SCC Publishing
Michelets vei 8 B
1366 Lysaker Norway

ISSN: 2703-9072

Correspondence:
g-hasne@online.no

Vol. 5.4 (2025)
pp. 1-15

A Substitute for Science: Recognizing Climate Rethoric

Geir Hasnes

Independent scientist, Kongsberg, Norway

Abstract

Climate rhetoric is filling the news media, based as it is on the IPCC Assessment Reports, which pose as untainted pure science. First, a part of the IPCC AR WG II is examined, and its science fails abysmally. Second, the general rhetorical tricks are examined, and when looked into, one finds that they also fail abysmally, not only among scientists, but also among most people.

Keywords: Climate rhetoric; rhetorical tricks; propaganda;IPCC

https://doi.org/10.53234/scc202511/02

1. Climate rhetoric

In the Norwegian journalist trade magazine *Journalisten* appeared an article on the coverage of the climate area in 2007, in which one critical author, Onar Åm, and one climate researcher, Rasmus Benestad, gave their views on the topic. (1)

The article stated that "Scientists who challenge the prevailing consensus on the climate area, complain about one-sided media coverage and refused newspaper contributions. The author of the new book "*The fight about the climate*", Onar Åm, believes Norwegian media has decided that the debate has ended.

"At the Meteorological Institute, climate scientist Rasmus Benestad is employed. He thinks that media coverage of the climate changes suffer from other weaknesses. Recently, he accused the website *Forskning.no* (An official research website in Norway) to act uncritically to the climate skeptics and further desinformation that is apt to cast doubt about the climate changes. Benestad feels that as a scientist, he must speak up so that media may convey the best possible knowledge on climate science.

"It is a sympathetic thought that the minority shall be heard. This is important in a democracy. But science doesn't work like that, because there, what counts is quality. The goal is to give society the best knowledge.

"The sceptics are usually not climate scientists, but sun scientists, geologists or economists. And they often bring up topics that the climate science feel they have done with.

"The climate scientist states that no report has been examined more thoroughly than the UN's climate report. – Science is not about what is most true, we are talking about what is most convincing. And scientific consensus is per definition most convincing, Benestad

says. The IPCC report is a summary of all scientific literature published after the previous report was published."

Here we learn about pure climate propaganda in the making. We may notice the terms:

- Climate scientist,
- Accuses media to act uncritically,
- Climate skeptics,
- Desinformation,
- Casting doubt,
- Science no democracy,
- Sceptics not climate scientists,
- Topics are done with,

These are all domination techniques. The supreme domination technique is shown in these statements:

- No report has been examined more thoroughly than the UN's climate report.
- Scientific consensus is per definition most convincing.

However, the first statement is remarkably uncritical to the IPCC report, while the second statement is only used to suppress criticism, referring to an alleged consensus between the scientists.

As we shall see below, the first statement will be shown not to be true. The second statement is an oxymoron: Science is not about consensus, and consensus has nothing to do with science.

2. Textual analysis of the UN Assessment Report, 2007

As a rule, we can't always take statements on science at face value.

- Benestad states: No report has been more carefully examined.

However, let us examine a part of the Assessment Report. Let's find out about peer review in practice.

- The passage we shall look at is part of AR 4, WG II, Chapter 10, pp. 469-506; 38 pages. 2)
- The chapter is authored by 23 'scientists, professors etc.'+ two review editors.
- Each person has authored on average 1,65 pages which they have been working with probably for years.
- The peer review of the report must have caused probably thousands of comments.

We shall have a look at Chapter 10.6.2, p. 493, the first two paragraphs, which we divide into nine separate statements:

10.6.2 The Himalayan glaciers

1. Himalayan glaciers cover about three million hectares or 17 % of the mountain area as compared to 2.2% in the Swiss Alps.
2. They form the largest body of ice outside the polar caps and are the source of water for the innumerable rivers that flow across the Indo-Gangetic plains.

3. Himalayan glacial snowfields store about 12,000 km3 of freshwater.
4. About 15,000 Himalayan glaciers form a unique reservoir which supports perennial rivers such as the Indus, Ganga and Brahmaputra which, in turn, are the lifeline of millions of people in South Asian countries (Pakistan, Nepal, Bhutan, India and Bangladesh).
5. The Gangetic basin alone is home to 500 million people, about 10% of the total human population in the region.
6. Glaciers in the Himalaya are receding faster than in any other part of the world (see Table 10.9)
7. and, if the present rate continues, the likelihood of them disappearing by the year 2035 and perhaps sooner is very high if the Earth keeps warming at the current rate.
8. Its total area will likely shrink from the present 500,000 to 100,000 km2 by the year 2035
9. (WWF, 2005).

Now, we can scrutinize the different statements.

First finding

The first finding is that there is *something wrong with the specified sizes*:

- In Statement 1: Himalaya's glaciers cover 30,000 km^2 (about three million hectares).
- In Statement 8: Himalaya's glaciers cover 500,000 km^2.

So we need to look up the source for the statements and examine it.

Examine the source

The single source of these two paragraphs is listed as Statement 9 (*WWF, 2005*), which is found in the reference list at p. 505:

- *WWF (WorldWildlife Fund), 2005: An overview of glaciers, glacier retreat, and subsequent impacts in Nepal, India and China*. WorldWildlife Fund, Nepal Programme, 79 pp. (3)

We then find it on the internet:

- https://www.wwf.or.jp/activities/lib/pdf_climate/environment/Overview_of_Glaciers.pdf

Second finding

The second finding is that the number of 500,000 km^2 *does not exist* in *WWF, 2005*.

- Statement 8 has been given as reference Statement 9.
- But there is no such number in *WWF, 2005*.

Examine the source (WWF, 2005) further

We now look for other of the statements in the source.

Statements 6 and 7 are found at p. 29:

> "Country Case Study 2 :India: Glaciers, glacier retreat and its impact: Introduction

> "As discussed in the thematic introduction to this regional status review, there is particular concern at the alarming rate of retreat of Himalayan glaciers. In 1999, a report by the Working Group on Himalayan Glaciology (WGHG) of the International Commission for Snow and Ice (ICSI) stated: "glaciers in the Himalayas are receding faster than in any other part of the world and, if the present rate continues, the livelihood of them disappearing by the year 2035 is very high". Direct observation of a select few snout positions out of the thousands of Himalayan glaciers indicate that they have been in a general state of decline over, at least, the past 150 years."

We find Statement 6 and Statement 7 in this paragraph, with a reference to "*a report by the Working Group on Himalayan Glaciology (WGHG)* of the International Commission for Snow and Ice (ICSI)".

Third finding

The third finding is that the WWF report took its material *from somewhere else*.

- (*WWF, 2005)* is not the main source of Statements 6 and 7. The sentence refers to *another report*, this time by *WGHG*.
- However, there is no reference to this WGHG report in the reference list of (*WWF, 2005)*.

Examine the source even further

As we can't find a report by WGHG, we now search for the phrase ICSI.

It is found on p. 2 in (*WWF, 2005*):

> "The *New Scientist* magazine carried the article "Flooded Out – Retreating glaciers spell disaster for valley communities" in their 5 June 1999 issue. It quoted Professor Syed Hasnain, then Chairman of the International Commission for Snow and Ice's (ICSI) Working Group on Himalayan Glaciology, who said most of the glaciers in the Himalayan region "will vanish within 40 years as a result of global warming". The article also predicted that freshwater flow in rivers across South Asia will "eventually diminish, resulting in widespread water shortages"."

Fourth finding

The fourth finding is *that even though WGHC and ICSI are mentioned as sources, the sources are not given*.

- There is no reference to the ICSI-report from 1999 either in (*WWF, 2005*).
- There is only a reference to the *New Scientist* magazine.

Examine the source with regard to Statement 1

Statement 1 quantified the cover of the Himalayan glaciers to be about three million hectares. Can this be found in *(WWF, 2005)*?

On p. 36 we find:

> "Recently the geologists of Geological Survey of India (GSI) counted 5,218 glaciers in the Himalayas (Puri 1994). It is estimated that 33,200 km2 (Flint 1971)

> of the Himalaya is glaciated and glaciers occupy about 17 percent of the total mountainous area of the Himalaya (Vohra 1978)".

But on p. 44 we find:

> "In the whole of the Himalayan Range, there are 18,065 glaciers with a total area of 34,659.62km2 and a total ice volume of 3,734.4796 km3 (Qin Dahe 1999)."

Fifth finding

The fifth finding is that the glacier area was estimated to 33,200 km2 in 1971 and to 34,659 km2 in 1999.

- The statements in the source are both larger and more detailed than Statement 1.
- According to the report, *the glaciers grew from 1971 to 1999*, contradicting Statement 6.
- It doesn't make sense that the numbers in the given source *differ* from the IPCC report.

Sixth finding

The sixth finding is that the number of glaciers are given as *18,065*.

- The statement in the source is larger and more detailed than Statement 4.
- Statement 4 states that there are 15,000 glaciers in Himalaya, but the reference gives the number 18,065. How can the number of glaciers change from the source to the IPCC report?

Examine the source of the source (New Scientist 1999)

Obviously, we have now found that the given source doesn't give the pieces of information that it is said to provide for IPCC report. So we have to examine the source for the source, which is given, as we can see above, as an article called *Flooded out* in the *New Scientist* magazine, June 5, 1999, by Fred Pearce. It opens: (4)

> "Melting Himalayan glaciers are threatening to unleash a torrent of floods into mountain valleys, and ultimately dry up rivers across South Asia. A new study, due to be presented in July to the International Commission on Snow and Ice (ICSI), predicts that most of the glaciers in the region will vanish within 40 years as a result of global warming.
>
> "All the glaciers in the middle Himalayas are retreating," says Syed Hasnain of Jawaharlal Nehru University in Delhi, the chief author of the ICSI report. A typical example is the Gangorti glacier at the head of the River Ganes, which is retreating at a rate of 30 metres per year. Hasnain's four-year study indicates that all the glaicers in the central and eastern Himalayas could disappear at their present rate of decline."

Seventh finding

The seventh finding is that we still *can't find the references* that have given the numbers of the IPCC report, while at the same time, the referred WGHG and ICSI report was *not published*.

- The *ICSI report* referred to in the *WWF report* is only mentioned in the *New Scientist* interview. There is no reference to it in the article.
- Still, the glaciers may disappear in 2035, but now it refers to the glaciers in the central and eastern Himalayas (only).
- In *Hydropower: Hydroelectric Power Generation from Alpine Glacier Melt* by Mauri Pelto, Encyclopedia of Earth Sciences Series, 2011, we find the report is referred to as "Hasnain, S. I., 1999. Report on Himalayan glaciology. Appendix 6, *unpublished minutes of the July 1999 meeting*, ICSI Bureau." (5)
- While a report where Hasnain is co-author: *Atmospheric Brown Clouds*, UNEP, 2008, refers to the referred report as "Hasnain, S.I. (1999). Final report of Himalayan Glaciology Working Group (1985-1999). International Association of Cryospheric Sciences http://www.cryosphericsciences.org (Unpublished)" (6)
- We also note that while the *New Scientist* article carried no own research, it was still given as source in the *WWF report*.

Examine the source of the source of the source (Down to Earth 1999)

The New Scientist article did not carry any references, but an internet search led to another journal, Down to Earth, which carried the article that the New Scientist based its article on: Glaciers beating retreat by the journal's staff, Apr. 30, 1999. (7)

Its ingress opens:

> "Himalayan glaciers, source of water for the innumerable rivers that flow across the Indo-Gangetic plains, are receding. And that too at a phenomenal rate."

Hear we can read that:

> "Glaciers in the Himalaya are receding faster than in any other part of the world and, if the present rate continues, the likelihood of them disappearing by the year 2035 is very high," says the International Commission for Snow and Ice (icsi) in its recent study on Asian glaciers. "But if the Earth keeps getting warmer at the current rate, it might happen much sooner," says Syed Iqbal Hasnain of the School of Environmental Sciences, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi. Hasnain is also the chairperson of the Working Group on Himalayan Glaciology (wghg), constituted in 1995 by the icsi."
>
> "The glacier will be decaying at rapid, catastrophic rates. Its total area will shrink from the present 500,000 to 100,000 square km by the year 2035," says former icsi president V M Kotlyakov in the report *Variations of snow and ice in the past and present on a global and regional scale* (see table: *Receding rivers of ice*)."

Eighth finding

The eight finding is that we now find *the real source* behind much of the IPCC chapter.

- The first two sentences in the first paragraph gives nearly word by word (except for the table reference) Statement 6 and 7 in the report. Here, Syed Hasnain is quoted as saying this.
- Now we also find Statement 8 in the second paragraph. Here we find yet another source, a report by some V. M. Kotlyakov, which we must investigate.
- We must also notice that the WWF report lists the *Down to Earth* article in the references, but there is no reference to it in the text.

So far, still, the glaciers will disappear by 2035, and now there is no limit to which glaciers as in the *New Scientist* article.

Let us also note this from the article:

> "In India, there is very poor database on glaciers. And whatever exists is in the form of snapshots. On the other hand, excellent studies have been conducted on Nepal's glaciers. So we presume their conclusions would also be applicable for glaciers in our country, particularly those in Sikkim, Garhwal and Kumaon Himalaya," says Hasnain."

- We note that Hasnain is quite sure on the receding glaciers, with *very poor data*.

Ninth finding

The ninth finding is that the IPCC editors have included a *non-referred source*.

In *Down to Earth* we can also read:

> "Himalayan glaciers cover about three million hectares or 17 per cent of the mountain area as compared to 2.2 per cent in the Swiss Alps. They form the largest body of ice outside the Polar caps. The 15,000-odd Himalayan glaciers form a unique reservoir which supports mighty perennial rivers such as the Indus, Ganga and Brahmaputra which, in turn, are the lifeline of millions of people. The Gangetic basin alone is home to 500 million people, about 10 per cent of the total human population."

- The passage is used almost word by word in the *IPCC report*, Statements 1, 2, 4 and 5.

The WWF report, about the same topic, states:

> "Himalayan glaciers form a unique reservoir that supports mighty perennial rivers such as Indus, Ganga and Brahmaputra, which are the lifelines of millions of people."

And:

"Himalayan glacial snowfields store about 12,000 cubic kilometres of freshwater and have a significant cooling affect in the entire region," says [Jagdish] Bahadur."

- The passage is used as input to the IPCC report's Statement 3.

It also states:

> "Recently the geologists of Geological Survey of India (GSI) counted 5,218 glaciers in the Himalayas (Puri 1994)."

- Let us hope the 5,218 glaciers are found in India, as the number differs from the 15,000 and 18,065 given elsewhere.
- The source: *Puri, V.M.M. (1994). Glacier Inventory, Geol. Surv. India (unpublished lecture notes), Foundation Course in Glaciology, 20p.*, is interesting since it is unpublished.

Examine the source of the source of the source of the source (Kotlyakov, 1996)

We find the report *Variations of Snow and Ice in the past and present on a Global and Regional scale*, Edited by V. M. Kotlyakov (Paris: UNESCO), 1996, on the internet. (8)

On p. 66 we can read:

> "The degradation of the extrapolar glaciation of the Earth will be apparent in rising ocean level already be the year 2050, and there will be a drastic rise of the ocean thereafter caused by the deglaciation-derived runoff (see Table 11). This period will last from 200 to 300 years. The extrapolar glaciation of the Eaeth wil be decaying at rapid, catastrophic rates – its total area will shrink from 500,000 to 100,000 km^2 by the year 2350. Glaciers will survive only in the mountains of inner Alaska, on some Arctic archipelagos, within Patagonian ice sheets, in the Karakoram Mountains, in the Himalayas, in some regioins of Tibet and on the highest mountain peaks in the temperature latitudes."

Tenth finding

The tenth finding is that the number of 500,000 was *not about Himalaya alone*.

- It was not the glaciers of Himalaya, as in statement 8, but *all non-polar glaciers,* that covered 500,000 km^2 and were going to shrink to 100,000 km^2.
- The authors of the IPCC report have *misunderstood* this what they have included.

Eleventh finding

The eleventh finding is the year of ***2350***.

- The year when 20% of the glaciers should be left, was *2350*, not 2035.
- *The authors, review editors, commentators etc. of the IPCC report have accepted the year as 2035 without any critical sense at all*.

Twelfth finding

The twelfth finding is that *no complete disappearance is found in the source*.

- The likelihood that the glaciers may disappear completely is *not treated by Kotlyakov*.
- It is simply something that *Hasnain opinionated* – without any backing.

Textual conclusions

In Chapter 10.6.2 The Himalayan glaciers, IPCC presented a hotchpotch:

- Statement 1) Himalayan glaciers cover about three million hectares or 17% of the mountain area as compared to 2.2% in the Swiss Alps. Source: *Down to Earth*, inaccurate statement.

- Statement 2) They form the largest body of ice outside the polar caps and are the source of water for the innumerable rivers that flow across the Indo-Gangetic plains. Source: *Down to Earth*, first part taken from the article's content, second part taken from the ingress.
- Statement 3) Himalayan glacial snowfields store about 12,000 km^3 of freshwater. Source: *Down to Earth*, quote from Jagdish Bahadur.
- Statement 4) About 15,000 Himalayan glaciers form a unique reservoir which supports perennial rivers such as the Indus, Ganga and Brahmaputra which, in turn, are the lifeline of millions of people in South Asian countries (Pakistan, Nepal, Bhutan, India and Bangladesh). Source: *Down to Earth*, countries are added.
- Statement 5) The Gangetic basin alone is home to 500 million people, about 10% of the total human population in the region. Source: *Down to Earth*.
- Statement 6) Glaciers in the Himalaya are receding faster than in any other part of the world (see Table 10.9). Source: *Down to Earth*, here quoting the unpublished ICSI-report. Not taking into account that the source says that the glaciers are *badly monitored* and that the WWF source also gives numbers showing that the glaciers are *growing*.
- Statement 7) and, if the present rate continues, the likelihood of them disappearing by the year 2035 and perhaps sooner is very high if the Earth keeps warming at the current rate. Source: *Down to Earth*, the first part quoting, wrongly, Kotlyakov who gives the year as 2350; the second part taken from the quote from Hasnain, who *opinionates*, because Kotlyakov doesn't state that they will disappear.
- Statement 8) Its total area will likely shrink from the present 500,000 to 100,000 km^2 by the year 2035. Source: *Down to Earth*, quoting Kotlyakov wrongly; he doesn't speak about Himalaya and uses the year 2350.
- Statement 9) (WWF, 2005). Minimally has been taken directly from the given source.

Methodical conclusions

Chapter 10.6.2 of the IPCC AR4 WG2 report of 2007 has been thoroughly examined:

- It fails abysmally. Nothing of it can be trusted, except the superficial facts, for instance that Himalaya has got some glaciers.
- The facts are inaccurate, differ between them, and have originated on different dates.
- Its main conclusions are not only wrong, but either
    - misunderstood (not only Himalayan glaciers),
    - remembered wrongly (2035),
    - mixing numbers without seeing it (30,000 vs. 500,000),
    - the opposite of what the source actually says (the glaciers grew)
    - or even made up (likelihood of them disappearing by the year 2035 and *perhaps sooner*).
- Its use of sources is abysmal.

- It is completely unbelievable that this chapter must have taken months to produce.
- The review editors cannot have 'reviewed' the paragraphs more than just reading through it and accepting it at face value. They haven't even spotted the contradictions and the unlikely year of disapperance.
- The peer review may have caused comments, but we do not know anything else than that those comments cannot have been taken into consideration.

With respect to Benestad's statements, we may therefore conclude that:

- It is not true that 'no report has been more critically examined than the IPCC report'.
- 'Scientific consensus' is not most convincing.
- Looking into the texts, we don't always find that 'consensus' when it comes to the facts.

With respect to the IPCC's treatment of scientific criticism, we note that:

- The 2035 statement caused a scandal in 2007. The IPCC including its chairman vehemently rejected all criticism.
- Reluctantly, they accepted the error by 2010.
- The IPCC report has not been corrected since; it is still found on the official site in its original state.
- Therefore, the IPCC reports can not be trusted.

What we see here is the two worst things you can do in science:

- Making up facts to fit theories
- Avoiding to examine the sources

3. Climate rhetorical tricks

Calculated propaganda

The IPCC is not the only institution that bends the facts and their interpretation. The editors of *The Guardian* made the following statement about their coverage on climate in a guideline in 2019 (9)

- We recently reviewed the language used in our coverage of the environment, and whether the terms we use reflect the phenomena that they describe in an accurate enough way.
- We want to ensure that we are being scientifically precise, while also communicating clearly with readers on this very important issue.
- The phrase 'climate change', for example, sounds rather passive and gentle when what scientists are talking about is a catastrophe for humanity.
- Increasingly, climate scientists and organizations from the UN to the Met Office are changing their terminology, and using stronger language to describe the situation we're in.
- That's why we want to change the terms we now use as follows: Use *climate emergency, crisis or breakdown* instead of climate change; use global heating instead of global warming, use *climate science denier* or *climate denier* instead of climate skeptic.

One may wonder whether they are desperate.

Recognizing propaganda

A discussion about scientific topics may often include textual clues that unmask statements as unscientific and meant for propaganda purposes. Below, a few of such types of statements are listed:

- *Uncertain or vague terms* that people can put whatever they imagine into, such as 'climate *change*', 'emissions' 'man-made warming', 'earlier than expected', 'extreme', 'sustainable', 'green',
- *Unrelated terms* that people can imagine are related, such as 'wildfires', 'cow farts', 'eating meat', 'heatwave', '97%',
- *Unrelated phenomena* such as cooling towers with water vapor coloured dark brown, giving the impresson of 'man-made dangerous emissions', or dying polar bears,
- *Unknown authorities* that people regard as truth witnesses, such as '[something scary may happen soon], say scientists' – always in plural,
- *Vague scientific terms* that people don't understand at all, such as 'climate sensitivity', 'greenhouse effect', 'tipping point', 'the precautionary principle', that sounds important on a large scale,
- *Lying by presenting truth, but not the context*, such as 'the country is warming twice as fast as the world', but not adding that the ocean is part of the world,
- *Apocalyptic prophecies* – 'we only have [n] years to save...', they are in general not true,
- *Appealing to emotions* such as 'our children', 'rich versus poor', 'inequalities',
- In short, everything that makes the reader/listener *assume* something bad.

Recognizing assumptions

We do not always recognize that in every discussion, there is a need to agree upon some common assumptions, as if they were agreed upon facts.

- The '1,5-degree goal' – goal for whom? What about the original '2-degree goal'?
- 'It has never been as hot before!' – note the use of 'never',
- 'The climate has been stable for so-and-so long' – pretty undocumented,
- The very best propaganda is the one that makes people put their own opinion into it. That's why Obama succeeded with the bland phrase "Yes, we can!" and Trump with the equally bland phrase "Make America great again!". Both seem suggestive of people's imaginations because everyone can imagine something that needs something to be done about it.

The main assumption in the scientific debate is that the 'hockey stick splice' of graphs is a fact. To which one may answer: "And Marilyn Monroe was a mermaid."

Figure 1. Proof that Marilyn Monroe was a mermaid.

Al Gore on propaganda **(**10)

- "Nobody is interested in solutions if they don't think there's a problem."
- "Given that starting point, I believe it is appropriate to have an over-representation of factual presentations on how dangerous it is, as a predicate for opening up the audience to listen to what the solutions are, and how hopeful it is that we are going to solve this crisis."

The science of 97 %

It is being said: "... 97 % of research points to human activity as a contributor." Contributor to what then?

- Man-made CO_2 as a contributor to a greener planet? 100 % agreement.
- Man-made destruction of the environment as a contributor to effects on climate? 100 % agreement.
- Man-made climate propaganda as a contributor to climate religious measures with no root in science? 100 % agreement.

Every time you see that there is 97 % agreement on something, you can easily conclude that this is a made up number, used to make an impression because:

- 100 % can too easily be disproved,
- 99 % sounds like too much, it sounds made up, like 99,99%
- 98 % is a bit too much,
- 96 % is too charged, as it is the alcohol content of moonshine; actually, it sounds funny to us,
- 95 % is too accurate,

- 94 % is just ridiculous.

No, 97 % is perfect, and peer-reviewed research has concluded that this is because 97 is a prime number, with all the suggestive mystery dwelling on the primes.

What actually is climate propaganda?

- Climate propaganda is free of cycles, feedback systems and falsification of hypotheses,
- It's free of reason,
- It's obviously manufactured to intimidate,
- And better yet, it makes such unqualified claims that most people can imagine their own fantasies into the predictions.
- If one examines climate science as presented in the climate reports, one finds a completely different and rather fragmented picture of the various branches of science, where it oozes uncertainty,
- Yes, every single thing in the report is indicated with the probability of whether it might happen or not.
- Try telling your loved one that you're 97% likely to love her or him, and look at the results.
- Climate propaganda is simply outrageously naïve, and stupidly produced.

Propaganda production

However, propaganda is being produced in large numbers.

"Covering Climate Now" is a global journalism collaboration cofounded by *Columbia Journalism Review* and *The Nation*, in partnership with *The Guardian*. They coordinate more than 500 media actors and expect to reach more than one billion readers. They provide a coordinated horror campaign with supplies for every single day, especially before large Climate Summits. Here you will find CBS, Bloomberg, BuzzFeed News, HuffPost, Newsweek, Rolling Stone, The Weather Channel, and many other famous or infamous websites. (11)

You can only imagine where (the Norwegian news bureau) NTB's material comes from and is spread in this country.

Are they succeding? Reading at coveringclimatenow 25/17/07, one could see: (12)

- Last Thursday, CNN ran a story that inadvertently underscored the fact that most journalism is still not getting across the full truth about climate change.
- Harry Enten, CNN's polling analyst, displayed Gallup data showing that 40% of Americans are "greatly worried" about climate change.
- But this 40% is "the exact same percentage as [were worried] back in 2000," he pointed out, "despite everything we see [today] on our television screens, our computer screens… the hurricanes, the tornados, the flooding."
- "Americans aren't afraid of climate change," Enten concluded. "Climate activists have not successfully made the case to the American people."
- Perhaps not, but neither have most journalists.

- The extreme weather events Enten cited have gotten extensive news coverage, but most of that coverage did not make the climate connection.
- As , "In the summer of 2024, for example, when record high temperatures brutalized outdoor workers, withered crops, and worsened hurricanes, only 12% of US national TV news segments mentioned climate change, though its role in driving such extreme heat has long been scientifically indisputable."
- Anthony Leiserowitz, the executive director of the Yale Program on Climate Change Communication, said Yale's latest survey found that only 29% of Americans are "very worried" about climate change — a remarkably low number, considering that climate change is already killing people and devastating communities around the world and threatens much worse if left unchecked.
- "I constantly make the point that only 29% are very worried, when it should be 100%," Leiserowitz told Covering Climate Now. "This reflects [climate change's] lack of salience for most Americans. There are many who are not deniers, but do not adequately understand the risks, that the impacts are here and now, and the urgency of action."

What to do when people don't believe you?

Figure 2. Norwegian poll in a climate propaganda propagating news website, showing that 56% of adult Norwegians are not worried about climate change at all, while 21 % are a bit worried, but believes it all is going to end up well.

Here are some labels used by climate propagandists, when everything else fails:

- Flat Earth Proponents
- Old White Men
- Conspiracy Theorist
- Right-wing
- Right-wing extremist
- Fascist

- Paid for by the oil industry

One may easily dismiss persons using these words in their arguments.

Does climate propaganda work?

Norway has been one of the most eager climate propganda nations in the world.

A recent poll in *Nettavisen* showed that Norwegians are not worried at all! (13)

4. Conclusions

Climate rhetoric has for long substituted scientific reports in news media. It can be easily be analyzed and rejected and every rhetorical statement on climate can be examined to see whether it holds water as science.

References

1) https://www.journalisten.no/klima/skeptiske-til-klimajournalistiskken/186393, by Kathrine Geard, Dec. 14, 2007.
2) Cruz, R.V., H. Harasawa, M. Lal, S. Wu, Y. Anokhin, B. Punsalmaa, Y. Honda, M. Jafari, C. Li and N. Huu Ninh, 2007: *Asia. Climate Change 2007: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, M.L. Parry, O.F. Canziani, J.P. Palutikof, P.J. van der Linden and C.E. Hanson, Eds., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2007, pp. 469-506.
3) *WWF (WorldWildlife Fund), 2005: An overview of glaciers, glacier retreat, and subsequent impacts in Nepal, India and China*. WorldWildlife Fund, Nepal Programme, 79 pp. Found at: https://www.wwf.or.jp/activities/lib/pdf_climate/environment/Overview_of_Glaciers.pdf
4) **Flooded out** by Fred Pearce, *The New Scientist*, June 5, 1999. Found at: https://www.newscientist.com/article/mg16221893-000-flooded-out/
5) *Hydropower: Hydroelectric Power Generation from Alpine Glacier Melt* by Mauri Pelto, Encyclopedia of Earth Sciences Series, 2011, Reference no 17. Found at: https://www.academia.edu/74140087/Hydropower_Hydroelectric_Power_Generation_from_Alpine_Glacier_Melt
6) *Atmospheric Brown Clouds. Regional Assessment Report with Focus on Asia*, United Nations Environment Programme, 2008, ISBN 978-92-807-2978-8, p. 122.
7) **Glaciers beating retreat** by DTE staff, *Down to Earth*, Apr. 30, 1999. Found at: https://www.downtoearth.org.in/environment/glaciers-beating-retreat-19691
8) *Variations of Snow and Ice in the past and present on a Global and Regional scale*, Edited by V. M. Kotlyakov (Paris: UNESCO), 1996.
9) https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2019/may/17/why-the-guardian-is-changing-the-language-it-uses-about-the-environment
10) https://grist.org/article/roberts2/
11) https://coveringclimatenow.org/
12) https://coveringclimatenow.org/from-us-story/are-americans-afraid-of-climate-change/ July 17, 2025.
13) https://www.nettavisen.no/norsk-debatt/klimakrisen-den-usynlige-valgkampsaken/s/5-95-2468174 June 05, 2025.
14) The author has taken many points from his book in Norwegian: *Klimakunnskapskrisen* (Kongsberg: Norway), 2023, ISBN 978-82-7610-020-4.