

EIR Science & Technology

The greenhouse effect: a scientific hoax

Why have the media blacked out the fact that most scientific experts dispute the cataclysmic warnings of a global warming trend? Carol White and Rogelio A. Maduro report.

As we showed last week in the article "Greenhouse effect hoaxsters seek world dictatorship," (*EIR*, Jan. 13, 1989) the widely touted claims of the existence of a biosphere-threatening greenhouse effect are being circulated to implement a hidden political agenda. Those in the West who are pushing the urgent need to act now, to cut back on the use of petrochemicals to fuel industrial processes, are cynically intent on reducing the capability of the developed nations to sustain their own people at their present standard of living; furthermore, they intend to use the existence of a so-called greenhouse effect to impose further extreme austerity on the developing sector.

According to the agenda of these neo-malthusians, the "Third World" is to be limited to the use of "appropriate technology." Various devices are intended to accomplish this, including debt-for-equity swap agreements, which would relieve countries such as Brazil of a portion of their debt, in return for their agreement to alienate huge portions of their land, as in the Amazon region. Organizations such as Prince Philip's World Wildlife Fund (now called the Worldwide Fund for Nature) would be given title to this land.

We have shown in previous articles (see R. Maduro, "Razing of rain forests upsets world climate," *EIR* Aug. 19, 1988, p. 16) how the deforestation of the Amazon, African, and Indonesian rain forests has been forced upon these nations by these same conservationist groups who argue that "Third World" nations should use "renewable energy sources," explicitly the burning of wood for fuel instead of petroleum and coal products, or the development of nuclear energy. At present, over 60% of all deforestation worldwide is the result of the use of fuelwood.

The ecologist grouping in the West which is pushing for radical restructuring of industry is one tool of a group of

international bankers and oligarchs who intend—in collaboration with the Soviets—to introduce a new era of feudalism. They would split the world between themselves and Russian imperialists, into an eastern and western half. So far, the Soviets have gone along with their illusions; however, we can expect that despite the Soviets' full public support to the ecology movement, and the constraints upon industrial and agricultural production which it mandates, in practice (and in secret!), they will never allow their own growing military machine to be hampered. This is so for the same reason that they do not intend to really share power with the West, but have their own evil imperial dreams.

In the article published last week, we reported on the parallel deployment of the Soviets, from Gorbachov on down, with Western ideologues, to give ideological credibility to policies intended to restructure agriculture and industry. In this article we will present the first of a series of interviews by reputable U.S. scientists who disagree about the existence of a greenhouse effect as described.

Until very recently, the news media have conducted a systematic campaign of blacking out any statements by responsible scientists refuting the cataclysmic warnings about the results of the alleged "greenhouse effect." A recent meeting of 30 top scientists took place at the National Academy of Sciences on the "Climate Change Problem." Almost every single scientist at that meeting disagreed with the statements made by the guru of the greenhouse effect, James Hansen, but the transcripts of the meeting will not be made public, and scientists present, who denounced Hansen, requested their names not be mentioned in public, otherwise they may lose their positions. At least half-a-dozen such closed-door scientific meetings have taken place in the past few months, yet, the media and the government will not disclose the re-

sults of the rather heated discussions.

Scientists who attack the prevailing mythology about the effect, have been denied fair access to the media, and in some instances have even been threatened with loss of their ability to work professionally should they continue. For example, Kenneth Watt from the University of California at Davis, gave a three-minute interview to a CBS reporter debunking the greenhouse effect which was to be aired as part of a half-hour special. The reporter received a telephone call from CBS headquarters in New York and was ordered to erase the interview and destroy any other tapes of scientists refuting the official network policy on the "greenhouse effect."

What the scientists say

The actual nature of the present climatic events is still a subject of heated debate among these scientists, some arguing that there has been a very slight warming of the Earth for the last 100 years, while others present convincing evidence that there has been a cooling. The majority say the only honest answer is "we don't have any conclusive evidence either way." But uniformly, they condemn the present hysteria being peddled by the news media as lacking any scientific basis.

The hysteria exploded in June of last year, when extreme drought was destroying much of the year's crops. James Hansen of the Goddard Institute of Space Studies in New York told Senate hearings at the time that the drought was the result of the greenhouse effect, and that "we can state with 99% confidence that current temperatures represent a real warming trend rather than a chance fluctuation." Hansen and his collaborators have based their outrageous statements on a very scant temperature record and computer models of climate that are extremely coarse and unreliable.

The truth is exactly opposite. The severe U.S. drought and a pattern of associated global weather anomalies cannot be attributed to a gradual warming trend—which even according to its proponents would only have serious effects on global climate and economy 50 to 100 years hence.

The main tool used by the climatologists causing all the hysteria are climate models, yet meteorologists who work on weather prediction are quick to point out that "long-range" weather forecasts are only approximately accurate beyond a couple of days. The climate models do not use any more sophisticated physics than the forecasting models, which are more detailed in a regional basis, and more accurate than any global model. One reason for the climate models' inaccuracy is their failure to include ocean/atmospheric interactions, a key factor reducing the reliability of the global models used to predict a 30- to 50-year greenhouse effect. This is a problem in the *theory* of the models, but it is also a limitation imposed upon them by the computational deficiencies of the computers used.

We are publishing the following interviews which Maduro held over the last months, with several leading U.S.

meteorologists to lay the basis for a campaign to debunk this latest environmentalist hoax once and for all. What kind of a world will it be, if the environmentalists are allowed to destroy the whole of industry with the same impunity with which they were permitted to destroy the nuclear industry!

Interview: Patrick Michaels

'People hide their pet issues in this thing'

Dr. Michaels is Professor of Environmental Sciences at the University of Virginia and a member of the executive board of the American Association of State Climatologists.

Q: I am studying the greenhouse effect and deforestation in the Third World, and I have studied extensively what James Hansen, George Woodwell, and Steve Schneider are stating about the greenhouse effect, and I wanted to know what you think of this question.

Michaels: The problem we have is that if you look at the earth's temperature curve [over time], it's not so clear that it's doing what it should be doing. That's the problem. The current CO₂ [carbon dioxide] concentration is 350 ppm [parts per million], but there are other trace gases that are known to be thermally active [that is, tend to produce the greenhouse effect]: methane, fluorocarbons, NO₂, and you could express their rates of effect in terms of the equivalent amounts of CO₂.

Q: So it's not just the CO₂ heating the atmosphere?

Michaels: Right. What you come up with [when you combine the effects of CO₂, methane, and so on] is that the effective CO₂ concentration in the atmosphere is about 407 ppm. The pre-industrial background is somewhere around 270 ppm. Hence, there has been a substantial increase. Several people have calculated that the equilibrium warming that should occur from that increase should be somewhere in the range of just under 2°C. And of course that hasn't happened. Then the argument is made that it is held back by oceanic thermal lag, but Wigley calculated oceanic thermal lag using the most liberal model we know of, and it still hasn't warmed up as much as it should have. It has warmed up about half of what is predicted. That gives one cause to wonder.

Q: That's very interesting.

Michaels: No, it's a serious problem. Don't get me wrong. If you want to paint me as an anti-environmentalist, I'm not