

Should ‘global warming’ fraudsters spend time in the clink?



Exclusive: Pat Boone offers Part 3 in his series on discrediting of ‘hockey stick’ scientist

Gentle reader – and fellow taxpayer – let us again examine an important and unfolding story of global climate science fraud unreported by “fake news,” or to put it more tactfully, inaccurate, biased and selective mainstream media.

The recent Mann v. Ball lawsuit verdict, dubbed the “science trial of the century,” has repercussions so profound it has spurred me to write this [series of articles](#) (this is the third, if you’re counting).

Please pay attention – or you’ll feel ashamed in the next few months as the truth of this worldwide deception is totally exposed for all to see.

Penn State professor Michael E Mann’s million-dollar libel case against fellow climate scientist Dr. Tim Ball was recently dismissed due to Mann’s “inexcusable delay.” The judge found in favor of Dr. Ball, the plaintiff, and professor Mann was ordered to pay a large fine and all court expenses, when he absolutely refused to produce the scientific basis for his widely acclaimed and accepted claim that the world is on the verge of deadly “global warming”!

Why is this so important?

Skeptics say that Mann is part of a *criminal* climate conspiracy. They assert Mann’s alarmist and iconic “hockey stick” graph – the cornerstone of U.N. global warming fears – was created from “secret science” – *intentionally* secret because it is fraudulent.

Back in 1999 Dr. Mann and his graph were the game-changer on the international scene, appearing, largely unknown and uncredentialed, as if from nowhere. The hockey stick showed “unprecedented” increases in modern global temperatures.

[Mann told reporters](#), “I found myself at the center of what is arguably the most suicidally contentious issue that we face today: the issue of human caused climate change and what to do about it.”

The only thing unprecedented, says Dr. Ball, is how rookie Mann suddenly appeared, soon after being awarded a “rushed through” Ph.D. and swiftly appointed Lead Scientist by the U.N.’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).

Were you aware of any of this? Was anybody aware of this, including the “mainstream media” that swallowed it, hook, line and sinker?

Mann’s tree ring temperature proxy graph was speedily accepted widely when it suddenly appeared – despite the reality that most scientists who had studied this knew that *higher temperatures than today existed during the Medieval Warm Period (MWP)*.

Understand: It was, and is, known that the overall climate of the world was considerably warmer than now – and there was no industrial revolution existing to blame it on!

The new hockey stick graph was hysterically touted by climate campaigners and policymakers alike, while centuries of painstaking, coolly collated records backing the warmer MWP were instantly ignored.

And those promoting one world government and control were avidly and insistently sounding the “Chicken Little, Sky is Falling” fallacy!

Skeptics smelled a rat, and Dr. Ball was sued by professor Mann – for publicly joking that Mann was a fake and “belongs in the state pen, not Penn State.”

This lawsuit dismissal should have been front-page news, but the media have largely ignored it. Wonder why? The main proponent of “global warning” was being called out as a fraud, and in public court!

But if he was truly concerned for his professional and personal reputation, all Mann had to do was show his data and workings in court. He wouldn’t – evidently, he couldn’t – so he refused. And his reputation has now sunk to the point where a reputed 97% of scientists are having to admit that Mann and his hockey stick theory are evidently a fraud.

Made up out of thin air, not globally warming air.

Despite this lawsuit running over eight years, Mann stubbornly hid his secret numbers from the court. His case was therefore dismissed for “unreasonable delay” – Mann’s “secret science” was staying secret.

Like you, I hope, I’m now asking for common-sense proofs.

My previous column was an appeal to reason, addressed to all parties. Even non-scientists can see the dilemma. I urged Mann to “cough up” all the data, which is what any honest scientist would do. If it’s reality-based – *let’s all see it!* Not just blindly take your word for it, as we have so far.

You know, as well as I do, how all this looks.

If the scientific “basis” for the whole “global warning” scam is bogus, then real scientists should and could have known it long ago. Who and what persuaded them to go along, unquestioning, like proverbial lemmings? Could it be big money, elite interests, even cabals who see this as a means of

assuming control over all production, industry and fuels, worldwide, telling us what we can and can't do – “for our own good”?

These “experts” had us believing temperatures would skyrocket, coasts would be flooded, properties and communities devastated. Remember when President Obama promised he was going to shut down all coal mining? And set about to do it?

The first prominent “Chicken Little,” Al Gore, revealed the “Inconvenient Truth” that he was continent-hopping in his private gas-guzzling jetliner – and the Obamas recently purchased a \$15 million beachfront mansion, which the globally warmed oceans will surely wash away – right?

Do they know something we don't?

If I still have your attention, and I hope I do, you may still be wondering about the real scientific evidence showing that all this “global warning” data are “hokey,” not “hockey” – so let me take you briefly “into the weeds” of actual data.

This is [yeoman's work](#) done by Steve McIntyre, a respected Canadian statistician.

McIntyre checked to see if Mann had done what any diligent scientist would do – perform tests (i.e., an r^2 statistic) to uncover any unforeseen errors in creating his graph. The U.S. House Energy and Commerce Committee's Wegman Commission (2006) asked McIntyre to assist in its investigations.

Wegman wanted answers about the controversial graph and asked Mann whether he had calculated such a verification r^2 statistic and asked what it was.

Even in response to a congressional inquiry, Mann refused to provide the test numbers. He did provide code, and that code revealed for certain that Mann calculated a verification r^2 statistic check during the summer of 2005.

Likewise, the National Academy of Sciences similarly asked Mann questions on whether he performed the verification r^2 regression tests *to verify whether his graph's hockey stick shape was correct*.

Then Mann caught himself out in a lie.

Our errant hokey stick professor flatly denied calculating that – saying that it would be a “foolish and incorrect thing” to do – notwithstanding the fact that his own source code, produced for the House Energy and Commerce Committee, showed that he *had* calculated the r^2 regression statistic: he simply didn't report it. Evidently, because it didn't validate his theory!

Are you smelling what I am? Remember Bernie Madoff – the financial “genius” who blatantly defrauded lots of experienced and very wealthy famous people of a reported *\$50 billion*, and us taxpayers of *billions more*?

Well, Bernie is in jail for several lifetimes – and this effort to stampede all of us into giving up our liberties to produce and create and go about our lives freely as we have become accustomed to do in modern society is a *multitrillion dollar scam* that we've been sold – on intentionally fraudulent data and pressure.

Might there be a vacancy next to Bernie Madoff?

[My gratitude to scientist Tom Tamarkin for the spadework and verifiable references herein.]

[WND](#)