



Up Front

Look at the data.

By C.J. Hadley

I am so far out of the loop that I can't see the rope. I am befuddled, stunned, perplexed and slack jawed at what comes via TV screens. Do the beautifully coiffed talking-head "news media" read the same reports we do and listen to all the testimony before congressional committees? Or do they simply toss the opinions of close to 75 million American citizens off with no guilt and barely a second lost?

Here's something else they will ignore or ridicule: "Climate the Movie: The Cold Truth" is a film by Martin Durkin that features distinguished physicists, astrophysicists and Nobel prize winners—some of whom have written for *RANGE*. Please check these reviews:

From IMDb: "Climate the Movie" is a must-see film for anyone concerned with the future of science and humanity. [It shows] how climate 'science' has been corrupted by politics, money, and the lust for power."

Via EEcav, late March 2024: "It's a bunch of cherry-picked nonsense from a known right-wing activist. There's no reason to treat this as an honest presentation about climate change."

Via NetZerowatch.com: "A lot of people should pay attention to 'Climate the Movie.' This is because whatever you think about catastrophic climate change, it touches on questions about democracy and free speech as well as climate science. But that might not be all that easy because just a day after it was released on March 21, it was shadow-banned by YouTube, making it difficult to do a Google search for it. In a way, this proves some of the points made in the second half of the film; that information on climate change is censored and highly controlled, even if it is true and undisputed."

Steven Koonin, Global Warming Policy Center annual lecturer and the author of "Unsettled," appears in the film and tells his students to "look at the data" then make up their own minds. "Tragically, far too many people—alarmist scientists, politicians, campaigners, journalists—make their minds up and then don't even look at the data. The film illustrates how corrupt some aspects of science have become; just looking at and relaying what the data shows results in censorship and marginalization."

By David Vetter, "The Climate Laundry," April 5, 2024: "Unfortunately for us all, it doesn't especially matter that every one of the film's silly claims is easily debunked: here, on a platter, is a pile of sciencey-sounding spam that the industry's useful trolls can hurl at scientists and climate communicators in a bid to waste bandwidth."

From Peter Murphy of CFACT, March 27, 2024: "[Mankind's] ability to control the weather and change the planet's climate is greatly exaggerated. More precisely, it is a fruitless and wastrel endeavor and unnecessary besides.... Climate will always change, no matter how many square miles of solar panels and wind turbines desecrate the landscape and oceans, regardless of how many strip-mined electric vehicles the government attempts to force-feed us, and no matter how many trillions of dollars are printed and spent by politicians and virtue-signaling multibillionaires.

"Climate change is a natural phenomenon primarily influenced by solar activity, including sunspots, solar winds, and cloud formation.... Instead, said industry is obsessed with carbon dioxide, which is a trace atmospheric gas comprising four ten-thousandths of the atmosphere, or 0.04 percent, that is essential to human, animal, and plant life."

From *The Epoch Times*, Dec. 20-26, 2023: "With current siting practices, an area the size of Texas is required to accommodate the wind and solar infrastructure we need to reach nationwide net-zero emissions by 2050," said Katharine Hayhoe, chief scientist for renewable energy advocate The Nature Conservancy. These grand schemes are being held up by the fact that 70 percent—or 1.3 billion acres—of the land in the contiguous 48 states is currently privately owned, and its owners often refuse to allow solar panels, wind turbines, power lines, and carbon pipelines to be installed."

According to the Renewable Rejection Database, compiled by journalist and author Robert Bryce, more than 600 communities across the United States have so far blocked or banned large solar and wind projects and other renewable energy ventures that they believe will damage local environments. "For the net-zero industry, however, centralizing land rights may solve this problem. In a 2020 report by Vanderbilt Law School faculty J.B. Ruhl and James Salzman, the authors advocate for 'more streamlined, top-down, preemptive processes,' as well as extensive use of eminent domain powers to speed the development of wind and solar projects."

Whose money, land, and freedoms are at risk? *Ours*. But sometimes it seems like we've just given the hangman a noose and said, "Hold this for me." ■