

Jeff Reynolds 020524

===

[00:00:00]

Introduction to Citizen Journalism

Jeff: the rise of citizen journalism has given lots of folks opportunities to get information that they wouldn't have gotten otherwise. It's the democratization of information

Guest Introduction: Jeff Reynolds

Tom: My guest today is Jeff Reynolds

Jeff: thanks for having me. I really appreciate it. I'm honored to be on. I've seen your guest list and I'm honored to be among them. So, uh, I am the currently the senior investigative researcher for a an outfit called Restoration of America, and we are trying to, uh, educate voters in America about the issues that are really important.

So, uh, I have you. Written a book in the past on, uh, dark money and how it's used to fund various different political, uh, efforts. And so, uh, that's, that's where I'm at. We're trying to get voters aware of a lot of the issues that are, and a lot of the people that are driving the [00:01:00] issues. So, uh, my latest report is on junk science behind the climate movement.

Okay, yeah, that's how I became

Tom: aware of your work.

The Left's Global Warming Ideology

Tom: Uh, the report is called How the Left's Global Warming Ideology Wrecked Science. It's a long, detailed report that's incredibly good. I encourage everybody to go into the show description and read it.

Jeff's Journey into Climate Skepticism

Tom: But, do you want to talk about how you became a climate skeptic?

Have you been digging in for many years or recently or what's happened? Yeah, yeah,

Jeff: um, I actually, I got my, uh, undergraduate degree of bachelors in zoology in 1993. And I promptly, uh, did not use my degree at all, but, uh, I entered the workforce and, uh, but I've always had this fascination with science and all of those issues.

And so several years ago, this is gosh, it's got to be about a dozen years ago. I started really digging into it. I'm like, You know, we're so overwhelmed with all this messaging about climate. We're all, we're [00:02:00] overwhelmed with, uh, the world's going to end and, and all of these catastrophizing sort of prognostications.

And so I started just wondering, well, you know, what, what's behind all of this? So I just did some digging on the internet, you know, nothing, nothing major. Right. Uh, but I, I started really being skeptical of every claim that they were making. Quite some time ago, and the more questions I asked, the fewer answers I got, and that was really sort of the seed that was planted for me that, you know, when, when you're and when your questions are answered with ad hominem attacks or, uh, you know, nothing of substance or other.

Um, logical fallacies and the more you attune yourself to this, the more logical fallacies you're going to see throughout the entire debate. You know, it's not really much of a debate. Um, but that's, those are clues to me. [00:03:00] Okay. I need to dig a little bit more. I need to ask more questions here. And the more questions I ask, the fewer answers I got.

So, the opening

Tom: quote in your report there is from Holman Jenkins of Wall Street Journal, and it is, The biggest lie in American climate journalism is that reporters cover climate science as a science.

Jeff: Well, yeah, absolutely. I mean, we've seen it, especially over the last three to four years, uh, but, uh, throughout Um, I'd say the last half of the 20th century.

We have not really talked clearly about science in the public domain. We talk more about, um, marketing campaigns really than we do about actual science. And I think that the, uh, the overriding assumption. Is that the American public doesn't understand science and they, uh, the elites will tell you that they glaze over and tune out and they don't want to know about it.

[00:04:00] And so when that happens, uh, you know, the people that are pushing a certain theory and certain political solutions to that theory, uh, have to do it in a way that is more, um What, what's the

word I want to say? It's, uh, they have to, they have to stoke the fear instead of actually talking about the science itself and it does nobody any real service.

So

I

The Culture of Lying in Climate Science

Tom: like in your piece how you open with talking about the culture of lying. I'm going to quote you again. A culture of lying has metastasized around the theory of man made global warming since its emergence as a prominent political movement in the 1990s. And you go on to say the lies are everywhere.

I think that's just an important point. They're just lying about everything all the time. And, uh, you, uh, dig into that very well, I think. Well,

Jeff: thank you. I appreciate that.

The Michael Mann Trial

Jeff: Um, I, uh, the next part of that is to that's, uh, the platter on which I serve up the Michael Mann trial, which is going [00:05:00] on right now, right?

And Michael Mann has been, uh, Picked apart for 25 years ever since and more than 25 years at this point since he published his two papers with the hockey stick graphs, um, that's the other climatologists and scientists and physicists and meteorologists have looked over that those papers, which then got.

Enhanced and, promoted in the I. P. C. C. Third assessment report in 2001 and then 2006. You have the inconvenient truth. Al Gore's documentary, quote unquote. And that seed that was planted in 1998 99 with Michael Mann and the hockey stick. And the more you, uh, read into the climate science, the more they move away from empirical data and [00:06:00] observations. And they move into computer modeling and interpretation, and that's, that's another telltale clue that they're not really actually talking about things that are happening in the real world.

They're talking about computer models more than, uh, actual observed data. So, uh, the lies that have built up around this whole thing got

their genesis really from the hockey stick graph and the papers that Michael Mann put out.

Tom: So as an aside, have you had a chance to follow this trial? And, uh, there's this Climate on Trial podcast.

There's coming out several of those per week are coming out. So much information. Have you been following it as it goes on here?

Jeff: It's a lot of information to digest. So I've been, I've been catching the highlights, uh, on, uh, ex Twitter. And I've been, uh, following along with some accounts that are, uh, Uh, giving the play by play on the testimony that's been given.

Yeah, I haven't been able to really dig [00:07:00] in for an hour at a time in a podcast, but, uh, I've been keeping up with as much as I can and it's really impressive. Um, Michael Mann has been. Sort of all over the map from the the accounts that I've been reading He's been all over the map as far as how he's justified some of the mistakes that were made uh, and then he's you know, blaming his lawyers for uh, some stuff that he wrote on his uh, curriculum vitae and that kind of thing so uh, but meantime the um, Dr.

Is it dr. Nguyen from last week the expert test, uh, uh, expert witness that Uh, Mike, uh, Mark Stein brought, uh, to testify, just ripped him apart. It just absolutely flayed his, um, his statistical analysis. And I go into a little bit of that in the report because there's so many different new, uh, revelations about the [00:08:00] hockey stick graph.

So I go into that in the report in some detail about all of the different problems with the hockey stick graph.

Tom: Do you think in that, that DC jury is going to give a reasonable result?

I don't trust them.

Jeff: Yeah, boy, that's that's a real question whether or not a D. C. Judge and jury is going to judge the case on its facts or what they went into the trial believing that that's a real question. If it were just on the facts, the trial would already be over. Michael Mann has not proven his case, and in both cases, I talk about this in the report.

Actually, the Tim Ball case in British Columbia and in the Mark Stein trial in Washington, D. C. Tim Ball. He he sued Tim Ball. Uh, a, um, uh, geophysicist in British Columbia in the early or in the mid 2000s, because Tim Ball said, uh, he, he, uh, paraphrased an old joke. He [00:09:00] said he belonged in the state pen instead of Penn State.

And, uh, of course, uh, Michael Mann sued him, uh, for libel and, uh, it's. This is actually remarkable that he, uh, that, uh, Tim Ball won the case in Canada where they no longer protect free speech. Uh, it's, it's really quite frightening what's happening in Canada as far as, uh, their, uh, lack of free speech protections.

But Tim Ball won because Michael Mann did two things. First of all, Tim Ball used the defense that he had the truth on his side that he did his own historical temperature reconstruction from, uh, from 80 0 to 82, 000 and showed that not only was there no warming in modern times, as Michael Mann's hockey stick shows, but also that Michael Mann had minimized The, um, uh, Minoan, uh, uh, era and [00:10:00] the little ice age.

So he minimized historical variability in average temperatures while, uh, uh, uh, fabricating the, uh, the spike in temperatures in modern times. So, uh, Tim Ball, uh, used that as his defense in his trial and. In the rules of discovery in the trial, Michael Mann also refused to, uh, release his statistical analysis and his statistical verification of the, uh, uh, statistical method that he used that he invented to create the hockey stick graph.

So when he refused to, uh, release his, um, his, um. Uh, his statistical verification, he lost the case, uh, and he has continued to refuse to release all that information. Uh, now it's very interesting, by the way, that, uh, Michael Mann's hockey stick has, uh, [00:11:00] It's long ago because of climate gate, we now know that the hockey stick was fabricated, uh, that they, uh, did the, the Mike's nature trick where they spliced on to, uh, reconstruction data.

The reconstruction data in modern times did not show a spike. And so they. Actually spliced onto after 1960, they spliced onto the historical reconstruction, the actual observed temperatures that they smoothed out and manipulated to show a spike. Uh, so that's one trick, but then just in November, we have another trick that was revealed.

Uh, the, uh, this was on Steve McIntyre's blog, who is actually going to be a, uh, a witness for the defense, uh, coming up. I believe this week or next week for Mark Stein, but on Steve McIntyre's blogs, a Swedish mathematician came out and said, Oh, by the way, I solved this a few months ago, and I forgot to tell you, but [00:12:00] he showed that.

It was impossible for Michael Mann when he did the historical reconstruction in the 1400s and the 1600s, it was impossible for him to have used the proxies he claimed to have used. So, in other words, the proxies are the, uh, the tree ring data that he says he used from a particular area in the Ural Mountains in Russia.

All right. It is impossible for him to have used those. But if he used these other trees in Canada, then he was able to show that the temperatures didn't vary as much. So he, uh, this this mathematician from Sweden just sort of came up with a solution and it fit perfectly. So he proved that Michael Mann.

didn't actually use the tree rings that he said he did in his hockey stick graphs in 1998 99. And this was a problem that [00:13:00] the scientists had long puzzled over, you know, for 25 years, they said they knew that the data analysis didn't match up to what he said it did, but they didn't know why. And, uh, we finally have this solution to it.

So now that's going to come out in trial here in the next week or two. It's going to be fascinating to see Michael Mann's reaction to that

Tom: One key problem that man had is a mean glance in the supermarket. He was out shopping and some guy gave him a mean glance and that's supposed to be Mark Stein's fault. It's just incredible.

John Hinderacher just had his office firebombed or a possible arson at

Jeff: his office. I actually didn't hear about that. Really? That's, that's kind of scary.

Tom: Yeah. Yeah. So it goes way beyond a mean glance, but, uh, it's pretty

Jeff: amazing.

Yeah. Well, he also, he, he, uh, man testified in the trial, uh, last week or the week before that, uh, he had lost grants of, uh, several million dollars. And on cross examination, he actually admitted that it was about 100, 000. [00:14:00]

Tom: Yeah, so it goes on and on. So far, it has not gone well for man, I would think, at this trial.

Jeff: You wouldn't think so, no. But again, you gotta worry about the jury. I mean, you go back to the O. J. Simpson trial, right? And trusting science to the jury is a dicey proposition.

Tom: One thing I've been doing in recent days is going through your report and tweeting out highlights, but, uh, you could just make a Twitter thread of the whole thing. There's so many, uh, good highlights.

I'm going to read another one here. Uh, this one is, The longer the earth goes without proving the theory, the more wild eyed the predictions of doom get. And the more its adherents resemble members

of a cult, call it the cult of scientism, instead of actual scientists. Indeed, the more the facts get in the way, the bigger the lies get.

I think that really does capture it, that there, it seems like they're lying, that the lies are getting bigger and bigger, and how much longer can it go on before everybody just rolls their eyes? I think we're near that point.

Jeff: I would hope so. But you know, it's I guess it's like P. T. Barnum said. You know, there's a sucker born every [00:15:00] minute.

Uh, there's a constant and I recognize this from early on in my life, too. I'm 52 now, right? Um, early on, you just sort of roll with things. You're not really paying close attention. You're you know, All right, fine. Maybe there's some global warming. Maybe we need to do something about it. You just sort of it's it's everywhere in, you know, the news and everything you consume as a television watcher, you know, reader of journalism.

So as a consumer, you're constantly bombarded with this, and it just sort of becomes second nature until you start Pulling at a thread, you know, you, you pull it one thread and then you pull it another one, and then pretty soon it's all unraveling. But you have to really take the time to kind of ask the, the hard questions and do the critical thinking.

Is this really actually a thing? You know? Um, and so one of the things that I, I covered in, you know, 'cause it is a cult. It is, it is. You know, they're, they're [00:16:00] pushing the lies as, as hard as they can, but we don't even know. What an average temperature is, we don't know what normal is supposed to be because they've never actually defined it.

It keeps moving around depending on which model you look at and which reconstruction, which historical reconstruction you look at. So we don't even know what a mean global temperature is supposed to be, never mind, you know, how much we've deviated from that mean.

The Impact of Climate Policies on Farming

Tom: You, uh, go on in your article saying that, uh, Uh, in poll after poll, Americans have, uh, put global warming solutions at the bottom of their list.

And then that gets even worse now that people are getting a

realization of what those solutions are. Massive redistribution of wealth, uh, big government intrusion into our lives, unreliable and expensive green energy, and all of the unreasonable demands to curtail human progress.

Public Opinion on Climate Change

Tom: I, I'm 15 plus years and [00:17:00] I'm really seeing people looking at the solutions and going, no way, I don't want any of this.

Jeff: Well, yeah, and that's that's really it right is it we we've done amazing things as a species We've we've created all of these technological and scientific advances and now the the oligarchs and the Globalists and the folks at the World Economic Forum and those types, you know, they want us to say well not so fast and especially In developing countries, like on the continent of Africa or in, uh, Asia or other places that are not necessarily filled with advanced Western civilizations and are not necessarily filled with the right types of people.

Uh, there's a real, I think there's a racist component to this as well, that they don't want certain people to have modern advances like we did. So have you followed

Tom: carefully what's going on in, uh, with the farmer protests [00:18:00] in Europe? I don't yet have a handle myself about whether the individual farmers, are they specifically saying the climate policies are what they're up against?

They're, they're thinking about climate as they're

Jeff: protesting. Yeah, well, this started in the Netherlands a year or two ago, where the Netherlands has a very robust agricultural industry, right? Most of the country is agricultural and they produce, they greatly outproduce their land, you know, from a productivity standpoint, they're some of the most productive farmland in the world.

And the Netherlands is part of the, uh, the European Union, of course. And the EU has told them that they produce too much nitrogen pollution. And so the government of the Netherlands has decided they're going to. Re basically rezone or reclassify 30 percent of the agricultural land in their in their nation and, uh, and take over basically [00:19:00] forcibly take farmland from the farmers, some of which have been in the families for 5, 6 generations.

And so these farmers are understandably perturbed by this. So they've been, they've been producing these, these strikes where they take, they drive their tractors by the thousands into the capitals and into

the cities to block traffic and, uh, protest the government policies that are going to take. A huge amount of this, this farmland.

And so, and it's all over the, the supposed, uh, uh, nitrogen pollution that's occurring because of agriculture. And this, this kind of stuff has spread because it's part of the EU. It's spread to Germany and France. And now you've got farmers in France and Germany, uh, spreading, um, taking their manure spreaders and spreading manure all over the government buildings, which I think is a nice touch.
[00:20:00]

So,

Tom: I wanted to throw in here that, uh, on, uh, Epic TV, I had, uh, Katie Spence of the Epic Times on my podcast, and then I've been looking at their website a lot since then. And there's a great documentary out there, it's over an hour long, called No Farmers, No Food, Will You Eat the Bugs? It's very good stuff.

It's helping me understand better what's going on over there, and they do mention climate a lot in there, that they're cracking down on farming because of this whole climate cult reason. It's, uh, it's incredible to see. It's

Jeff: astonishing because, you know, they also blame, uh, global warming on, uh, uh, mass, uh, production of meat.

And so it's like the vegans have taken over. They're, they're, uh, saying that you cannot eat meat or, uh, we can't produce meat on this, uh, level because it produces too much methane. There's never been a, uh, uh, any sort of proof that the amount of methane produced by agriculture is any different from [00:21:00] all of the mega fauna that used to, uh, roam the earth, uh, before man took over, uh, we're, we're now essentially the apex predator, but it used to be mammoths and saber tooth tigers and dinosaurs and all of those other giant we're, Uh, animals.

How much methane were they producing it? It's, it, uh, has to have been on the same scale. Uh, you still see it in Africa with elephants and giraffes and, and that sort of thing, so. The idea that factory farming is doing anything different than what nature has done has never actually been proven. Uh, one

Tom: interesting related thing is that, uh, just a few days ago, Elon Musk tweeted, I'm pro environment, but I support the farmers.

Farming has no material effect on climate change. He also came out, though, in favor of a carbon tax. I know. But he's supporting the farmers. I think this whole attack on farmers because we think that CO2 is going to lower crop yields and make us hungry That's not

playing. I can't imagine that's playing with anyone.

Jeff: What do you think? [00:22:00] Uh, yeah, I don't think so. I you can pry my cheeseburger from my cold dead hands Yeah, I think a lot of folks are realizing, you know, and a lot of folks are trying to eat healthier and all that stuff. And they're starting to realize that maybe the, uh, the middle aisles of the grocery store aren't the best place to go shopping.

Right. You know, you're better off going into the produce aisle in the meat section, but, uh, you know, I think there's, there really is. No great love among most of the, the residents of the United States to say, look, I'm not, I'm, I'm going to give up my meat for the environment because there's no real connection.

No matter how much doom saying they do, you can't really make a connection.

Elon Musk's Views on Climate Change

Tom: Where do you fall on your opinion on Elon Musk? I still don't know what to think. So sometimes he seems like he's on the side of reason and sometimes not. Where do you, what do you think?

Jeff: [00:23:00] Well, he's, he's an interesting dude. I'll give him that.

I, uh, there are some things I agree with him on like, uh, you know, not demonizing farmers, but then in, you know, within hours, he came out in favor of a carbon tax in one of his tweets. And so, uh, you know, and we know. Just look at Michael Bloomberg. We know that sin taxes not only don't have an effect on what they're trying to control, it, it hurts poor people more than it hurts the affluent.

And it, uh, it doesn't affect the behavior in ways that they predict. And, uh, a carbon tax is just a, it's basically just a sales tax or a breathing tax. It's, it's an existence tax. Um, so it's not going to have any effect on people other than perhaps to make them more healthy and to reduce the population.

So maybe, maybe that's what they're, uh, maybe that's what they're aiming at after all.

Climate Debate and the U.S. Presidential Election

Tom: Do you have any thoughts on how the whole [00:24:00] climate

debate is going to affect the U. S. presidential election this year, whether it's going to come up in any debates that they have

Jeff: from here on out? Well, yeah, that's that's the question, right?

Is if it's actually going to come up or if there's going to be any debates at all, um, with, uh, And, um, Joe Biden's current condition. I doubt they'll let him take the stage to take on Donald Trump, presumably the nominee on the right. Um, but I believe that the proxies that are going to be running the campaign are going to push that pretty hard.

And.

Inflation and the Climate Agenda

Jeff: I don't know how that's going to play in Biden's favor because of the inflation that we've seen over the last couple of years. Uh, the last three years, uh, consumer prices have skyrocketed. Gas has actually come down. A little bit from its high last year, but the rest of, you know, food and, uh, rents and housing costs and heating costs, all of those things have gone up and stayed up and, [00:25:00] uh, people are much less.

Able to afford the cost of living because it's gone up so much. So I don't know how, uh, a climate agenda is going to play in that, in, in, in that ecosphere.

I did have a

Discussion on Bjorn Lomborg's Climate Policy Analysis

Tom: separate thing to bring up here, just hot off the presses, from Bjorn Lomborg, who's supposed to be sort of on our side.

He quotes that optimal, realistic climate policy will cost 18 trillion, but will deliver climate benefits worth twice that. I think the climate benefits are worth exactly zero, or measurable climate benefits. What do you think of Lomborg's analysis?

Jeff: Uh, Bjorn Lomborg is an interesting dude. I have heard him several times on, um, Jordan Peterson's podcast.

And, uh, he, he's, he's a thoughtful guy and he's willing to actually think critically about these issues. So I, I don't always agree with him, but I, I always appreciate listening to him and getting different

perspectives. He is, um, on, [00:26:00] on the warmer side. He, he does believe in global warming. Uh, he believes that the, uh, man's contributions to carbon emissions are what's driving the warming trend in our atmosphere.

And so he believes that there are solutions that are needed. Uh, so that's where he and I, And I'll, you know, I'll defer to him. He's he's an expert.

Debunking Climate Change Myths

Jeff: I'm not, you know, so, but, um, I will say that, uh, he, he still believes in some of the things that have been debunked in my view, uh, such as the idea that there is a warming trend because Several of the reconstructions show that there's a cooling trend.

Several of the reconstructions show that the, uh, the warming trend that may have been elicited is nowhere out of the ordinary from historical times, from the last thousand years or 2000 years. So I'm not sure that there's a solution [00:27:00] necessary if there's not exactly a problem. And we can't, we can't actually tell by the way, if it's man's.

contributions to CO₂ in the atmosphere. That's another thing that I cite. I cite Edwin Berry, a PhD physicist, uh, in my report who has demonstrated that there was one paper he did that shows that it's about 3.4 percent of the rise in carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. is due to human emissions. So in other words, 96 and a half percent of the rise in carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is due to natural conditions.

He has since come out with another paper and revised that and said that it's about 2 percent human emissions. 98 percent of it is natural emissions. So, uh, it strains credulity to definitively claim that it's man's contributions to carbon emissions [00:28:00] that are creating any sort of a warming trend when 98 percent of the carbon dioxide in the atmosphere occurs because of natural emissions or the rise, I should say, 90 percent of the rate of rise is driven by natural emissions.

Tom: Okay.

Data Manipulation in Climate Science

Tom: One other quote I just wanted to throw in here from your report again is, data manipulation is a feature of climate science, not a

bug. I think it's a very important point because I 100 percent agree with that.

Jeff: Yeah, no, that's, that's absolutely true. And we've seen it with the hockey stick and every other, uh, computer model based, uh, study since then there, there, the vast majority of papers on climate are based on computer modeling and not on.

Observed data. And so that's that's a really important point that we really we're relying so much on baseline assumptions that have not been proven that we can't really [00:29:00] take the the climate models seriously.

Tom: Yeah, I think that was a point that, uh, Freeman Dyson, uh, stressed that's so important that the people that are all in on this, uh, they've lost the connection between models, any connection between models and reality.

They think the models are reality. It's just that, it's that simple. And people living in the real world are looking around, they're not seeing any climate crisis. They're living, uh, in reality, not in any modeled world. So

Jeff: important. Yeah, no, I mean, they often claim that, you know, I mean, Al Gore claimed that the Arctic ice sheet was going to be gone by 2014.

That's clearly not true. In fact, we're setting records. I've seen graphics that show, or ice maps that show that This winter's ice is actually slightly larger than what it was in 1999. So, uh, you know, and you look at the Antarctic ice sheet, it's been setting records on and off for 15 years. [00:30:00] We have more ice at Antarctica than we did 20 years ago.

What

The Rise of Alternative Media

Tom: do you think overall about the media landscape, about how the, uh, CNNs of the world, of course, are all in on this, but there's the rise of this alternative media. Are you seeing that, uh, in your, in your work here?

Jeff: Yeah, well, I, I, that's what's really driven me over the last, I'd say, 15 years or so, is looking at the media landscape and trying to be one of those folks that pierces the corporate veil and, and, Cuts into the corporate media landscape that is, it's, it's owned part and parcel by the people that are protecting the narrative.

And so, uh, the, the rise of citizen journalism has given lots of folks opportunities to get information that they wouldn't have gotten otherwise. It's the democratization of information. Uh, and that, that's something that I've been passionate about for a very long time, ever since I [00:31:00] got involved in politics.

Uh, you know, 2008, 2009, uh, and you look at You know, CNN and M-S-N-B-C, even the local news.

The Influence of Billionaires and Foundations on Media

Jeff: And, and you look at the money that's going into this, like the, the foundations and that, that's, by the way, the, the book that I wrote is, uh, on the dark money on the left and the foundations and the billionaires and all of the money that they're putting into these things, and they're putting a lot of money into, uh, creating these investigative journalism outlets.

Okay, because a lot of the corporate media has died off. It's it's going extinct. And so the newspaper industry, for instance, is on life support. There are barely any newspapers left, whereas 15 years ago, even Uh, or 20 years ago, it was the predominant way for people to get information. They've lost so much infrastructure and and profit [00:32:00] that they can't fund their investigative journalism units.

And so, uh, what you're seeing is the rise of nonprofits. That is funding agenda driven investigative journalism. Uh, I'll give you an example. The Pew, uh, the Pew charitable trusts, a lot of folks know the Pew organization as a public polling, uh, and information outlet, but they do a lot more than just that.

They fund, uh, they send money, they actually have an entire investigative journalism unit. So they hire journalists to create reports on climate, or institutional racism, or systemic racism, or those kinds of things. And then feed them to local news outlets who need the content. Uh, so local newspapers and local, uh, uh, nightly news programs and that sort of thing, [00:33:00] and even the national news organizations will use their information, but it's it's clearly agenda driven, and it's clearly from one side of the aisle.

They don't give both sides or multiple perspectives on much many of these. News items that they produce. So they're, they're funneling billions of dollars in pews. Just one of them. There are lots of, you know, the Ford Foundation, the Hewlett Foundation, um, Arabella Advisors. There are so many of these, uh, foundations that are Funding these things.

The, the, the Associated Press has created an entire unit for climate reporting. Uh, you've probably seen a lot of their reporting on, you know, how bad is it going to get and all that stuff. And, uh, a lot of that is funded by outside sources, by nonprofits that are trying to seed these, uh, these outlets with these stories to show that, that side of the perspective [00:34:00] without showing multiple viewpoints.

Tom: So do you see Bill Gates himself as being one of the people who is funding a lot of the stuff like in, I thought he was funding the Guardian, for example, and they're completely crazy on

Jeff: climate. Yeah, no, that's, that's absolutely true. And, um, I, my favorite thing about, uh, Bill Gates was Um, I write this weekly semi weekly column on the worst climate stories.

Um, and I, I know you retweeted one of those. Um, and I appreciate that. But a few weeks back, I, uh, included an item where He actually wants to clear cut forests and bury the trees in the deserts of Nevada for carbon sequestration purposes. So, he wants to clear cut to sequester carbon. It doesn't make any sense whatsoever.

Um, uh, and he says that, um, planting more trees is a [00:35:00] crazy idea that will never, uh, control the carbon levels in the atmosphere. So, uh, yeah, with that as background, uh, yeah, uh, Bill Gates is one of the big funders of, you know, he's a, he's a big proponent of the world economic forum and, uh, eating the bugs and all of that stuff.

Um, but he's just one, you know, I mean, he's, he's a, he's a billionaire multiple times over, but he's just one guy. I mean, uh, on the right, we always talk about George Soros, uh, but now his son, Alex. Yeah, Alex Soros, uh, is taking over and he's become even more militant with his funding than, uh, than George's.

So, uh, the Open Society Foundation, uh, George Soros left 18 billion to that to fund it into perpetuity. But there's all these other different, uh, uh, organizations and they actually come together in multiple, uh, uh, yearly, uh, um, [00:36:00] Uh, conferences, donors, conferences like the Donors Alliance. There's a couple in the Environmental Grantmakers Association.

Those are two of the many different gatherings where billionaires and foundations come together and decide on a yearly or by, uh, biannual basis how they're going to spend their money and what issues they're going to, uh, collectively put their money into to solve. So they are coordinating their funding in a way that is Uh, very precise and surgical.

They're, they're doing it on purpose and they're all doing it

together. So they're, uh, uh, force multiplying and amplifying all of their, their funding. Okay.

Climate Activism and its Funding

Jeff: I'm going to

Tom: quote Michael Mann here. Cause I think he's really projecting a quote. He says, if you're a prominent climate account on Twitter, there are organized teams funded by fossil fuel groups, dark money organizations, and Petro States who will now target your tweets with troll bot attacks.

Elon Musk, who [00:37:00] bought Twitter with the help from the Saudis and Russia, enabled this. End quote. So there's this whole theory, I'm on Twitter all the time, I don't see any evidence whatsoever that this is happening. Do you think it's happening?

Jeff: Man, I wish. I wish I could get a check from Big Oil. Sadly, I don't.

But, um, I, you know, I got involved in the Tea Party movement in 2008 2009. I still have yet to see a single check from the Koch Industries or the Koch Brothers. So, yeah, no, I, in fact, that's one of my main complaints is that on the right, the funders and the foundations don't organize and coordinate their funding enough like they do on the left, and we're fighting with one hand tied behind our back.

Tom: So I just saw something in the last few days about Exxon fighting back a little bit. I hadn't seen any pushback. Do you know what that is about? I'm gonna look it up here if you haven't heard

Jeff: of it. Uh, I have not heard of it, but I, I know that they're putting a lot of money into things like [00:38:00] algae research and, uh, different, um, They, they run commercials all the time for, uh, Um, green energy and alternative energy and that kind of thing, wind and solar and all of that stuff, different sources of fuels and that kind of thing and I don't know if that's just a an attempt to get people off their backs or to, you know, make people think they're they're a green company when it's still fossil fuels.

But, uh, I would if I were, uh, you know, an executive at one of these. Uh, petroleum companies. I'd take the Alex Epstein approach. I'd just say, look, fossil fuels are good for America, good for America, good for society, good for civil society, good for humanity. And, uh, there's no evidence whatsoever that we are harming the environment by burning fossil fuels.

And look at all the benefits that we get from all of [00:39:00] this. Look at, look how far we've advanced as a society since we discovered the ability to burn coal and oil and create electricity and then harness the atom and create nuclear energy and hydroelectric and all of those things, you know, that's another.

That's another pet peeve of mine. I used to live in Oregon. I live in Florida now, but they are now, they're, they're tearing out the dams in the Klamath River Basin, and they're, they're making noise about tearing out the, uh, Snake River dams. Uh, something like 63 percent of the power in the state of Oregon used to come from hydroelectric, and they have never Proven beyond a shadow of a doubt that the dams are the reasons for the reduction in salmon populations.

Uh, there's so because because they're anadromous fish, they breed upstream and they live most of their lives out in the ocean. They've never studied the ocean part of [00:40:00] their life cycle to any, any great extent. So they don't know why they're not returning to, to spawn at the rates that they used to. They simply don't know.

Tom: So, um, I did, I went back and I found this tweet about Exxon. So I'm going to read it from, uh, Steve, uh, Steve Malloy. Climate idiocy has awakened a sleeping giant. ExxonMobil will continue with its preemptive lawsuit against climate activist shareholders, even though the shareholders have withdrawn their shareholder proposal.

After 16 years of laying down for the climate hoax, maybe Exxon is finally rousing itself to push back. That would be a great development. If that happens, they should be pushing back.

Jeff: Yeah, that's absolutely great. Uh, because that's another one of those activist things that they're doing. Uh, that's all.

It's a lot more effective than gluing themselves to airport runways or throwing soup on the Mona Lisa. They're actually, they're, they're buying shares so that they can then go as activists to the shareholder [00:41:00] meetings and, you know, protest and make demands and say, You're an evil oil company. You should go out of business.

Uh, you know, so they, they understand how to use the capitalist process to a certain extent by becoming a shareholder and then going and making a lot of noise. So the more you can fight back against that garbage, the better.

Tom: So speaking of that garbage, I was going to bring that up. There's a kind of a new group in the U.

S. called Climate Defiance. They're supposed to be a scrappy group of young people who go and shout down speakers and chase people around and they're so proud of themselves, but they are funded, I found out

by a Hollywood director, Adam McKay. That just came up publicly that, uh, his group is funding them and also, uh, Jeremy Strong from succession.

Mm-Hmm . He is also on the board that's helping to fund these

Jeff: people. Leonardo DiCaprio is, uh, a big player in this and, uh, even though he takes his PR private jet to con all the time. Um, but, uh, yeah, no, and, and another big one is Reid Hoffman. [00:42:00] Uh, my. Organization Restoration of America just published a another big report on read Hoffman, who's the founder of LinkedIn, and he's funding all sorts of these radical protest groups.

Um, but yeah, that just came out in the New Hampshire and Iowa, the New New Hampshire Republican, uh, primary and then the Iowa Republican Caucus. Where they were going around and harassing the Republican, uh, nominee or, um, uh, candidates for the primary nomination. And they were shouting them down and they were bragging about how we've got 'em surrounded.

Uh, he can't leave the building, you know, so they're basically, uh, uh, bragging about. Kidnapping of presidential candidate. They did this to Vivek Ramaswamy. They did this to Ron DeSantis. Um, I think they did it to Nikki Haley as well. So, uh, yeah, they're out campaigning and meeting with the voters and talking to the voters.

And these guys are [00:43:00] coming in and, uh, literally trying to, uh, uh, kidnap them, which is par for the course, because you saw this throughout the, uh, the 2010s, uh, when people like Charlie Kirk or Ann Coulter would go to speak on campus to conservative groups that on college campuses. Uh, this happened at Berkeley.

This happened at, I mean, all kinds of different, uh, colleges where conservative speakers would speak and they would get shouted down to the point where it created a. Security hazard and they had to cancel the event and they call this direct action and that's actually part of my book is uh, they do this all the time where they they uh, it's a um an antifa sort of Direct action by any means necessary Is their slogan?

uh, they go to uh, Deny people their their free speech rights and actually physically threaten them so that they are intimidated into Not speaking their minds So let's

Tom: make sure we talk about your book. It's [00:44:00] called behind the curtain, right? I just bought it on Kindle. Well, I appreciate

Jeff: that. And this is the book.

Um, and it's, uh, it's available at, uh, who owns the dems. net. Uh,

so, uh, I'm, I'm, I'm a bit of a partisan. Uh, you, you should know this. I, I'm, I come from the right side of the aisle and, uh, I wanted to write a book The idea that the Republican Party is always blamed as being the party of billionaires and big business and that sort of thing, and it's really not true.

It's, I mean, it's true to a certain extent, but the idea that the Democratic Party is the party of the little guy is something that I wanted to push back against. They're beholden lock, stock and barrel to their, uh, billionaire benefactors and their, their nonprofit foundations, uh, which hold billions, hundreds of billions of dollars, uh, in endowments that they spend [00:45:00] on their behalf in the form of grants or direct funding.

So that's that I, I expose as much of the, uh, the funding on the left as I can. It's, it's dark money that's passed around in. Legal and sort of extra legal means, and some of it's illegal. A lot of it's from, uh, offshore, too. So, that, that's a lot of fun. Do you

The Fall of the World Economic Forum's Reputation

Tom: have any comments on the fall of the reputation of the W.

E. F.? I think there was a time a few years ago where I sort of, uh, I didn't, uh, disrespect the W. E. F., but I think a lot of people have found out that they're, they're doing stuff that's not in our best

Jeff: interest. Yeah, it's well, it's it's funny that their reputation has suffered in direct proportion to the level of knowledge that people have of what they're proposing.

So, uh, yeah, I'd I'd I'd say that's a that's a welcome change. Although I still Still think a lot of people are just simply unaware of what they're doing and how they're coordinating their efforts and how the world leaders are coming [00:46:00] together to do the things that they're proposing at the World Economic Forum or the United Nations or those those globalist sorts of efforts.

Globalist efforts are their primary. means of achieving their goals are to undermine the sovereignty of independent nations. And that's, that's what they're trying to do the, to the United States, because the United States constitution protects the individual liberties of every American citizen. And when you do that, you can't then have collective guilt or collective salvation, which is what they're, that's what collectivists are trying to do on a global scale.

Very good.

Recommended Climate Change Resources

Jeff: Other than

Tom: your own work, is there anybody else's work that you'd like to point us to that you, uh, you enjoy particularly?

Jeff: Oh, yeah. Well, obviously your Twitter account is is a gold mine. Um, I have, [00:47:00] uh, uh, you mentioned Steve Malloy, who's done great work on junk science, and it's actually at junk science on Twitter X.

Um, and then, of course, Judith Curry, who's going to, uh, Uh, testify on behalf of Mark Stein against Mark Man, uh, Michael Mann in the trial. She's one of the scheduled witnesses. Judith Carter has done great work. Um, and she was the chair of the climatology department at Georgia Tech. So no slouch in the climate department there. Um, the CO2 coalition is a great organization. I know a couple of the founders of that. They are out there promoting the positive benefits of carbon dioxide, uh, and atmospheric carbon dioxide.

The fact that it's. you know, plant food, not a pollutant. So, uh, there are lots of folks out there that are doing that. And I do, of course, have to give a plug to my organization one more time. Restoration of America. We are [00:48:00] doing a lot of work on election integrity. We're doing a lot of work on deep dives into research on public policy issues.

That's how this report came together. So there's a lot of good stuff that we're doing there.

Conclusion: The Importance of Climate Change Awareness

Jeff: Uh, the whole objective of my report was to collate as much of the dissenting information as we can put together in one place so that people have a place to go to to embolden them to ask the questions about whether climate change is actually happening and whether those solutions they're proposing are going to do anything to fix climate change.

Uh, so a lot of folks don't even know that there's a debate or if they have questions, they don't know how to, uh, answer those questions and. You know, there's, there's, like you said, there's more awareness growing all the time, but there are also lots more people coming [00:49:00] online as adults, you know, graduating college and entering the workforce that have just not looked at these issues.

So having those resources available is, is what's really important.

Tom: All right. Any other points you'd like to make before we finish this one up? Well, I'm, I

Jeff: think I'm good. Uh, I have been writing on these issues for quite some time now, and I'm thrilled to have been on the podcast. Uh, I appreciate you having me on Tom.

Uh, you've had an illustrious list of, uh, guests. And so I'm honored to be one small part of that. All right.

Tom: Thank you very much. We'll talk to you next time. Jeff Reynolds.