

The history books will tell you the Soviet Gulag State murdered 61 million citizens, Mao’s Communist Chinese Ant Hill murdered 35 million Chinese, and the Nazi Genocide state murdered upwards of 20 million people.

If Klaus Schwab gets his way, his far-left technocratic regime will eclipse these records. According to the WEF’s depopulation agenda, billions must die.

Schwab has penetrated the governments of most Western democracies, turning them into authoritarian dictatorships, in which he is the invisible dictator, pulling the puppet strings of compromised leaders like Macron in France and Trudeau in Canada.

Covid vaccines, abortions and euthanasia vans are drastically reducing the number of people in the West.

Trudeau has been an enthusiastic supporter of abortion, openly mocking Christians who oppose the murder of children, while passionately endorsing state euthanasia, signing laws that vastly expand the reach of the central government when it comes to killing its own citizens and reducing the population.

Macron's France, fully infiltrated by the WEF and being destroyed from the inside, is not far behind Canada.

And the WEF-infiltrated Dutch government has begun euthanizing citizens, including children under the age of twelve, because they have minor disabilities, autism, or suffer from alcoholism. According to the government, euthanizing these people will help "save the planet."

The Netherlands is one of the most Davos-friendly nations in the world, and the current government has embraced Klaus Schwab's vision of a depopulated world, by any means necessary.

Doctors in the Netherlands have been ordered to begin euthanizing citizens with autism and other minor disabilities, without fear of prosecution – even if the patient does not currently express any desire to die.

Autism rates are skyrocketing around the developed world, with many experts blaming the intensive vaccine schedule inflicted on the young and very young. According to the Dutch government, which pushes dozens of aluminum-laced vaccines on toddlers, euthanasia is the answer to the explosion in autism numbers.

A Kingston University investigation of Dutch euthanasia cases found that the Dutch state has begun euthanizing alcoholics, sex abuse victims, dementia and depression.

With these cases, experts have questioned whether the law allowing doctors to kill patients on behalf of the state via lethal injections has strayed too close to Third Reich Nazi-style eugenics programs.

Here at the People's Voice we have been warning that WEF-infiltrated governments were planning to roll out kill-lists of so-called "useless" people ever since Bill Gates let the cat out of the bag while speaking to his inner circle.

This is the brutal, murderous world Bill Gates and his associates at the World Economic Forum are determined to roll out as part of their Great Reset. We can't allow their evil logic to become the new normal.

Nobody wants to be proved right about a disturbing eventuality as the normalization of

forced euthanasia. But here at the People's Voice we have been warning about this for years.

And now, as governments plunge needles into the arms of people who do not want to die, how long before the mainstream admits another so-called conspiracy theory has become a conspiracy fact?

Here at the People's Voice we are determined to continue exposing the crimes of the globalist elite. But we need your help. Subscribe to the channel if you haven't already and join the People's Voice Locals Community for access to exclusive content.