

Trump Transition Will be a Tsunami Washing Away Climate Corruption

Dr. Tim Ball

January 2, 2017

Many people, including my wife, ask why I continue to fight for the truth about the greatest deception in history, the claim that humans are causing global warming. The answer is simple; I don't want any politician to be able to say they weren't told. I have written a multitude of articles in every medium possible, published books, done countless radio and TV interviews, and given hundreds of public lectures. It is in the record and readily available with the simplest of Internet searches. If they didn't know, they didn't look very hard or were deliberately selective.

Despite that, there were times when I questioned the efficacy of my actions. This was brought home recently when in one of the many Internet interviews I do with students around the world a young woman asked if, in retrospect, I would follow the same path. After very little contemplation I said no and quoted the old saying that if the world wants to be fooled, let it be fooled. However, I then added, that it is of no consequence because of the path already taken and so you must follow Winston Churchill's dictum.

“Never give in. Never give in. Never, never, never, never—in nothing, great or small, large or petty—never give in, except to convictions of honour and good sense. Never yield to force. Never yield to the apparently overwhelming might of the enemy.”

Nothing has happened to challenge my “*honour or good sense.*” Indeed, I steadfastly kept the idea in the front of my mind that if evidence of ‘good sense’ appeared that showed I was wrong, I had to be the first to announce it to the world.

Over the last 40 years, I saw events come and go that I thought would expose the greatest deception in history: The claim that human CO₂ is causing catastrophic global warming, known as anthropogenic global warming (AGW). I kept thinking and hoping that something or someone would appear to expose the entire thing. It needed an event or person who could go to the heart of the problem that was established and firmly protected within the realm of government. I watched the [Chapter Eight](#) debacle in which sections of a final report agreed on by the committee were drastically altered when it was released to the world. I thought the

[leaked emails](#), first 1000, then 5000 and finally 220,000 from the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) that became the control centre for the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) would open people's eyes. The exposure of malfeasance, collusion, and manipulation of data, publications and even scientific journals should have stopped the corruption. It didn't.

The disclosures should have converted the valiant supporters of the IPCC and CRU. It didn't. For the few of us who already knew, it was just confirmation. It is a measure of the tunnel vision of left-wing ideology that the *Guardian* reporter George Monbiot, a strong supporter of both agencies and their work wrote,

It's no use pretending that this isn't a major blow. The emails extracted by a hacker from the climatic research unit at the University of East Anglia could scarcely be more damaging. I am now convinced that they are genuine, and I'm dismayed and deeply shaken by them.

But this didn't trigger a campaign by him to demand the truth as it would in a less doctrinaire person. As Clive Crook wrote in *The Atlantic*

"I had hoped, not very confidently, that the various Climategate inquiries would be severe. This would have been a first step towards restoring confidence in the scientific consensus. But no, the reports make things worse. At best, they are mealy-mouthed apologies; at worst, they are patently incompetent and even willfully wrong. The climate-science establishment, of which these inquiries have chosen to make themselves a part, seems entirely incapable of understanding, let alone repairing, the harm it has done to its own cause."

I thought the leaked emails from the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) that exposed the corrupt activities of the central scientists at the IPCC would stop the juggernaut. Instead, they hired PR people and set up controlled whitewash investigations as Crook noted. None of it stopped and only marginally slowed the AGW deception. The marginal delay occurred because the emails were leaked in November 2009, a month before the Conference of the Parties (COP) 15 meeting in Copenhagen that planned to agree on a successor to the [Kyoto Protocol](#). A year later COP 16 in Durban, South Africa, they approved the replacement for Kyoto, the great socialist transfer of wealth scheme based on use and abuse of CO2, with the [Green Climate Fund](#) (GCF). Too many people had too much invested, and most of the public didn't understand what was happening.

A major factor in perpetuating the deception was the claim that 97 percent of scientists agreed. This was another [falsehood deliberately created](#) to perpetuate the myth. A Queensland University researcher claimed to have surveyed 11,944 papers and concluded 97.1% expressed an opinion supporting climate change. In fact, by their definition, only 41 agreed with their hypothesis or 0.3%. The only 97% figure of relevance is the 97% who have never looked at the IPCC science.

The 3 % who have, were shocked. For example, Emeritus Professor of physics, the late Hal Lewis wrote in his resignation letter to the American Physical Society (APS) in October 2010

"the global warming scam, with the (literally) trillions of dollars driving it, that has corrupted so many scientists, and has carried APS before it like a rogue wave. It is the greatest and most successful pseudoscientific fraud I have seen in my long life as a physicist."

German meteorologist and physicist Klaus-Eckart Puls had a similar experience as he explained.

"Ten years ago I simply parroted what the IPCC told us. One day I started checking the facts and data – first I started with a sense of doubt but then I became outraged when I discovered that much of what the IPCC and the media were telling us was sheer nonsense and was not even supported by any scientific facts and measurements. To this day I still feel shame that as a scientist I made presentations of their science without first checking it."

For most, it is so bad they think they are misreading it, so they reach out to others for confirmation. This was the experience of people like Albert Jacobs who contacted me several years ago to speak to a small group of Albertans. Their concern about the proposed Kyoto Protocol led to examining the scientific justification and found it wanting. I met the group at the Calgary airport and after convincing them that the science was worse than they surmised the discussion turned to the real issue. Should they stick strictly to the science or be aware that the issue was science corrupted and used for a political agenda. The other issue was making the science understandable to the 80% of the public who are Arts students. To their credit, they stuck to the science and did it with great success.

A few years later I got a call from Malcolm Roberts a recently retired Australian engineer and businessman who also looked at the climate science. I helped him

work with others to create the [Galileo Movement](#), an organization that has achieved the same impact as Friends of Science. Malcolm wanted to become proactive, and as we communicated, he became aware that the real problem was in the deliberate use of bureaucrats. He learned that Maurice Strong set up the IPCC through the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and as Strong knew the politicians and public would not challenge the bureaucrats. This culminated in Roberts running for office under a new Australian Party banner – [One Nation](#).

Meanwhile, he also learned that everything presented to the public was computer generated; there was not a shred of empirical evidence to support the AGW hypothesis. His campaign as the Senator from Queensland was successful, and his [maiden speech](#) started the search for empirical evidence. To my knowledge, it is the first open challenge to the bureaucrats who control the global warming agenda by a politician. He asked the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization (CSIRO), the agency responsible for climate change, to produce empirical evidence for global warming.

They produced a report that failed to provide any evidence. Instead, they countered with English TV celebrity Brian Cox showing a temperature graph from NASA GISS showing the temperature rising. Apparently, he didn't know that a temperature graph is not empirical evidence of AGW. Worse, he didn't know the graph was altered to exaggerate the gradient. If he had done even minimal research, he would have come across [Tony Heller's](#) explanation of what and how the 'adjustments' were made to create exaggerated warming. Because of these events Senator Roberts arranged for Tony and me to appear with him at the Australian Parliament with a public presentation. The Senator spoke about the failure of CSIRO to provide empirical evidence. Tony explained the extent of the corruption of the temperature data, and I provided the entire development and objective of the AGW deception from the Club of Rome through Agenda 21 and the IPCC.

Then, as the ancients would say, the stars aligned. While in Australia with Senator Roberts Donald Trump won the US Presidential election. It will change everything, but especially with the climate corruption. A measure of Trump's acumen and developer's sense was that he appointed various people to head transition teams before the election. He knew you need everything ready to go on the first day of construction. Myron Ebell of the Competitive Enterprise Institute (CEI), who both Tony and I knew, was appointed to lead the transition team dealing with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and climate change. He invited the three

of us to appear at a meeting on Capitol Hill to make similar presentation to those we made in Australia.

We appeared on the Hill on December 12 before Senators, Congressmen, Aides, and members of the public. We then went to the CEI to participate in discussions with a group called “Cooler Heads” that included other members of the EPA transition team. Considerable discussion ensued with many questions related to positive actions. President-elect Trump wants clean air and water, so some form of EPA is required. What is not needed are bureaucrats creating regulations and enforcement without scientific evidence for a political agenda.

It is likely Trump will advocate withdrawal from the Paris Climate Agreement. Ironically, because of Obama’s need to bypass the US Senate, it was an Agreement, not a Treaty. Then, to satisfy less committed nations and reach an agreement for the publicity it was made non-binding. This means the US can walk away and there is nothing any other nation can do.

The exploitation of environmental concerns and global warming to push a political agenda is coming to an end. Control of bureaucracies is critical because they are the massive army of unaccountable control. As American author and social commentator, Mary McCarthy said,

Bureaucracy, the rule of no one, has become the modern form of despotism.

Two actions are required to drain the Washington environmental and climate change swamp; reduction of funding and changes to legislation. Both are scheduled for implementation by the Trump administration under the guidance of the transition teams. Nothing cleans out a swamp better and quicker than a tsunami.

Dr. Tim Ball