



Dr. Tim Ball On Climate: Lies Wrapped In Deception Smothered With Delusion

Technocrats have darkened hearts just like everyone else, but they soon discovered how to use the mantra of 'science' to trick and deceive. In similar fashion of the 1970s Chiffon Margarine ad, "It's not nice to fool mother nature", Technocrats follow with "97% of scientists agree...". □
TN Editor

The Washington swamp displayed all its corruption skills with lies, deceptions, misrepresentations, and deliberate creation of deceit, during the Kavanaugh hearings. The willingness of politicians on the left to destroy everything America stands for was frightening. We watched Senator Blumenthal, who lied about serving in Vietnam when he never left the United States, remind Judge Kavanaugh of a [legal maxim](#) "*Falsus in Uno, Falsus in Omnibus*," false in one thing, false in everything.

The only difference between these and previous similar tactics was boldness - the left was forced to show their hand more than normal. There are few silver linings to this cloud because if it succeeds, it is the end of America. Everything the left did and said undermines core values

of a civilized society, correctly and uniquely identified as American exceptionalism.

One sliver of silver lining is in the level of corruption exposed to achieve a political agenda. Now it is easier for people to grasp the extent of corruption on the greatest deception in history, human-caused global warming (AGW). It is easier now to get them to understand that the left will do anything to achieve their goal. The significant differences between AGW and the Kavanaugh debacle were time and extent. The AGW deception has evolved slowly and insidiously since the late 1960s. It began as the objective of David Rockefeller's Club of Rome's (COR) to control energy and thereby political power. It is just as corrupting and devastating an attack on American exceptionalism but worse because it is global. [The COR say](#) they are

“a group of world citizens, sharing a common concern for the future of humanity.”

Compare this claim with H. L. Mencken's observation that,

“The urge to save humanity is almost always a false front for the urge to rule.”

America was seen as the greatest threat to their objective, so it became a major target, but it was still only a part of the global control.

COR member Maurice Strong took the urge to rule to the UN where he put it into action. After spending five days with Strong at the UN, Elaine Dewar summarized his goal in her book *Cloak of Green*.

Strong was using the U.N. as a platform to sell a global environment crisis and the Global Governance Agenda.

He did this by creating the political monster known as Agenda 21 and creating the science to support the politics through the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Like all deceptions, there are lies within lies and deceptions within deceptions. Even the selection of terminology and words was deliberately planned to deceive. For example, the Earth's atmosphere does not work like a greenhouse.

The analogy was only valuable because it automatically triggers the concept of heat for the public. The deceivers knew this type of misrepresentation worked because the same people created the term “holes-in-the-ozone.” They knew there were no holes, but the term implied a leak, a break in the atmosphere, with all the “[Chicken Little](#)” the sky is falling fears that engenders.

The next example was the word skeptic, which as Michael Shermer explained.

“Scientists are skeptics. It’s unfortunate that the word ‘skeptic’ has taken on other connotations in the culture involving nihilism and cynicism. Really, in its pure and original meaning, it’s just thoughtful inquiry.”

After 1998 the evidence did not fit the AGW theory anymore so by 2004 they changed it from the global warming theory to the climate change theory. They also changed the slur from skeptics to deniers, with its holocaust connotations. They ignored the fact that these scientists do nothing but educate people to the amount and extent of natural climate change.

The most effective deception was the claim that 97% of scientists agree. It is as false as the whole claim and was also deliberately created. It was a major part of the confusion created and exploited by the difference in meaning of words between different segments of society. It is why Voltaire said,

“If you wish to converse with me, define your terms.”

That sounds arrogant and condescending, but it is essential for any chance of accurate understanding.

[RealClimate](#) was the website created to manipulate the global warming story. Most of the people involved with its creation were members of the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) and the IPCC. The need for a propaganda vehicle was revealed in November 2009 when thousands of emails were leaked (Climategate) and exposed their tactics and activities. A book by Mosher and Fuller listed some of them.

- *Actively worked to evade Freedom of Information requests, deleting emails, documents, and even climate data.*
- *Tried to corrupt the peer-review principles that are the mainstay of modern science, reviewing each other's work, sabotaging efforts of opponents trying to publish their own work, and threatening editors of journals who didn't bow to their demands*
- *Changed the shape of their own data in materials shown to politicians charged with changing the shape of our world.*

RealClimate explained on [22 December 2004](#) why they started to use the word consensus. It illustrates how political it was and how they knew it didn't apply to science, but the goal was deception.

We've used the term "consensus" here a bit recently without ever really defining what we mean by it. In normal practice, there is no great need to define it - no science depends on it. But it's useful to record the core that most scientists agree on, for public presentation. The consensus that exists is that of the IPCC reports, in particular the working group I report (there are three WG's. By "IPCC", people tend to mean WG I).

In short, we agree therefore there is a consensus.

The academic source of the 97% claim came from John Cook et al., in 2013 under the titled ["Quantifying the consensus on anthropogenic global warming in the scientific literature."](#) Lord Monckton dissected the claim in his comment titled, ["0.3% consensus, not 97.1%."](#) He explains how the authors took divided 11,944 abstracts of articles into three categories using their own definitions. Monckton used,

The authors' own data file categorized 64 abstracts, or only 0.5% of the sample, as endorsing the consensus hypothesis as thus defined. Inspection shows only 41 of the 64, or 0.3% of the entire sample, actually endorsed their hypothesis.

The penultimate comment comes from Harvard graduate, medical doctor, and world-famous science fiction writer, [Michael Crichton](#).

"I want to pause here and talk about this notion of consensus, and

the rise of what has been called consensus science. I regard consensus science as an extremely pernicious development that ought to be stopped cold in its tracks. Historically, the claim of consensus has been the first refuge of scoundrels; it is a way to avoid debate by claiming that the matter is already settled. Whenever you hear the consensus of scientists agrees on something or other, reach for your wallet, because you're being had.

The ultimate comment comes from Albert Einstein.

No amount of experimentation can ever prove me right: a single experiment can prove me wrong.

The left was fully revealed in the Kavanaugh debacle. It was so extreme that it made exposure of their methods and tactics clear to people who found them hard to believe. Now, it is easier for them to grasp the AGW deception.