The Campaign For Liberty promotes and defends the great American principles of individual liberty, constitutional government, sound money, free markets, and a non-interventionist foreign policy, by means of educational and political activity.

Visit us on the Web at www.CampaignForLiberty.com

Climate Change Dogma and World Government

By Adam Murdock, MD **12/03/2009**

Adam Murdock, MD, is a physician working in Texas. He is founder and editor of The Freemen Institute, a website dedicated to preserving the foundations of liberty.

Stop the Climate Scientific Global Dictatorship! A Call to Action As a physician and as one that has conducted research and published in peer-reviewed journals, I am intimately connected to the scientific world and the scientific process. The scientific process requires a complete objectivity, a complete reliance on the data. It does not rely on what politicians think, or what the supposed majority of other scientists believe, or even upon what was thought to be proven in the past. It requires continual scrutiny and a stubborn willingness to be critical of everything proven and unproven. At times this stubborn willingness to continually analyze and reanalyze established beliefs places the scientific world in disarray as new beliefs replace old. What marks someone as a true scientist is a willingness to let go of previously held beliefs when the facts turn in another direction, even at the expense of one's established research, reputation, and tenure.

A scientific dictatorship occurs when this willingness to follow the data is disregarded and replaced with political correctness, consensus, economic motives, or personal hopes and aspirations. This dictatorship which attempts to suppress alternative viewpoints or theories is merely an attempt to make a scientist's own selfish view preeminent at the expense of the scientific process and sometimes the truth. Inevitably, this dictatorship uses tactics like vilification, name calling, discrimination, and sometimes even threats of physical incarceration or violence in order to enforce the accepted dogma.

There are no greater examples of this than the ordeal of scientists that challenged the belief that the earth was flat and the center of the universe. The scientists that challenged the existing scientific aristocracy or dictatorship of the time were often incarcerated and even sometimes put to death. If true scientists like Copernicus and Galileo and their counterparts lived in a world filled with true followers of the scientific process they might have encountered some initial skepticism but would not have suffered like they did. True scientists would have evaluated the evidence that they presented and quickly have come to the same conclusion themselves. The fact that this didn't happen was evidence of an over-arching scientific dogma or dictatorship at that time. Their theories threatened the position, theories, and power of the existing scientific elite of their day.

The same type of scientific dogma or dictatorship exists in the world today. There are many examples of modern scientists that have challenged the accepted scientific dogma. Oftentimes, they have had to surmount tremendous obstacles and go to great lengths to prove they were right.

It was only twenty years ago that two Australian scientists, Robin Warren and Barry Marshall

implicated a bacteria, Helicobacter pylori, as the causative agent in many intestinal ulcers. Prior to 1982, the predominant theory for the cause of ulcers was overproduction of stomach acid. The prevailing wisdom of the time was that if only stomach acid could be reduced then ulcers could be controlled. Of course, this would lead to lifelong treatments for acid suppression. When these two scientists proposed a simple bacterium as the cause, which could be eradicated with a simple antibiotic cocktail, they were more than met with initial skepticism -- they were mocked and ridiculed. It was only because of tireless persistence on their part, which included ingesting the very causative organism in question and testing their hypothesis on themselves, that eventually the established dogma began to subside.

Along the same lines it is within the last twenty years the cyclo-oxygenase type 2 (COX-2) inhibitors like the infamous Vioxx were touted as the new anti-inflammatory medications for this generation. They would replace similar medications like Ibuprofen and Advil. When evidence surfaced that these medications may be causing increased incidences of heart attacks and deaths, they were forced off the market. Unfortunately, because the company and its scientists had great reputations, profits, and careers at stake it may have taken 3 years after the associations with heart attacks were discovered before the drug was removed from the market. It is not clear how many people have suffered the ultimate consequence for scientists letting ulterior motives cloud scientific purity.

This brings to me to the most important issue of our day -- the debate over whether climate change is related to man-made green house gases or if it is related to natural processes such as sun-spot cycles. While it is not the purpose of this article to discuss the science around this discussion in detail, what can be illuminated is the presence of a dogmatic scientific bureaucratic dictatorship that has one particular view in mind at the expense of all others. This view contends that mankind is responsible for global warming, the inevitable consequence of which will be a collapse of the earth's vital ecosystems. In order to stop man and the collapse of the earth, the global scientific and political dictatorship would have the first world nations dramatically reduce their production of green-house gases. This will be accomplished by the cap-and-trade system, which would de-industrialize, depopulate, and subjugate the peoples of Europe and America and transfer their wealth to the third world and to the sponsors and ministers of the system.

As the EU President Herman Von Rompuy recently put it:

"2009 is also the first year of global governance, with the establishment of the G20 in the middle of the financial crisis. The climate conference in Copenhagen is another step towards the global management of our planet."

It is clear from this statement that the climate agenda goes hand in hand with the plan for global governance. In fact, it may serve as the key stone to the foundation of just such a superstate. It is precisely because the globalists are using this issue as the means for attaining their long sought after dominion that the climate change debate is the most important issue of this generation.

What about the science that is being used as one of the stepping stones to global governance? Has global temperature really been increasing in lock-step with carbon-dioxide emissions?

Climate change skeptics have recently challenged the assumption of climate change fanatics by pointing out that the global temperature doesn't appear to have continued to rise over the past decade or more, despite a continued surge in carbon-dioxide emissions. In fact, the temperatures may have decreased slightly. Yet, this information has fallen on seemingly deaf ears in the climate community. Fortunately, the question was recently answered by the climatologist global warming alarmists themselves. In emails that were leaked from the bastion of climate activism, the climate research unit (CRU) of East Anglia University, are some really startling yet somehow expected revelations about the real data, propaganda, intimidation, and fraud perpetrated by the climate

change scientific community.

In fact, in response to a recent skeptical article entitled "Whatever happened to Global Warming" by Paul Hudson, a BBC weatherman, one of the lead authors of the IPCC report commented within the private leaked emails:

“The fact is that we can't account for the lack of warming at the moment and it is a travesty that we can't."

In commenting about Hudson's piece, climate scientist Michael Mann of Penn State University added:

"extremely disappointing to see something like this appear on BBC. its particularly odd, since climate is usually Richard Black's beat at BBC (and he does a great job). from what I can tell, this guy was formerly a weather person at the Met Office.

"We may do something about this on RealClimate, but meanwhile it might be appropriate for the Met Office to have a say about this, I might ask Richard Black what's up here?"

What is clear from the conservations in these emails is that not only is the science not settled but there was a systematic attempt by these scientists to keep any contrary viewpoints out of the media, published literature, and the political arena. Does this sound like people genuinely seeking after truth or just scientists trying to protect their own turf, reputations, and agenda - whatever the cost?

In another email, the director of the East Anglia climate center, Phil Jones, suggested that we:

“will keep them out somehow -- even if we have to redefine what the peer-review literature is!"

This email highlights a very important but little understood point outside of academic circles. Central to life of an academic researcher is their ability to publish peer-reviewed papers in to the literature. Often times, the amount of published material they produce correlates with their ability to become tenured and to continue to receive grants. What is particularly disturbing about these emails is they demonstrate a willingness to destroy other people's lives by making it difficult for them to publish.

An example of this scientific shakedown by these supposed scientists occurs in email by Michael Mann that suggests destroying a journal that dared publish these alternative viewpoints. He writes:

"Perhaps we should encourage our colleagues in the climate research community to no longer submit to, or cite papers in, this journal."

In another of the emails, Tim Wigley says that pressure should be applied to a particular journal, Climate Research, to fall in line with the established climate change order. He writes that the publisher needed to be more concerned with how publishing alternative viewpoints, or as he puts it “misinformation," would be “perceived." He added: “whether it is true or not is not what the publishers care about -- it is how the journal is seen by the community that counts."

This scientific witch hunt is vaguely reminiscent of the Spanish Inquisition. It is not about the truth of their ideas, it is about the opposition. If it takes destroying their opponents' careers in order to perpetuate their climate fraud, then they seem perfectly willing to do it. Another excerpt demonstrates this career-destroying intention of theirs. In a comment about James Saiers of the Geophysical Research Letters journal:

"If you think that Saiers is in the greenhouse skeptics camp, then, if we can find documentary

evidence of this, we could go through official AGU channels to get him ousted"

In response to these vicious attacks, one of the subjects of some of the emails, Pat Michaels, a climate scientist at the Cato Institute, said in response that: "This is what everyone feared. Over the years, it has become increasingly difficult for anyone who does not view global warming as an end-of-the-world issue to publish papers. This isn't questionable practice, this is unethical."

To add insult to injury these very same scientists also write about their attempts to fraudulently distort their own data so they can continue the charade. In another email by Phil Jones the truth about the agenda comes out. It turns out they are more worried about the climate agenda going forward than what their data actually shows. If they have to distort the data then they will do what it takes. He writes:

"In any case, if the sulfate hypothesis is right, then your prediction of warming might end up being wrong. I think we have been too readily explaining the slow changes over past decade as a result of variability -- that explanation is wearing thin. I would just suggest, as a backup to your prediction, that you also do some checking on the sulfate issue, just so you might have a quantified explanation in case the prediction is wrong. Otherwise, the Skeptics will be all over us -- the world is really cooling, the models are no good, etc. And all this just as the US is about ready to get serious on the issue."

In another email they write:

"I've just completed Mike's Nature trick of adding in the real temps to each series for the last 20 years (ie from 1981 onwards) and from 1961 for Keith's to hide the decline."

Here we sit on the verge of subjecting ourselves to the tyranny of global government in the name of protecting the planet. Now that the truth has been established and the hypocrisy and error revealed, let us press our congressman and senators before it is too late. In a matter of a couple weeks the most important conference of our lifetimes will convene in Copenhagen in order to decide our fate. I urge you with all the energies of my heart; let us pull down the global warming false idol worshippers and their climate dictatorship while we still have time.