



There Is No Climate Emergency

Conservative leaders must develop a plan to kill the climate scare before it destroys our nations.

Words by Tom Harris. Photo © Larry Angier.

Many Republican leaders support the unscientific and costly climate scare. Take for example, the Conservative Climate Caucus. Its founder and chair emeritus is Rep. John Curtis (R-UT) and current chair is Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeke (R-IA). It has 81 members, all Republicans from the U.S. House of Representatives, including 12 from Texas, the state that leads the nation in coal consumption. Since coal is public enemy number one in the eyes of the climate cult, the last thing any Texas politician should be doing is promoting the climate scare. Yet they do, saying on the Caucus' home page: "Climate change is a global issue.... Solutions should reduce global emissions and not just be 'feel good' policies."

The "emissions" they refer to are mainly carbon dioxide (CO₂), which there is no need to reduce since it is plant food. Speaking at the 2017 America First Energy Conference in Houston, Dr. Craig Idso, chairman of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, said, "The entire terrestrial biosphere is reaping incredible benefits from an approximately 40 percent increase in atmospheric CO₂ since the beginning of the Industrial Revolution."

It is just as bad in Canada where virtually all conservative politicians promote the climate scare with nonsensical and expensive "solutions" like carbon sequestration, capturing CO₂ from power plants and storing it underground. This is an expensive and potentially dangerous solution to a problem that does not exist. Murray Energy CEO Bob Murray told Congress a few years before he

passed away that "carbon sequestration" is code for "no coal," something no sensible American or Canadian should promote because many of them rely on coal for their survival.

Rather than simply tell the truth about climate change—namely, that there is no climate emergency and efforts to control the climate will leave us bankrupt, hungry and freezing in the dark for no environmental benefit—many conservative leaders attempt to finesse the issue to expand the tent of voters who may support the party.

After all, backroom strategists tell their political bosses: "The polls show that most of the public believe there is a climate crisis. So we have to have a credible plan to reduce greenhouse gases to fight climate change. There is no alternative if we are to get elected."

Besides the fact that most polls are "push polls" designed to give an outcome desired by climate alarmists and so cannot be trusted, conservative strategists fail to recognize the role political leaders play in determining public opinion. A 2012 paper by Robert J. Brulle of Drexel University, Jason Carmichael of McGill and J. Craig Jenkins of Ohio State published in the journal *Climatic Change* looked at 74 surveys over a nine-year period to attempt to determine the factors that had the greatest influence on public opinion concerning climate change. They considered five possibilities: scientific information, extreme weather events, advocacy, media coverage, and what politicians and political parties were saying about the topic. They found that neither the promulgation of scientific informa-

tion nor extreme weather events had a significant impact. Media coverage had some impact, but the strongest effect came from the positions of competing politicians and political parties.

When politicians of all stripes supported the man-made dangerous climate-change narrative, the public generally did too and demand for action rose. But when politicians questioned the narrative, the public became far less concerned about climate change and their demand for action plummeted...substantially. Similarly, Harvard University's Susan McDonald concluded in 2009: "When elites have consensus, the public follows suit, and the issue becomes mainstreamed. When elites disagree, polarization occurs, and citizens rely on other indicators...to make up their minds."

And other studies found the same. So if conservative politicians wait until public opinion opposes the climate scare before they take a sensible approach to the issue, they will wait for a very long time indeed.

What are conservative politicians (most knowing full well that the climate scare is bogus) to do if they want to avoid being massacred by the press and losing elections, but also want to contribute to ending one of the greatest threats to our nations? Here is a step-by-step strategy they should follow.

They should immediately stop supporting the climate scare through their use of language. This would mean never using the following terms or phrases: carbon tax, carbon emissions, carbon pollution, carbon footprint, low carbon energy, and so on. Instead



call it carbon dioxide, which is about 80 percent of greenhouse gases, not counting water vapor, emitted by human activity in the United States and Canada. By calling the nontoxic, invisible gas CO₂ “carbon,” they are using the language of climate alarmism since “carbon” brings up thoughts of soot and pollution.

Conservative leaders must also stop saying, or even implying, that we need to reduce emissions, since the implication is almost always about reducing CO₂ emissions, which is unnecessary, of course. Instead, talk about increasing the efficiency of our energy use where it is currently inefficient.

They must never talk about a climate emergency or make statements about extreme weather increasing as a rationale for their climate plans. Instead, only boost “reduction” of air, land and water pollution where currently a problem.

They should stop supporting carbon sequestration, electric vehicles and other expensive technological fixes to a problem that does not exist. That includes stopping promotion of the idea that we need to move off coal to natural gas. Natural gas is a valuable power source, of course, but its use has no impact on climate.

They should begin to shift their parties’ focus away from the impossible goal of trying to stop climate change to adaptation and building resilience, with a focus on preparing for cooling, a far more dangerous scenario than warming for a high latitude country like Canada and large parts of the United States.

Conservative party brass must correct their political opponents every time they make statements about climate change that are opposed to what is actually in the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change documents. Much of what alarmists

say about climate change is actually refuted by the IPCC itself.

They need to call for all subsidies of wind and solar power to be removed so they are forced to compete against legacy power sources on a level playing field. This will compel the government to show that wind and solar are already competitive with fossil fuels without the subsidies, which they cannot do, of course.

They should call for the Biden and Trudeau governments to convene open, unbiased public hearings into the science of climate change, with experts on all sides of the issue invited to testify. When the government refuses to do this, ask in Congress, in the

The “emissions” they refer to are mainly carbon dioxide (CO₂), which there is no need to reduce since it is plant food.

House of Commons and in public: “What is the government hiding? Why will they only allow the public to hear the views of experts who agree with them?” The World Climate Declaration, signed by 1,609 scientists, engineers and other experts in over 30 countries, including 321 from America, 122 from Canada and two Nobel Laureates, states point-blank, “There is no climate emergency.” Conservatives should be asking why those experts are being ignored.

When they are in a position to do so themselves, convene open, unbiased public hearings into the science of climate change, with experts on all sides of the issue invited to

testify, and then publicize the testimonies widely.

Conservative parties also need to coordinate honest public opinion polling, asking neutral questions such as: “Do you think that we are in the midst of a climate crisis so severe that it is worth restructuring our entire energy infrastructure in an attempt to protect the climate?” and “How much would you personally be prepared to pay per month so that America/Canada will lead the world in its attempts to stop climate change?”

Publicizing the results of unbiased public opinion surveys are poison to the climate scare, so broadcast it widely.

Finally announce: “Considering the gross uncertainties in the field and disagreements between leading experts, we will henceforth focus not on attempting to stop climate change, but on adaptation and building resilience to climate change. Only when or if the science solidifies behind the dangerous human-caused climate-change hypothesis will we consider supporting any mitigation projects at all.”

Many well-meaning, skilled and intelligent people get into politics because they genuinely want to improve their country. But because of pressures of political correctness, many lose their way after attaining power and end up supporting positions they know are wrong. Whether they follow the specific approach I am recommending or not, they really owe it to all of us to develop and carry out a comprehensive plan to kill the climate scare before it destroys the societies that past generations fought to build and defend. ■

Tom Harris is executive director of the International Climate Science Coalition.