



As they lose arguments, climate scientists call for ban on dissenting views

## Description

A cohort of climate fanatics claiming to be “scientists” is demanding that a prominent science journal pull a recent study about the alleged “climate crisis” because the paper does not align with the prevailing global warming dogma.

*The European Physical Journal Plus*, published by Springer Nature, published the review, which looked at data on possible changes in the frequency or intensity of rainfall, cyclones, tornadoes, droughts, and other extreme weather events.

“On the basis of observation data, the climate crisis that, according to many sources, we are experiencing today, is not evident,” reads a summary of the 20-page study.

To the average climate fanatic, these are *fighting words*. They insist that cow farts and gas-powered cars are heating up the planet, which in turn is causing there to be bad weather in some areas from time to time.

The *AFP* fake news agency was so upset by the study’s findings that its employees frantically contacted a slew of climate scientists, at least four of which “confirmed” that the paper must be false. (Related: There is no climate emergency, according to real scientists.)

“The paper gives the appearance of being specifically written to make the case that there is no climate crisis, rather than presenting an objective, comprehensive, up-to-date assessment,” said Richard Betts, the Head of Climate Impacts Research at Britain’s Met Office.

“They are writing this article in bad faith,” further complained Friederike Otto, a senior climatologist at the Grantham Institute for Climate Change and the Environment.

“They do not have a section on heat waves” – mentioned only in passing – “where the observed trends are so incredibly obvious.”

## Climate crazies are coming unhinged as their golden calf gets

## deconstructed

If either of these two climate fanatics is to be taken seriously, then how come they are not refuting the paper's claims using facts? Why are they not specifically pointing out where the paper went wrong and correcting the record?

The only thing they are doing is stating that they do not like the study's findings – but it gets worse. Not only do they disagree with the paper, but they want it retracted immediately without going through the usual process of formal refutation.

"If you disagree with a particular scientific study, you challenge it on a factual basis and point out exactly where it is flawed," writes Paul Homewood in a guest piece for *Watts Up With That*.

"There is a well-established method of doing this, which is to ask the journal to print a response to the original article. Normally the paper's authors would of course have a right of reply. That is the way the real facts are established."

"To simply demand that the journal withdraw the paper is the worst sort of censorship, and reminds us all of the dark days of Climategate, when such practices were rife whenever anybody dared to challenge the climate establishment's agenda."

Fascism seems to be the only "argument" that climate fanatics have when it comes to "debunking" science of which they disapprove. Rather than challenge criticisms point by point, they instead resort to a witch hunt, followed by a burning at the stake for all climate offenders.

In this case, the goal is simply to force the study's retraction so that as few people as possible see it and consider the points it makes. Does that sound like a sound scientific approach to you?

Homewood says critics of the paper have every right to disagree with its claims, but "they need to present the facts ... instead of blackmailing *The European Physical Journal Plus* into withdrawing the paper."

by: Ethan Huff

### Category

1. ECO-Climate-Environment
2. Freedom-Free speech-Resistance & H-rights
3. Main

### Date Created

10/06/2022