

TRUE OR FALSE

97% of all climate scientists support man-made global warming theory

FALSE, 100%

By John Eidson

In attempting to convince Americans to accept massive new carbon taxes they say are needed to save the planet from climate collapse, proponents of anthropogenic (man-made) global warming theory often make the entirely false assertion that 97% of all climate scientists believe that man's use of fossil fuels poses an imminent, catastrophic threat to the environment.

The 97% figure comes from a survey of 11,944 peer-reviewed scientific papers conducted by John Cook, a blogger and 'climate communication research fellow' at Queensland University. His report is titled [Quantifying the consensus on anthropogenic global warming in the scientific literature](#), or *Cook et al (2013)* for short.

When the Cook survey was published in May 2013, it seemed strange that even a pro-warming blogger could find such overwhelming scientific consensus at the very time earth's failure to overheat as predicted was causing red-faced scientists to recast their figures and come up with excuses to explain away the glaring inaccuracies of their frightening predictions.

As with most surveys, *Cook et al (2013)* has statistics that lend themselves to being maliciously misquoted. Here's one such statistic in the Cook survey, and it's huge: The 97% figure does not refer to a consensus of "all scientists", as is widely misreported. The 97% "consensus" refers exclusively to the support level among scientists **whose papers stated a pro-or-con position** not mentioned by climate alarmists — that 66.4% of the abstracts surveyed **did not take a position**. That's 2 out of 3 abstracts that were **ENTIRELY NEUTRAL**. The 97% figure in the Cook survey refers only to those scientists (32.6% of the total) whose abstracts definitively stated belief in global warming theory. Thus, **of the total abstracts surveyed**, only 32.6% -- not 97% -- stated support of global warming theory. In other words, of the 11,944 scientists whose papers were analyzed, less than a third support anthropogenic global warming. It doesn't take a genius to see that 32.6% support is nowhere near the 97% figure that's deliberately misrepresented by climate alarmists determined to win at all costs, even if by outright deceit.

Another troubling aspect of the Cook survey is the potential lack of objectivity among surveyed scientists who stated support for global warming theory. Given the monopolistic funding of climate science, the opinions of scientists whose jobs and government grants can depend on arriving at pro-warming conclusions hardly constitute a reliable sampling of non-self-interested scientific opinion.

No one knows what the climate will be like in the future. But if global warming science is "settled", as President Obama and other progressives say it is, why do its proponents find it necessary to mislead voters about its level of support in the scientific community?

THE BOTTOM LINE IS THIS:

What sets science apart from religion is that only empirical evidence matters, not opinions or beliefs, including those of scientists who profess keen insight into a phenomenon as immensely complex and utterly unpredictable as the climate. Consider this indisputable fact: Beginning in 1997 -- and in the face of dramatically rising levels of CO2 emissions every year since -- the warming trend that began in the early 1980s came to a virtual standstill, where it has remained for the last **seventeen years**. Given the determined effort to scare Americans into approving a massive tax on carbon consumption, it's not hard to see why the totally false "97% of all scientists" claim is used by progressives to mislead low information voters.

In the 1980s, the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change ominously warned -- and indeed, virtually guaranteed -- that unless massive carbon taxes were immediately enacted in western countries, the planet would suffer a near-term catastrophic increase in global warming. That clearly has not even come close to happening. Much to the dismay of climate change alarmists, the empirical evidence offered by actual real-time climate observations over the last three decades unequivocally shows that the terrifying computer model predictions of pro-IPCC scientists have been magnificently wrong. Given the IPCC's decades-long record of producing wildly inaccurate climate forecasts, why would any thinking person have blind faith in what they're saying now?

"The only way to get society to truly change is to frighten people with the possibility of catastrophe."

Prof. Emeritus Daniel Bolkin, Environmental Studies Department, University of California

"Unless we announce disasters, no one will listen."

Sir John Houghton, first chairman of the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

"We need broad-based support to capture the public's imagination, so we have to offer up scary scenarios, make simplified dramatic statements, and make little mention of any doubts. Each of us has to decide what the right balance is between being effective and being honest."

Dr. Stephen Schneider, Professor of Climatology, Stanford University, and lead author of multiple UN IPCC reports

"We have got to ride the global warming issue. Even if the theory is wrong, we will be doing the right thing."

Timothy Wirth, U.S. Secretary of State for Global Issues

"In searching for a new enemy [to fight capitalism], we came up with the idea that pollution, the threat of global warming, water shortages and the like would fit the bill."

Club of Rome, The First Global Revolution

"We must make this an insecure and inhospitable place for capitalists and their products."

David Foreman, Founder of Earth First

"One has to free oneself from the illusion that international climate policy is environmental policy. One must say clearly that we redistribute the world's wealth through climate policy."

Ottmar Edenhofer, Co-Chair of UN IPCC's Working Group III

"Current lifestyles and consumption patterns of the affluent middle class involving high meat intake, appliances, air-conditioning and suburban housing are not sustainable."

Maurice Strong, senior advisor to UN Secretary General Kofi Annan, chairman of the 1992 U.N. Conference on Environment & Development in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

Strong's views parrot those of other international socialists who believe that citizens in western societies must be forced to radically downgrade their lifestyles through the imposition of draconian taxes on the consumption of energy. Such taxes would mean not only less meat consumption and less air conditioning and fewer appliances, but *significantly* smaller cars and smaller houses, and a dramatically reduced ability for average people to afford travel by automobile and commercial aviation. Of course, such lifestyle cutbacks will never apply to the socialist elites trying to frighten voters into accepting massive new taxes that can be used to redistribute wealth around the world.