

Lies, Damned Lies, and the St. Louis Science Center

By Timothy Birdnow Wednesday, February 2, 2011

“Apocalyptic predictions require, to be taken seriously, higher standards of evidence than do assertions on other matters where the stakes are not as great.” —Carl Sagan, *Foreign Affairs* Winter 1983-84

The Jesuits are said to have a guiding motto “give me a child until he is nine and he will be mine for life”. The point being that the fundamental assumptions and prejudices of the man are forged in the crucible of childhood, hand fed, as it were. They are not the product of careful observation and reasoning, but rather dribble into the psyche of the child, and thus shape the man. Once set, they are very difficult to remove.

Which is why advertisers target young children; they know that they can have lifelong customers for their products if they can establish early the lust for material things. It is the reason liberals are so interested in education - especially early in life. Public schools were designed to get liberal hands on those impressionable minds early, and to break - at least partially - the stranglehold that parents have on the formation of their children.

It is most definitely why environmentalists are struggling desperately to impact early education of children.

We are seeing this more and more; environmental sacraments to wed children to the Green Goddess. Letter writing campaigns, recycling drives, scary stories about drowning polar bears and the like are all aimed at getting the little crumb crunchers into the Gang Green.

How many children have been forced to watch Al Gore’s mistake-laden movie “An Inconvenient Truth”? Precious school time (Educrats are always telling us they need longer school days and years because there isn’t enough time) on a propaganda piece designed to

scare the gullible and immature. Why have polar bears been declared endangered? Their numbers are not falling, but rather rising.. The reason they we are told they are drowning in melting waters is that children think they are cute, and the goal is to get children on board the poison ivy green train.

There have been a spate of recent stories that confirm this; we have been told we must eat our pets (or at least rid ourselves of carbon-emitting furry friends in favor of pets we can - and do - eat), for example.

All manner of terrible things have been predicted as right around the corner, that our families and friends will die horrible deaths because of the greed of a few and the carbon footprint of the many.

How about the carbon monster!

In fact, just about every bad thing is caused by Global Warming, er, Climate Change, er, Global Climate Disruption.

Which brings us to the special exhibit "Climate Change" at the St. Louis Science Center.

The St. Louis Science Center is one of the crown jewels of the St. Louis metropolitan area. A free facility dedicated to the teaching of science to youngsters, the Science Center is supported by taxes paid by residents of both the City of St. Louis and St. Louis county and by corporate donations. As such, it has been a boon to the area, drawing in tourists as well as local visitors and school children.

But the Science Center has become increasingly politicized in recent years, and has shown its true bias in a recent special exhibit in partnership with the American Museum of Natural History designed to panic children into believing that mankind is doomed because of Anthropogenic Global Warming. The exhibit, entitled Climate Change, is intended to propagandize:

"This comprehensive exhibition examines one of the most urgent scientific and social issues of the 21st century. Through interactive stations and dioramas that interpret the latest research, Climate Change presents evidence that human activity over the last 300

years has dramatically altered the natural world. Visitors will discover the effects on our atmosphere, oceans, land and societies, and will see how individual, communal and governmental action can make a meaningful, positive impact in reducing global climate change.

- Observe how Mother Nature documents severe droughts, intense rains and increased wildfires.
- View a 12-foot-tall Atlas buoy and a robotic Ocean Glider to see how scientists collect information about the ocean.
- Learn about alternative energy sources that can eliminate dependency on fossil fuels.
- Find out how individuals, companies and other organizations in St. Louis are responding to the challenges of climate change.”

Except it does NOT present the latest research, but rather the research presented by the now discredited IPCC report, with zero dissent. Science is not about presenting hypotheses as fact, yet this exhibit confidently proclaims computer models and hotly debated research as settled, then asks the children to commit themselves to environmentalism. It also plays a sleight-of-hand, claiming to provide proof of climate change but in reality presenting computer estimates and conjecture of the effects down the road.

For example, the exhibition warns of catastrophic deforestation of the planet. Yet this flies in the face of actual facts. According to the Cato Institute:

“According to the most recent UN data, the most authoritative figures at our disposal, world forestland today covers 4 billion hectares, more than 30 percent of the total global land area. That figure has not changed appreciably since 1950, even in the midst of the population explosion, massive economic growth, and urbanization of the globe. Today forestland occupies about one-third of the United States, and that proportion has been expanding steadily for over 70 years. According to the U.S. Forest Service, million new cubic feet of wood are grown annually in the United States, while only 16.5 million cubic feet are harvested. Net annual growth exceeds annual harvests in commercial forests by 27 percent.

Since 1920 U.S. forests have expanded by 57 percent, a remarkable fact given that during the same period the U.S. population doubled,

the economy grew by a factor of 6, and per capita output increased by a factor of 3. Forestland has increased by 27 percent since 1952.³² Although demand for wood products today is at an all-time high, the United States is still able not only to meet demand with currently available timber stock but to continue adding to forest reserves. In fact, there is only one-third less forestland in the United States today than there was in the 1600s when European settlers first encountered it.”

Yet the exhibit blames an increase in wildfires on Climate Change, ignoring the fact that, due to a LACK of deforestation and a refusal to both log and clear underbrush, as well as firefighting efforts, there is more combustible material to burn.

The exhibit claims the world could supply all its energy needs with renewables, something that is impossible with current or foreseeable technology.

Another claim is that, on the whole, the World's oceans are warming. Interesting, that. Also, not true.

Another fallacious claim made is that the oceans undergoing acidification. This may be technically true, insofar as they are becoming less alkaline. The display never uses that term, instead claiming that the oceans are becoming more acid “from base”. Well, what kind of science education is that? If the purpose of this exhibit is to educate and not indoctrinate, it would explain that the oceans have dropped from a PH of 8.2 to 8.1 since the mid 1700's, and that we cannot even determine if this “acidification” is caused by atmospheric CO₂ or other issues - such as undersea volcanoes. Also, there is absolutely zero proof that decreasing PH will have any effect whatsoever on coral reefs, shellfish, or other sea life. It should be pointed out that there is no evidence that it has in the past, despite much higher CO₂ levels in previous eras. Again, this is conjecture passed off as scientific fact.

Another bold and beautiful statement is that “Sea ice is retreating earlier (in the spring)”, again another unsupportable statement. For example, Lake Opinicon in Ontario shows no discernible pattern. In

fact, there is no discernible pattern suggesting a later freeze and an earlier thaw in the Arctic at all.

Also, Arctic sea ice has thinned, but not because of Climate Change but rather changes in weather patterns - particularly the Arctic Oscillation (AO) and the Pacific Decadal Oscillation (PDO). No mention is made of either in the exhibit. There isn't any real discussion of the fact that the Arctic ocean has melted prior to the rise in CO2 levels. Mention is made of melting ice in Greenland (but no mention that this is likely driven by changes in the AO and PDO) , but no mention that Antarctic ice is growing- and 90% of the world's pack ice is in Antarctica.

They claim that there is an unmistakable "fingerprint" showing species being disturbed by "Climate Change" yet cite no evidence.

They claim many glaciers in the Andes could melt in ten to twenty years. This smells of the melting Himalayas; the IPCC report claimed they would be gone by 2035, which turned out to be a mistaken quote from a scientist speculating without evidence that they may melt by 2350. In fact, many Himalayan glaciers are growing. Also, the predictions - based on the decline of the Qori Kalis glacier - completely disregards the very warm El Nino conditions that exist today, a natural phenomenon.

Land use, too, is responsible in part for the melting of Kilimanjaro (that and the fact Africa has experienced drought conditions for quite some time, leading to drier winds) and may be part of the problem in the Andes. It should be pointed out that mountain glaciers are more susceptible to changes in solar activity, having less air to block radiation. Just as snow will melt on a day with temperatures below freezing if it is in sunlight, so too the high glaciers are subject to the effects of thermal mass.

ACCORDING TO NOAA:

"The total energy output of the sun is nearly constant. At the top of Earth's atmosphere the total irradiance from the sun is about 1366 W/m². Imagine thirteen 100 Watt light bulbs shined all of their energy onto a square meter. During the course of an 11-year solar cycle, the average output of the sun changes by about 1-2

W/m² or about 0.1%. Thus, the solar constant varies between 1365 and 1367 W/m² and is therefore, not really a constant.

In other wavelengths such as the ultraviolet and extreme ultraviolet parts of the solar spectrum, the solar variability can be quite large. In the x-ray wavelengths, the sun can change brightness by a factor of 100 or even 1000 in just a few minutes but these wavelengths only affect the upper reaches of our atmosphere. Figure 2 shows a 5-year sequence of x-ray images of the sun from solar maximum to solar minimum.

It is thought that the total solar output of the sun has changed by larger amounts over longer time scales. There is evidence that the total solar output may have been as low as 1360 W/m² during the 19th century and even lower than that during the 17th century. Thus over centennial time scales, the solar output may have changed by 0.5%.”

[...]

“Even the climate changes of the 20th century may have a significant solar component. Figure 3 shows comparisons of globally averaged temperature and solar activity. Many scientists find that these correlations are convincing evidence that the sun has contributed to the global warming of the 20th century. Some say that as much as 1/3 of the global warming may be the result of an increase in solar energy. So, while it is becoming clear that human activity is changing the climate today, solar activity may also be contributing to climate change and probably changed the climate in the past.”

This suggests a much larger influence in the high places. It also does not take into adequate account the possible effects of solar-related forcings, such as cosmic rays. Again, no mention of any of this at the exhibit. Solar activity increased considerably during the late 20th century, but has since petered out.

Interestingly, global warming stopped when the Sun decided to nap.

Another fallacious claim made is that “Since 1993 sea level rise has picked up speed”. Untrue statement. In point of fact, sea levels

DROPPED in both 2006 and 2010. It should be remembered that sea levels have been rising since the end of the last full ice age as the Earth has slumbered to an interglacial peak.

Another wonderful statement “Earth shows no sign of cooling off soon”. Tell that to the people in Britain, or in New York, or just about anywhere in the Northern Hemisphere this season. (I know; weather isn’t climate.) The reality is there has been NO warming of the globe since 1995, and this according to Climate Research Unit (CRU) head Phil Jones, he of the infamous “hide the decline” e-mails.

In fact, the Gang Green has been forced to claim it’s cold because of Global Warming. It should also be pointed out that CRU has been shown to have purposefully manipulated temperature data to “hide the decline” (the infamous “Mike’s nature trick”) and the surface stations used to track global temperatures have been shown to be less than reliable.

They claim storms and hurricanes are becoming more intense. Not true.

They claim that atmospheric CO₂ has been “fairly stable” for hundreds of thousands of years and that the increase in modern times is mainly from burning fossil fuels, but this is just an assumption. Geological history shows carbon dioxide levels rise AFTER a warming period - generally about 800 years later. The Medieval Warming Period - a period warmer than the current warming trend - went from roughly 950 to 1250 a.d. In other words, about 800 years ago. Shouldn’t we expect a rise in carbon dioxide in the atmosphere? No mention of this at the exhibit.

In point of fact, paleoclimatology shows much higher levels of CO₂ in the past; as high as 7000 ppm’s and there was no correlation with temperature trends. In fact, some very cold periods coincide with high levels of CO₂, and life has flourished along with those levels. The choice of timeframe is telling.

They claim that air temperatures were far more stable over the last 11,600 years. Uh, what of the Roman Warming Period, the Medieval Warming Period, the Little Ice Age?

Oh, and the guide for teachers says that carbon dioxide is the most powerful greenhouse gas in the atmosphere - something patently untrue. Water vapor is the most prevalent, and certainly CFC's are far more powerful.

This exhibit, designed to teach children about the science of climate change, is chock full of errors, distortions, and outright lies. No mention is made of opposing viewpoints, nor of the scandals involving data tampering that put the whole theory in serious doubt. Children are told that they can recycle and turn off light bulbs and that this will somehow help "save the planet" and there is even a pledge board where children are told to push a button if they will pledge to take action. This is scientific propaganda at it's most malignant.

At the Endangered Atmospheres Conference in 1975, Margaret Mead made this plea:

"It is concluded that, in cases where the societal risk is great, one should therefore act as if the unaccounted-for effects had been included, since we have no way of dismissing the very possibility that the calculated effect will prevail."

And Mead, in her keynote address had this to say;

"What we need from scientists are estimates, presented with sufficient conservatism and plausibility but at the same time as free as possible from internal disagreements that can be exploited by political interests, that will allow us to start building a system of artificial but effective warnings".

Mead, William Kellogg, future Obama Science Advisor John Holdren, and a host of other political scientists met to find a way to promote their utopian vision for the world, and Anthropogenic Global Warming was one of their chosen instruments.

In short, they were to argue for a consensus, and smear any scientists who actually wanted to do their jobs. This has become the standard tactic of the warming alarmists; impugn anyone who disagrees, claim they are in bed with Big Oil or Big Tobacco, or dismiss their credentials.

But to make this scheme work they need to brainwash the children; the children will grow up believing in this false Environmental faith, and once they have committed to it forever will it dominate their destiny (apologies to George Lucas). This abomination at the well-respected St. Louis Science Center is purposefully designed to terrify and trick.

It is instructive to view the guide for teachers. See it [here](#).

Here is something equally instructive:

“The Saint Louis Science Center and youths from the Youth Exploring Science (YES) program will be hosting a community conversation on climate change. This event includes: Panel lectures by climate change scientists Climate change tabletop activities including Polar Bear Hopscotch, Carbon Footprint Survey, What’s for Lunch?, and What’s a Watt?”

Time to visit the Climate Change exhibition

Breakout discussion groups on topics including, but not limited to, local actions to “adapt” to climate change, climate change evidence, common misconceptions, and what educators can do to inform students about climate change”

This exhibit was in partnership with the American Museum of Natural History in New York.

Roger Revelle, granddaddy of the whole Global Warming theory, disavowed the hysterical end-of-world scenario generated by computer models. He believed carbon dioxide would raise planetary temperatures by 2* at most, and considered it more of a curiosity. Global Warming is based almost entirely on computer generated fantasies and cherry picked data. (Consider the cherry picking of tree ring data by Michael Mann and Keith Briffa, for instance.) Climate is not, never has been, and never will be stable; it’s easy to manipulate data to say what one wishes. There have always been politically active scientists; consider the Union of Concerned Scientists, for instance, that Leftist cabal that used to push for a nuclear freeze. Consider Carl Sagan’s Nuclear Winter hypothesis (which Freeman Dyson of Princeton referred to as “an absolutely atrocious piece of

science”), since roundly smashed. Remember Paul Ehrlich’s The Population Bomb, a neo-Malthusian screed that has failed miserably in its predictions. Time after time environmental catastrophes have been proven wrong, yet the same people keep generating them - and the media keeps listening and repeating.

Why? Because there is an agenda at work, and because most science funding comes from the government today.

Science is biased because that is what the masters in Washington, those who dole out the capital for research, want. Climatology, for example, was a sleepy, underfunded backwater, but not anymore. Gargantuan amounts of money are at stake, both for research and for the fundamental restructuring that the political forces generate. Al Gore made millions riding this gravy train, selling carbon credits and offsets. Many scientists have become call girls for the liberals shelling out money.

And the true believers have their hand in our pockets to fund their New World Order. The St. Louis Science Center is publicly funded. They want a new generation of true believers, and things like this Climate Change Exhibition are the tools employed to reel in the fish.

There are lies, damned lies, and then there’s Global Warming. It’s the biggest fish story of them all!