Canada Free Press - Printer Friendly Page © V2.0 - CJ Website Design www.cj-design.com

## **Demagoguery and Rhetoric, Climate Change**

# The End Doesn't Justify the Means When you Deliberately Deceive

By Dr. Tim Ball Tuesday, September 8, 2009

A pattern has emerged in Obama's policy initiatives. It's not the change in ideas or methods promised and it isn't new. It is pure demagoguery. A demagogue, is defined as, "A political leader who seeks support by appealing to popular desires and prejudices rather than by using rational argument." Aristophanes (446-386 B.C.), a comic playwright, used it in a satire about a political leader, but there is nothing funny or satirical about what Obama is doing.

In modern times <u>H.L.Mencken defined</u> a demagogue as, "one who preaches doctrines he knows to be untrue to men he knows to be idiots." Mencken also explains why he knows they are untrue. "The whole aim of practical politics is to keep the populace alarmed (and hence clamorous to be led to safety) by menacing it with an endless series of hobgoblins, all of them imaginary." Obama plays the game by finding a fault and inflating and conflating it to a catastrophe. It's easy because, you can always find fault and elaboration is easy. Elaboration is always to the point where he can argue government intervention is the only solution. Here a third Mencken quote is relevant. "The urge to save humanity is almost always a false front for the urge to rule." Thomas Sowell already identified Obama as a demagogue and has written about his urge to save humanity. "Barack Obama says that he wants to "heal America and repair the world." One wonders what he will do for an encore and whether he will rest on the seventh day." Obama the great savior rides to the rescue assuring people he does not want it this way but there is no choice; besides government intervention is only temporary. The giveaway is there is no substance and no proof. Sowell notes, "It is not too much to ask politicians to talk specifics, instead of trying to sweep us along, turning off our minds and turning on our emotions, with soaring rhetoric".

Everyone agrees Obama is a master at rhetoric. It was <u>noted</u> in the presidential race. Specifics were not considered as critical then, although some were concerned. By contrast, newcomer Obama is largely a stage presence defined mostly by his powerful rhetoric. The trouble, at least for me, is the huge and deceptive gap between his captivating oratory and his actual views.

His actual views require specifics and Obama is consistently short on them. As Jack Shafer <u>notes</u>, "Given that many of his speeches are criminally short on specifics....how does Obama do that thing he does?". The answer is he never provides facts. He got away with it in the campaign because of the hysteria and euphoria of having an African American President. Now, as Sowell writes, "The time is long overdue for voters to demand specifics instead of rhetoric that turns their emotions on and their minds off."

Dr. Tim Ball Bio

**Email Article** 

**Shop CFP** 

**Photo Gallery** 



## The Beef is where's the Beef

When facts are provided they're always found wanting. They either don't apply or are lies that don't sustain the rhetoric. Obama's method has taken major parts of society, including Wall Street, the banking industry, housing, the automotive industry, health care, and the environment and claimed they're corrupt or on the verge of collapse. When that doesn't work, he suggests they're part of the greedy, avaricious and exploitive system represented by the previous administration that exploits the bad side of human nature. He warns this will continue without government control and he is the savior who knows what's best for you. As a Canadian I am familiar with this approach. I watched former Prime Minister Pierre Elliot Trudeau, masquerading as the philosopher king to hide his socialist intent. Like Obama, his former writings and associations told the real story. He only adopted a moderate position in his rhetoric to gain power.

The objective of all political rhetoric is to impose a political system. The difference is between those who want a system that allows the individual to determine their lives and those who want to determine the lives of the individual. Here I examine the lies told to use the environment to achieve a political system of complete control.

Obama's rhetoric is a continuation of the "humans are destroying the world" claims of the Club of Rome. Their classic statement was that "The Earth has cancer and the cancer is man." Here is Obama's application of that thinking to climate. "Climate change is real. Not only is it real, it's here, and its effects are giving rise to a frighteningly new global phenomenon: the man-made natural disaster." The statement is asinine. Climate change is a natural phenomenon so saying climate change is real is like saying tides are real or women are having babies is real. Then we are told, "it's here", when it has always been here. The last part is a euphemism for humans causing global cancer. Obama's statements underscore his ignorance about climate and leave political motivation as the only explanation. It isn't science, it isn't logic, but it is deception. It dashes the hopes of Donella Meadows, one author of Limits to Growth who said, "A knowledgeable and courageous U.S. president could help enormously in leading the world's nations toward saving the climate."

#### Ads by Google

Are your savings insured?
Find out with the CDIC Deposit Insurance Calculator today.

www.cdic.ca/calculator

Embed Video on Webpage Create Custom Flash Players Easily No Coding Required. Try Free Trial. www.KickApps.com

No Programming Needed Design a Great Website in One Hour with No Javascript Skills Required. www.avanquest.com

Social
Bookmark &
Upload
Submit links of
Articles, Videos,
Images for free.
Even earn
money!
CodexFind.com

# Who is the Enemy?

There are several early statements symptomatic of the rational for deception. It's a classic case of the end justifying the means. The 1974 report of the Club of Rome titled, *Mankind at the Turning Point*" says, "It would seem that humans need a common motivation...either a real one or else one invented for the purpose...In searching for a new enemy to unite us, we came up with the idea that pollution, the threat of global warming, water shortages, famine and the like would fit the bill. All these dangers are caused by human intervention, and it is only through changed attitudes and behavior that they can be overcome. The real enemy then, is humanity itself." The last sentence is correct, but not as they intend. The enemy is that small portion of humanity who thinks they know what is best for others and are determined to control them by whatever means possible. The frightening thing is they admit they are deceiving us. Here are some of their comments;

**Timothy Wirth**, former one-term Senator and now President of the UN Foundation "We've got to ride this global warming issue. Even if the theory of global warming is wrong, we will be doing the

right thing in terms of economic and environmental policy."

**Christine Stewart**, former Canadian Minister of the Environment "No matter if the science of global warming is all phony...climate change provides the greatest opportunity to bring about justice and equality in the world."

**Prof. Chris Folland**, Hadley Centre for Climate Prediction and Research "The data doesn't matter. We're not basing our recommendations on the data. We're basing them on the climate models."

**Dr David Frame**, climate modeler at Oxford University "The models are convenient fictions that provide something very useful."

The last two quotes speak about computer models, the favorite vehicle for those who want to deceive about the environment and the climate. It doesn't matter that the models don't work. As **Tim Palmer** leading climate modeler at the European Centre for Medium Range Weather Forecasts said; "I don't want to undermine the IPCC, but the forecasts, especially for regional climate change, are immensely uncertain." Yet the regional models are far more accurate than the IPCC General Circulation Models (GCM).

Computer models are useful because they have a scientific aura and people don't understand them. As **Pierre Gallois** explained, "*If you put tomfoolery into a computer, nothing comes out of it but tomfoolery. But this tomfoolery, having passed through a very expensive machine, is somehow ennobled and no-one dares criticize it.*" The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Reports provides temperature estimates from their computers that the world uses as predictions. The deception is they say they are scenarios not predictions but they know they're used as predictions and do nothing to correct the misuse.

The Club of Rome publication *Limits to Growth* used computer models and the same technique. They explain, *The World3 (sic) model was not intended to be predictive or for making detailed forecasts, but to provide a means for better understanding the behaviour of the world economic system. "In this first simple world model, we are interested only in the broad behavior modes of the population-capital system."* The reality was that like the IPCC models the outputs were used as predictions. This is not surprising because the authors used them to predict a collapse of the resource and global ecology in the first case and devastating runaway warming in the second case.

## **How Much Time Left Or Is It Too Late?**

The Club also started the trend of saying there is only so much time left. In 1974 their *Report Mankind at the Turning Point*, "*Ten or twenty years from now it will probably be too late*." With this example, and by exploiting fears and deceiving people about impending doom they have caused fools to rush in and make equally ludicrous comments.

Al Gore said, "If the vast majority of the world's scientists are right, we have just ten years to avert a major catastrophe..."

James Hansen of NASA Goddard Institute of Space Studies (GISS) says we have four years left.

**Prince Charles,** a real court jester, has <u>calculated</u> we have 100 months (93 left) to avert catastrophe. I assume he told the plants when he spoke with them.

**Steve Connor**, Science Editor of the UK newspaper the Independent tells us, "Many scientists believe that we have about 10 years left to enact policies that will curb dangerous climate change."

In 2007 The **World Wide Fund for Nature <u>said</u>**, "Our planet is just five years away from climate change catastrophe - but can still be saved, according to a new report."

In a 2008 Salt Lake Tribune story, **Carlos Pascual** vice president for foreign policy studies and Strobe Talbott president of the Brookings Institution, <u>said</u> we have 8 years left. **Thomas E. Lovejoy**, of the Smithsonian Institution said, "*Most of the great environmental struggles will be either won or lost in the 1990s and ... by the next century it will be too late.*" The report, <u>Meeting the Climate Challenge</u> published in 2005 claimed we had 10 years left.

## Child Abuse of Future Generations?

Some of these predictions are already wrong, but all of them will be wrong. This is not surprising because the science on which they are built is deliberately false. An accurate prediction is encapsulated in James Froude's comment that "Fear is the parent of cruelty." The pain Obama and the deceiver's actions will inflict on future generations are certain.

## (9) Reader Feedback | Subscribe

Dr. Tim Ball Most recent columns

Copyright © 2009 CFP

"Dr. Tim Ball is a renowned environmental consultant and former climatology professor at the University of Winnipeg. Dr. Ball employs his extensive background in climatology and other fields as an advisor to the International Climate Science Coalition, Friends of Science and the Frontier

Centre for Public Policy.â€

Dr. Ball can be reached at: <u>Letters@canadafreepress.com</u>

Older articles by Dr. Tim Ball

Printed from: http://canadafreepress.com/index.php/article/14509