



SCC Publishing  
Michelets vei 8 B  
1366 Lysaker Norway

ISSN: 2703-9072

Correspondence:

[office@clintel.org](mailto:office@clintel.org)

Vol. 6.1 (2026)

pp. 77-81

## Clintel and Climate Change: A Few Remarks from a Klimarealist<sup>1</sup>

*Václav Klaus*

*President, Clintel*



Professor Kvalheim, Distinguished Audience, Ladies and Gentlemen, many thanks for bringing me to Norway. As the recently appointed second president of Clintel, I have received several invitations from Clintel supporters in foreign countries, but yours is the first I have accepted. I don't know why. Perhaps because your invitation, as well as the talk with Prof. Solheim when I met him in Brussels last December, seemed serious to me. Plus, your name Klimarealistene — for someone who considers himself a realist - sounds perfect. Once again, many thanks.

I am glad to be in Norway and to attend this gathering. I will not spoil the evening by commenting on the ongoing dramatic and extremely dangerous events in the world, especially in Iran and the broader Middle East. However, as someone who has spent the last more than 30 years in politics, I consider it almost inappropriate to pretend that everything is in order and that we should talk only about climate and about the misuse of climate sciences to progressively shape our societies. Nevertheless, I respect the topic of our meeting. I also assume that the Klimarealistene are realists in every aspect of life, not only in discussing climate. I see the recent events in Iran as a denial of realism, and I believe that all true realists must oppose it.

---

<sup>1</sup> Speech for the Annual Meeting of the Klimarealistene, Oslo, Norway, March 15, 2026  
<https://doi.org/10.53234/SCC202603/08>

## 1. Me and Norway is a relatively short Story

I have been to Norway only twice, which is much less than to almost any other European country (excluding some former Soviet Union republics). For the first time, I was here for a few days in February 1994, attending - as Prime Minister of the Czech Republic - the opening ceremony of the Lillehammer Olympic games. I still remember that it was very Norwegian. It was one of the last old-style, traditional ceremonies, not yet spoiled by the excesses of cosmopolitan progressivist ideology, as it was seen in Paris in 2024. It was minus 19 degrees Celsius in Lillehammer that day, and spending three hours outdoors, sitting without moving, was an unforgettable experience.

My second visit to Norway, in 2005, was an official state visit as President of the Czech Republic. I met King Harald V, Prime Minister Bondevik, and other government officials. Our delegation also visited Bergen and had a chance to enjoy a trip on one of the fjords. That's all I personally saw in Norway until today. I know it is not enough.

For an economist like me, your country is connected with the first Nobel Prize winner in economics, Ragnar Frisch (as well as with Trygve Haavelmo). As an economist and a politician, I am sorry to mention that Norway is for me connected with one very misleading idea, *the notion of sustainable growth*, which for me goes together with Madame Brundtland. I had been for years her resolute opponent at many international gatherings. This conceptually wrong idea became - quite logically - one of the crucial tenets of green ideology, of environmentalism. It remains till now one of its main pillars - competing with the infamous and economically totally irrational concept of the *Limits to Growth*. Sustainable growth and limits to growth are both based on the same way of thinking.

Economists know that the degree of concern about the quality of the environment is a function of economic affluence, of GDP per capita. In this respect, it is inevitable that Norway, as one of the richest countries in the world, takes care of environment more than less developed countries, which means more than the rest of the world. *There is, however, a fundamental difference between the environment and environmentalism*. Environmentalism does not care for the environment. It just misuses environment as an instrument for changing human society according to its own preferences. This is conceptually unacceptable for any democrat. No one should try to impose his or her own priorities and preferences upon free citizens.

I quite often and for you perhaps somewhat paradoxically - refer to Norway when I am asked to explain and justify that it was me who, in spite of being a strong critic of the European unification, on behalf of the Czech Republic sent the letter to Brussels applying for EU membership. It was thirty years ago, in 1996, still a very short time after we had got rid of communism. At that moment we were not yet a well-established and generally accepted normal European country, at least in the eyes of the self-appointed owners of the EU.

My often-repeated argument has been that, as a post-communist country, we did not have the luxury of being Norway or Switzerland - strong and self-confident enough to oppose EU membership. I am still convinced that we had no other choice at that time - not because we were eager to get EU money (which is not very helpful), but because of our lack of reputation and recognition after forty years of communism. The public mood in my country would not have allowed me not to do it at that time. That is the main reason for my often referring to Norway.

## 2. I was invited as the new President of Clintel

Let me say a few words about my views on climate alarmism, which I suppose is the main topic of the Klimarealistene and of your today's annual meeting. I didn't come here to lecture anyone. I would instead like to share with you some of my worries and uncertainties - about the attempt to create an international network of opponents of climate alarmism and about Clintel, thanks to which I came into contact with you.

Some of you might have read my 2026 Clintel Presidential Address<sup>2</sup>, in which I dared to express some of my misgivings about the future of our organization. Its development really bothers me. We are obliged to the founders of Clintel, to Professor Berkhout, and to all those who signed the first Clintel Declaration to continue moving in their footsteps. We must not disappoint their expectations.

In my Presidential Address I stressed that *we are not negativists but rationally thinking sceptics*. In the original Declaration of Clintel we stressed that in our view "climate science has degenerated into a discussion based on beliefs, not on sound, self-critical science". This is, and should remain, I believe, our starting point.

I also fully support - as Prof. Berkhout put it in his September 2025 letter to me – «the irreplaceable role of background science or sciences, as opposed to climate modeling". As a former econometrician, I consider climate models a big problem. When I compare them with econometric models, the excessive use of so-called parametrization (or calibration of parameters) in these models is for me something unimaginable. *It is a return to a prescientific way of thinking*. But these models - full of mathematics - look scientific and people are not ready to see the problem. Modelling without solid background science is, of course, conceptually wrong.

We also do not believe that "science is settled", which is one of our main disagreements with the IPCC. Science can never be settled. We should insist on that. I am sure you see it the same way.

I suggest four main points for our considerations:

1. Is Clintel (or should Clintel be) *another lobbyist organization*, another activist pressure group fighting the main irrationalities of climate alarmism? *My sincere answer is: I am not sure*. I am in positive contacts with an active Czech Clintel group. Its existence is the outcome of a spontaneous evolution taking place in many countries. It is a group of people who are just now lobbying against the closure of the last coal mines in the Czech Republic. This lobbying is, without doubt, a very commendable goal. Because we don't have oil and gas on the territory of our country, coal - this traditional fossil fuel - has been our main source of energy for two centuries.

It's a big issue in my country these days. I was asked by this group to personally hand over, as a former President of the country and as the current Clintel President, a well-formulated, data-supported document prepared by this group to the Czech Minister of Trade and Industry. I did so, even though I was not sure that this is (or should be) the main activity of Clintel. You may have your own experience with this in Norway and - believe me - I have come here to learn as much as possible from you.

2. We know that Clintel itself - similarly to Klimarealistene - is not, and I think shouldn't attempt to be, *a research institution*. We have members and supporters who work in research and theory, but we do not plan to organize such research ourselves (nor do we have the capacity or funding to do so). I hope this is the way you look at it as well. Am I right? Or is there another way of looking at it?
3. Clintel could, of course, remain just *an umbrella institution* that gives individuals dispersed in the world the feeling that they are not alone, that there are many people all over the world who see the world and its problems in a similar way, who cannot stand the IPCC's arrogance and the resulting politicization of climate sciences. Who need an international organization that expresses their views with credibility and respect. This is, undoubtedly, another possible direction for our activities. Let's make the discussion about it explicit.

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://clintel.org/clintel-president-vaclav-klaus-we-are-productively-and-rationally-thinking-sceptics/>

4. Clintel could eventually become a sort of *publishing house*, with its own journal and its own books. It would mean extending our newsletter and publishing more such books as the very successful 2023 study *The Frozen Climate Views of the IPCC*<sup>3</sup>. Do you have the feeling that there are not sufficient opportunities to publish your views? I am not convinced about it. But it should be discussed as well. Should we be satisfied with online publications, or are we - as I am - old-fashioned believers in the importance of printed publications?

As I said, I came to Norway to listen and to learn. And I am looking forward to it. *We who are here today feel that climate alarmism, based on non-serious, politicized science, is increasingly becoming a threat to the future of the world.* And we, as Europeans, see it as an even greater threat to Europe than to other continents. The Green Deal, the European idea, has become *the embodiment and flagship of climate alarmism*. Its consequences are leading to the growing irrelevance of our old continent. It is liquidating the European industry. The dream of living on services and on imports of all industrial and agricultural products is totally irrational. It might be possible, but not prematurely.

Norway is in my view - fortunate not to be a member of the EU, although we know that Norway participates in many of the EU's very doubtful activities. In this respect, even without formal membership, you are part of it. You are, however, not penalized for failing to implement EU directives, which is a great advantage. At least for now.

### 3. The Economists and Climate Alarmism

As an economist turned politician at the moment of the fall of communism, I have very strong views on this issue. When I speak about climate alarmism, about environmentalism, I speak about an ideology, not about science. Economists have many disputes with this ideology. I don't think we have enough time this afternoon to discuss them. Let me give at least a brief overview of the main points in this dispute:

1. Economists disagree with the concept of "Limits to Growth". It is based on a static way of thinking similar to the views of Robert Malthus and all Malthusians, views of which have many times been challenged and disproved by serious economists. *This static concept ignores technical progress and human ingenuity.*
2. Economists disagree with the would-be wisdom of central planners and all similar people who are convinced that they know better than the market what should be produced and how. We who had experienced communism know something about this. *Central planning and all forms of government regulation make the economy inefficient and environmentally untenable.* The regulation of CO<sub>2</sub> asks for large-scale interventions in the price system and for massive subsidizing of green products. Today's argumentation is very similar to what I remember from the communist era.
3. Economists consider *the price system* to be the main and irreplaceable source of information for our decision-making. Any violation of its functioning is a fatal blow to rationality and efficiency. Again, our experience is unforgettable. We are frustrated that this experience has been already more or less lost in the brave new world of today.
4. Creating and trading the so-called emission allowances, which is the basic way of dealing with CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in the European Union, has no connection with the market system, with free prices. It is *a state controlled administrative system* which only pretends to be

---

<sup>3</sup> Reference

market friendly. It is not the way how to introduce economic way of thinking into solving environmental problems.

5. Economists (not the critics of economics) invented - more than a hundred years ago - the concept of *externalities*, but environmentalists misuse this term and interpret the world as being full of externalities, which is not true. This wrong idea must be resolutely rejected.
6. Environmentalists hold a very trivial concept of intertemporal decision-making which is not based on *the idea of discounting*. "This has become one of the fundamental concepts of economic science. I entered the debate about global warming decades ago with an article about discounting and expressed in it my disagreement with the a priori very low discount rate used in climatological modelling. The choice of a low discount rate, almost zero, was based on an a priori ethical reasoning only, without reflecting the opportunity costs of pro-environmental decisions (and investments).

I am convinced Clintel and all Klimarealistene should pay more attention to the economic side of the climate change issue. Non-economists usually don't want to do this, which is a mistake.

#### 4. Conclusion

Ladies and Gentlemen, let me stop here. In the subtitle of my 2007 book "*Blue Planet in Green Shackles*<sup>4</sup>", which has been published in 18 languages, I raised what is - for me a fundamental question: "*What is Endangered: Climate or Freedom?*" I am convinced - and I suppose many of you are as well - that the climate is more or less OK. We should do our best to convey this truth to as many people as possible.

Gloria von Thurn und Taxis, a German aristocrat, published a book in 2025 with the title "*Lieber unerhört als ungehört*<sup>5</sup>" (Langen Müller Verlag, München). I hope the Norwegians speak or understand German sufficiently well, because the English translation "Better ignored than unheard", as it was translated by Artificial Intelligence, is not so elegant.

As I said. we are not negativists but rational sceptics. However, *we are not, and shouldn't be, naive optimists*. We don't overestimate the positive signals coming from various places - especially from the United States and from President Trump these days - because we know that *nothing has changed in Europe, in the European Union*. Some of you may say *yet*.

I disagree. Those of us coming from the social sciences can't imagine a substantial change in Europe being realized in the foreseeable future, because the main characteristic of the European Union doesn't make such change possible. But as we say, again in German, *Optimismus ist Pflicht*. Let us remain realists striving for a fundamental change.

**Co-Editor:** Jan-Erik Solheim

#### Disclaimer/Publisher's Note:

This article reflects solely the views, analyses, and conclusions of the author(s). Science of Climate Change, its editors, and its publisher make no representation or warranty as to the accuracy or completeness of the content and disclaim liability for any loss, damage, or other consequence arising from the use of, or reliance on, any material published herein.

---

<sup>4</sup> *Blue Planet in Green Shackles What is Endangered: Climate or Freedom?* Competitive Enterprise Institute, ISBN 978-1-889865-09-6

<sup>5</sup> *Lieber unerhört als ungehört: Lektionen aus meinem Leben*, Langen Müller Verlag, München