

Comments on DoE's Notice of Availability: A Critical Review of Impacts of Greenhouse Gas Emissions on the U.S. Climate, 2025-14519 (90 FR 36150); Docket No. DOE-HQ-2025-0207

Government Accountability & Oversight
Contact: info@govoversight.org

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS:

COMMENT 1: *This Review is essential because it introduces into the official government record some semblance of the balance which exists in the observational and publication records but which was excluded from previous consideration by the agency. Balance is generally downplayed or excluded outright from higher-profile compendia whose content is dictated by parties whose livelihoods, revenues and business models depend on a crisis narrative. Immediately upon the Department announcing this Review, the individuals and institutions comprising the scientific establishment revealed their objective to discredit the Review. Many of those same individuals and institutions responsible for the distorted picture of observational data that dominates climate policy and legal discourse participate in litigation campaigns both attempting to impose a policy agenda and seeking hundreds of billions of dollars in disgorged revenues from the energy industry. The success of these campaigns hinges on a climate-crisis narrative, and the “disgorged” proceeds these ideological actors seek most certainly would go in part to furthering the climate industry of which these individuals and institutions are a part. The Department should consider this enormous conflict of interest when evaluating the record.*

Additionally, the scientific establishment gunning for this Review has a history of targeting “dissenting” arguments, assertions, and even mere information for discredit, and even the individuals and institutions associated with such dissenting views. Coincidentally, this same establishment has a history of being wrong seemingly without parallel in any other context, profession, or discipline.

COMMENT 2: *“U.S. policy actions are expected to have undetectably small direct impacts on the global climate and any effects [NB: again, while not expected to be detectable] will emerge only with long delays” (Review, at p. ix); “Thus, in contrast with conventional air pollution control, even drastic local actions will have negligible local effects, and only with a long delay. The practice of referring to unilateral U.S. reductions as “combatting climate change” or “taking action on climate” on the assumption we can stop climate change therefore reflects a profound misunderstanding of the scale of the issue.” Id., at 129; “Consequently, in contrast to the case of local air contaminants like particulates and ozone, even the most aggressive regulatory actions on GHG emissions from U.S. vehicles cannot be expected to remediate alleged climate dangers to the U.S. public on any measurable scale.” Id. at 130.*

The absence to date of clarity and emphasis on this point has enabled jurisprudence arguing, in short, “the evidence shows ‘we must do “something”’; regulating (this or that sector’s GHG emissions) is ‘something’; therefore, we must do that.” See generally, Massachusetts v. EPA, 549 U.S. 497, 127 S Ct. 1438 (2007), and Id. 127 S Ct. at 1458. This in turn has led to profound regulatory and economic costs, distortions and dislocation. It is therefore difficult to overstate the importance of the Review placing that critical point in perspective: there is no projected detectable climate impact (let alone benefit) from “climate” policies (i.e., all-pain-no-gain).

GAO Comment Summary

Government Accountability & Oversight, a 501(c)(3) non-profit public policy group with a particular focus on the areas of energy and environmental policy, hereby comments in response to your Notice of Availability: A Critical Review of Impacts of Greenhouse Gas Emissions on the U.S. Climate, 2025-14519 (90 FR 36150); Docket No. DOE-HQ-2025-0207 (“the Review”).

These comments are of particular importance given the historical public record, and efforts undertaken immediately upon the Department’s announcement of the Review to undermine DoE’s Review, by parties interested in perpetuating the crisis narrative (i.e., the climate industry, *infra*). This tracks with a point made recently by Review co-author Dr. Steve Koonin

that he started to dig more deeply into climate science in 2014—and discovered that it had a “dirty underbelly.” “I started paying attention to the representation of climate science in the media and political discussions, and realized that things were just not being told straight.”¹

Another Review author, Dr. Judith Curry, wrote in an email, “I would like to see a broadening of the tent for the ‘official’ assessments to include disagreement, debate, uncertainty.”² Implicit in Dr. Curry’s comment is that disagreement, debate and uncertainty have been absent.³

Judging by its words and actions, the climate industry perceives balance and debate as existential threats, and that to “hold a public debate about climate science [and] write a line-by-line rebuttal of the National Climate Assessment” constitutes “a sustained assault on mainstream global

¹ Madeleine Rowley, “The Truth About Climate Change ‘Lies Somewhere in the Middle,’” The Free Press, August 20, 2025, <https://www.thefp.com/p/the-truth-about-climate-change-lies-middle-steve-koonin>.

² Scott Waldman, “Trump team readies more attacks on mainstream climate science,” Climatewire, August 19, 2025. Typical of the genre, the article describes Dr. Steve Koonin, former Provost at CalTech and Obama DoE climate official, as “Koonin, a former chief scientist for BP.” Meanwhile, a plaintiff’s witness and board member of the Union of Concerned Scientists, which launched the climate litigation epidemic with a 2012 meeting in La Jolla, CA, simply as “Ben Santer, a climate scientist who worked at DOE for 30 years before retiring in 2021.” The public record is clear that the activist/plaintiff’s witness Santer “end[ed] his affiliation with [Lawrence Livermore] lab over its invitation for Steven Koonin to give a seminar” on climate science.” “Prep the Judges, Lest Ye be Judged: More Institutions Enlisted in Climate Litigation March, Hint at Possible Climate “Criminal Litigation,” Government Accountability & Oversight, May 26, 2021, <https://climatelitigationwatch.org/prep-the-judges-lest-ye-be-judged/> (linking to <https://blog.ucs.org/science-blogger/climate-denialism-no-place-at-lawrence-livermore-laboratory/?rid=24768794>). “Climate” journalism, in short, which is of and indeed is the public organ grinder for the climate industry, is as forthright as the individuals and institutions for which it plumps. See FN 6.

³ This is not a secret, just an inconvenient truth. For years senior researchers with no risk of not attaining tenure or advancement warned of the unfolding perversion of the field. Former Alfred P. Sloan Professor of Meteorology at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Richard Lindzen noted his observation that, “There’s one thing you shouldn’t say, and that is, ‘this might not be a problem.’” Interview, “The Great Global Warming Swindle,” Documentary Film, Channel 4 (UK), 2007. Years before that, then-Virginia state climatologist and University of Virginia professor Dr. Patrick Michaels urged the same caution, that “a coalition of interests has promoted the greenhouse theory: scientists have needed funds, the media a story, and governments a worthy cause”. Interview, “The Greenhouse Conspiracy,” Documentary Film, Channel 4 (UK), 1990. In the same program, Dr. Sherwood Idso similarly warned, “[a] lot of people are getting very famous and very well-known and very well-funded as a result of promoting the disastrous scenario of greenhouse warming.”

warming research.”⁴ This defining characteristic of “climate” discourse – that it cannot challenge the crisis narrative – does not suggest confidence in the merits of that narrative.⁵

The Department’s Review provides the beginnings of the balance that has long been lacking, which absence in our view was intentionally engineered, or “manufactured.” GAO suggests that DoE should consider this history, context, and these interests in assessing the data and also evaluating comments both from directly interested rent-seeking industry or purportedly objective academics and institutions and professional associations (*infra*). This is, as usual, buttressed with a contributing assist from the media⁶ all seeking to undermine this Review’s improvement of the record grounded in that fear, *supra*, that debate = assault. Proper consideration of a party’s comments will require an assessment of that party’s history in creating and feeding the climate industry, and/or its interest or even financial dependence on the perpetuation of that industry.

Finally, with Comment 2, GAO suggests that DoE should consider the role this industry’s deliberately unbalanced crisis narrative has played in influencing the judiciary, the consequences thereof, and thus the importance of inserting this long-overdue balance in the record.

COMMENT 1: *We incorporate by reference all other statements on Comment 1, above.*⁷

Many comments on DoE’s Review will reflect the fact and tendencies of what has become over the decades a Climate Industry, a self-perpetuating, “positive feedback loop” of catastrophist misrepresentation of observational data, both fed by and feeding vast government interventions. Any investment by commenting parties in preserving an alarmist, “crisis narrative” and official line of catastrophism which is not supported by the actual record is a material consideration.

No Mandarin wants the mandarin to end... and most will behave accordingly

The scientific establishment has become a powerful constituent part of the climate industry. The scientific establishment and climate industry are co-dependents, with great overlap of participant institutions and individuals and reliant on each other’s prosperity for their recent past and future growth. To preserve this, the same institutions and individuals have mobilized to, effectively,

⁴ Waldman, “Trump team readies more attacks on mainstream climate science,” Climatewire, August 19, 2025.

⁵ For years, pressure group activists hired by Ivy League institutions offered at least the appearance of academic prestige to assail, discourage and muffle dissenting speech that might impede the climate industry. Taxpayer-funded agencies did the same. “ClimateGate” revealed the ugly history of back-room dealing to keep work that threatened the manufactured consensus from publication. This is all readily available in the public record, including but not limited to the exhibits and transcripts of testimony in *Michael E. Mann v. Simberg, et al.*, D.C. Sup. Ct., 2012 CA 008263 B (2024).

⁶ *Id.* See also other, representative tendentious framing in ostensible news stories at, e.g., Scott Waldmin, Benjamin Storrow, “DOE reframes climate consensus as a debate,” Climatewire, July 31, 2025; Maxine Joselow and Brad Plumer, “Energy Dept. Attacks Climate Science in Contentious Report,” *New York Times*, July 31, 2025; Lisa Friedman, “Repeal of Clean Energy Law Will Mean a Hotter Planet, Scientists Warn,” *New York Times*, June 20, 2025; Benjamin Storrow, “How Chris Wright recruited a team to upend climate science,” Climatewire, August 11, 2025; Scott Waldmin, Zach Colman, “Meet the scientists Trump could tap to undermine climate regulations,” Climatewire, March 19, 2025; Hannah Northey, Christa Marshall, “Researchers who question mainstream climate science join DOE,” Energywire, July 9, 2025.

⁷ For ease of use these comments reference published summaries of relevant commentary and/or research.

shout down speakers and speech that threatens this shared prosperity. DoE should fully consider this vested interest when assessing both the record and efforts to undermine this Review.

We quote the following at length as being highly relevant to assessing input by conflicted parties whose advocacy pervades the scientific “consensus” view (hyperlinks in original):

Dennis Thompson, a political scientist and ethics expert, provides an often used definition of conflicts of interest in a 1993 comment in the New England Journal of Medicine:

A conflict of interest is a set of conditions in which professional judgment concerning a primary interest (such as a patient's welfare or the validity of research) tends to be unduly influenced by a secondary interest (such as financial gain)...

And he describes the meaning of a secondary interest noting that the problem is not its existence, but the extent to which it displaces the primary interest:

The secondary interest is usually not illegitimate in itself, and indeed it may even be a necessary and desirable part of professional practice. Only its relative weight in professional decisions is problematic.

Researcher conflicts of interest can induce the researcher into biased decision making and research misconduct (e.g., cherry picking data) that result in distorted research results. When found out after the fact conflicts of interest undermine public trust in science.⁸

Vested interests may take the form of financial assets, social standing, or political influence. Such interests often shape decisions and behaviors, motivating individuals or groups to advocate for particular policies or outcomes in business, politics, or other arenas, whether consciously or unconsciously. These interests help explain why considerations such as conflict of interest, bias, objectivity and balance are incorporated not just generally,⁹ but more specifically as well, into, e.g., the development of scientific findings, conclusions, and recommendations.¹⁰

Many such interests are present in the “climate” edifice constructed over decades and with many billions of largely taxpayer dollars (consider that, e.g., for years the federal government has spent more on climate change than taxpayers sent to the National Cancer Institute). It is axiomatic that

⁸ Jessica Weinkle, “Bias: Undisclosed conflicts of interest are a serious problem in the climate change literature,” Conflicted Substack, Jan. 9, 2025, <https://jessicaweinkle.substack.com/p/bias>, assessing Patrick Brown, “Do Climate Attribution Studies Tell the Full Story? How a cascade of selection effects bias the collective output of extreme event attribution studies,” BreakthroughJournal.com (Breakthrough Institute), Jan. 8, 2025. See also, e.g. Jessica Weinkle, “Conflicts of interest in climate change science,” Conflicted Substack, Feb. 18, 2025, <https://jessicaweinkle.substack.com/p/conflicts-of-interest-in-climate>.

⁹ <http://www.nationalacademies.org/coi> .

¹⁰ See, e.g., Policy on Composition and Balance, Conflicts of Interest, and Independence for Committees Used in the Development of Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations, National Academies, Sciences, Engineering and Medicine, Revised January 30, 2025, <https://www.nationalacademies.org/documents/embed/link/LF2255DA3DD1C41C0A42D3BEF0989ACAECE3053A6A9B/file/D4D336B1CB9047B19928EA8785ED2E43C913B841539A?noSaveAs=1>. We cite this for these purposes to show what NAS’s view of balance is, which the recent initiative plainly even aggressively avoids, rather than asserting a procedural violation.

this money would no longer flow, certainly at the recent astronomical levels, if scientists concluded tomorrow that Man's influence on climate is likely within natural variability or otherwise the crisis narrative was exposed, i.e., that anthropogenic effects on climate change are real but possibly not detectable, are de minimis, or otherwise are not catastrophic or substantially different than we have faced and will always continue to face.

Parties who created a panic, and with the vested interest in there being panic, are motivated to perpetuate the panic; they need there to be a problem in order to keep their train rolling. These beneficiaries will not go gently into an era of less relevance, influence, or importance.

As such, GAO encourages DoE to consider a commenter's past contributions to, current involvement in, and (it is rational to assume) continued interest in maintaining the climate industry whose viability (some vocal parties have indicated they believe) the Review threatens.

But, 'Consensus'

A "positive feedback loop" exists of interrelated environmental pressure groups, activist academia with booming taxpayer- and activist donor-financed research and advocacy practices, professional associations, and governmental institutions. It collaboratively engineered the touted "consensus" and promotes the climate industry.¹¹ Laboratories like NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies (GISS) for years housed the most vocal proponents of "global warming" and related policies, who in their quest would engage in personal attacks against dissenters. Peer activist institutions included NOAA's Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory (GFDL) and the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR). Of course, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory housed Union of Concerned Scientist board member, and climate-plaintiff's witness Dr. Ben Santer for many years until he cut ties over Livermore allowing Review co-author, former CalTech Provost Dr. Koonin to speak at a function (see, e.g., fn. 2, *supra*).

Institutional Example

One representative example among the parties laboring to manufacture and protect "consensus" and perpetuate panic is the National Academies of Science (NAS). This official conduit between science and government, which has for more than three decades has served as a politicized, activist organ and now collaborates with the "climate" trial bar (*infra*), has mobilized an emergency effort to counter DoE's Review evaluating relevant data.¹² As Co-author Dr. Koonin

¹¹ See, e.g., Richard Lindzen, "Manufacturing Consensus on Climate Change," The American Mind (Claremont Institute), November 21, 2024, <https://americanmind.org/salvo/manufacturing-consensus-on-climate-change/>. Cf. Complaint for Declaratory, Injunctive, and Mandamus Relief, *Environmental Defense Fund (and Union of Concerned Scientists, infra) v. Christopher Wright, et al.*, D. MA, Aug. 12, 2025, <https://library.edf.org/AssetLink/0kdlw6oq5v8hsvj152eqx01b0qn74uuq.pdf>.

¹² The NAS was established by Congress in 1863 to advise the federal government on scientific issues. Since then, as it marched toward its current activist mission, the NAS even made longtime Malthusian, and Club of Rome and UN Earth Summit organizer Maurice Strong the first non-citizen winner of its Public Welfare Medal, for his tireless support of "multilateral approaches to sustainable and equitable development and international peace." <https://www.nasonline.org/directory-entry/maurice-f-strong-yfykr3/>.

has stated in an interview, “the National Academies has spun up a study that they hope to release by September, which effectively sounds like it will be a counter to what we have written.”¹³

Consider that NAS was unable to perform, even after all this time, a similar study on the origins of COVID-19 on the grounds that (per NAS’s President¹⁴) the Academies required the government to ask it to do so, yet hurried on its own initiative to produce a paper to counter a government report on “climate” (using undisclosed donor funds).¹⁵

The NAS’s recent foray into supporting the climate litigation industry (on top of decades of increasing policy activism) prompted University of Colorado Professor Roger Pielke, Jr. to write (hyperlinks in original):

“it would be fair to ask whether the NAS Attribution committee is about science advice at all, or instead, a not-so-subtle form of institutionalized stealth advocacy in support of climate litigation. Has the integrity of the nation’s leading institution of science advice been compromised? That couldn’t be the case, could it?

The first public meeting of the NAS Attribution committee will take place a few weeks from now. On that agenda is a litigator from Sher Edling, LLC, a firm that is litigating almost two dozen climate cases that depend up claims of extreme event attribution.⁶ Somehow, that litigator’s role as a counsel-of-record in these various lawsuits was left off of the NAS public meeting agenda.”¹⁶ (links in original)

Indeed, that NAS “Fast-Track Review”¹⁷ organized with an apparent urgency was proposed with 6 of 15 members of the review panel having led or joined amicus briefs in favor of imposing the “climate” policy and legal agenda (and thus having revealed a strong bias toward linking

Consider how, in 2001, when the proceedings that ultimately led to the initial Endangerment Finding were getting underway, “the White House requested the National Academy of Sciences to assist the Administration in its review of climate change policy. The Academy ‘is a private, nonprofit, self-perpetuating society of distinguished scholars engaged in scientific and engineering research . . .’ NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL, CLIMATE CHANGE SCIENCE: AN ANALYSIS OF SOME OF THE KEY QUESTIONS, preface (2001). Under its congressional charter, issued in 1863, the Academy has a mandate to advise the federal government on scientific and technical matters when requested.” *Massachusetts et al. v. EPA*, 415 F.3d 50, 367 U.S. App. D.C. 282 (D.C. Cir. 2005). Its conversion into a climate-activist organ is indisputable on current evidence including but not limited to that cited herein. In the instant matter, not only did the administration did not bother (given said body of evidence/work), and the NAS took it upon itself to convene an emergency proceeding to impede reform NAS’s conversion into an advocacy organization and active enabler of the climate industry, even the climate litigation industry.

¹³ Madeleine Rowley, “The Truth About Climate Change ‘Lies Somewhere in the Middle’,” *The Free Press*, August 20, 2025, <https://www.thefp.com/p/the-truth-about-climate-change-lies-middle-steve-koonin>.

¹⁴ Marcia McNutt, “President, @theNASciences, former Editor-in-Chief of Science journals, AAAS” (<https://x.com/Marcia4Science>), Aug. 13, <https://x.com/Marcia4Science/status/1911509590178693512>.

¹⁵ Roger Pielke, Jr., Aug. 22, 2025, <https://x.com/RogerPielkeJr/status/1959054773757649109>.

¹⁶ Roger Pielke, Jr., “Attribution Stealth Advocacy at the NAS,” American Enterprise Institute, Nov. 4, 2024, <https://www.aei.org/articles/attribution-stealth-advocacy-at-the-nas/>.

¹⁷ <https://www.nationalacademies.org/news/2025/08/national-academies-launch-fast-track-review-of-latest-evidence-for-whether-greenhouse-gas-emissions-endanger-public-health-and-welfare>

increasing atmospheric CO₂ to supposedly dangerous global warming and a threat to human health, thereby being somewhat extreme-outliers in the extent of their activism as “scientists”). There of course are not six amici filers on the panel opposed to this position—or any so far as we see, though such a background either way should immediately disqualify potential panelists.

This, like other efforts before it, shows that NAS’s Review is not intended to be impartial but to reinforce the very claim it is purportedly designed to test.¹⁸ It represents simply more advocacy, which DoE should consider when evaluating the importance it gives to NAS’s input.

The Problem is “Science”-wide

Both the institutions of science and their constituent members have over recent decades sacrificed credibility on the altar of ideology. “Climate” is no different; indeed, the parallels of ongoing advocacy promoting the “climate” policy agenda with other recent advocacy in service of ideological activism are inescapable.¹⁹ There is no evidence that the lessons of the COVID experience with ideological bias in making pronouncements re: “science” has left policy-minded science-advocates chastened in their ambitions to serve as policy arbiters.²⁰ The widespread problem of activist-science is particularly acute whenever “climate” policy is implicated, triggering activism by even academics or researchers not working in fields directly involved in or

¹⁸ See, e.g., Roger Pielke, Jr., “A Takeover of the IPCC,” *The Honest Broker*, Aug. 20, 2025, <https://rogerpielkejr.substack.com/p/a-takeover-of-the-ippcc>.

¹⁹ This runs from COVID-19 (Dan Diamond, “Suddenly, Public Health Officials Say Social Justice Matters More Than Social Distance,” *Politico*, June 4, 2020, <https://www.politico.com/news/magazine/2020/06/04/public-health-protests-301534>, to Monkeypox (one person’s risk is another’s celebration, *infra*).

This extends all the way down to the shared push for lockdowns and other government interventions. See, e.g., “As environmentalist group Extinction Rebellion co-founder Clare Farrell wrote in April, ‘the things we were told we simply can’t change when we were on the streets last year are perfectly possible (necessary!) to change if we decide to prioritise. Coronavirus is showing us what’s possible, at least.’ Yet Walter Russell Mead, ‘Coronavirus and the Climate,’ *Wall Street Journal*, June 15, 2020, https://www.wsj.com/articles/coronavirus-and-the-climate-11592235174?st=cUFbrV&reflink=desktopwebshare_permalink. Meanwhile, “as Pakistan’s Prime Minister Imran Khan wrote on Twitter, ‘We sought a total lockdown without thinking about the consequences for the daily wage earners, the street vendors, the laborers, all of whom face poverty and hunger. . . . May Allah forgive us.’” *Id.* See also, “Both crises require global solutions. The COVID-19 crisis will not be resolved until all countries bring the pandemic under control through widespread vaccination, and the climate crisis will not be solved until all emitters swing into action, bringing global emissions to net zero.” Oya Celasun, Florence Jaumotte, Antonio Spilimbergo, “What COVID-19 Can Teach Us About Mitigating Climate Change,” International Monetary Fund, July 9, 2021, <https://www.imf.org/en/Blogs/Articles/2021/07/09/what-covid-19-can-teach-us-about-mitigating-climate-change>; see also, e.g., “the rapid global response to COVID-19 may also serve as a call to action for addressing the climate crisis... the IMF likens the urgent global threats of COVID-19 and climate change, suggesting that the international community should use similar tools and global cooperation to tackle both,” COVID-19 Brief: Impact on Climate, U.S. Global Leadership Coalition, September 2021, <https://www.usglc.org/coronavirus/climate/>.

²⁰ See, e.g., in an interview during the 2023 monkey pox outbreak, former director of the National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases, Dr. Demetre Daskalakis, said the Biden administration aims to “support peoples’ joy as opposed to calling them ‘risky’”: Interview, MSNBC. Video available at <https://x.com/RNCResearch/status/1670433692312018944> “One person’s idea of risk is another person’s idea of a great festival or Friday night.” Alec Schemmel, CDC official who blasted Trump’s ‘weak science’ led politicized Biden-era monkeypox response, Yahoo.com, Aug. 30, 2025, <https://www.yahoo.com/news/articles/cdc-official-blasted-trump-weak-120043260.html>.

financially benefitting from the climate industry. As the National Academies of Science panel staffed with amicus brief-filing activist/scientists assembled to counter this Review shows.

This is a continuation of a modern reality:

Liberals and medical advocacy organizations often use such imperious terms as “pro-science,” “science says” or “consensus shows” when the science is murky or conflicted at best. What they are really saying is: *We believe this, and therefore it is so...*

The same is true of many public-health pronouncements.

While the pandemic ended long ago, the medical establishment has continued to erode its credibility by asserting that flimsy and flawed “science” supports its liberal views...

Experts squandered public trust during the pandemic by falsely claiming that lockdowns and school closures were guided by science... . The AMA also supported the Biden administration’s climate regulations, including its electric-vehicle mandate and efforts to restrict greenhouse-gas emissions across the economy, under the false flag of protecting public health. A friend-of-court brief by the AMA and other medical organizations in *West Virginia v. EPA* (2022) declares that “volumes of peer-reviewed science on such health effects reinforce the conclusion that climate pollutants warrant action from EPA.”

Greenhouse-gas emissions from fossil fuels may contribute to rising temperatures, but they don’t harm public health, unlike pollutants such as nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter. Carbon dioxide is harmless to humans and vital to plants.²¹

The American Medical Association enlistment years ago to participate with climate advocates to push the agenda extends even, incredibly, to “[s]upport rapid implementation and incentivization of clean energy solutions and significant investments in climate resilience through a climate justice lens.”²² Remember, unlike other policy areas (defense, tax, etc.), “climate” policy does not promise to impact the climate (*Comment 2*). Medical associations promote particular energy

²¹ Allysia Finley, “The Doctors Who Cry ‘Science’: The AMA aligns itself with the left on abortion, climate, transgenderism and affirmative action,” Wall Street Journal, August 24, 2025, https://www.wsj.com/opinion/the-doctors-who-cry-science-506d9b4e?mod=columnists_article_pos9. The author continues, rightly, “The AMA and the rest of the medical establishment have cried science so many times to support their progressive views that many Americans no longer believe them on anything...If the medical establishment wants to restore trust in science, then it should stop politicizing it.”

²² See, e.g., “In 1989, the AMA issued its first report on the effects of global climate change and joined with governmental and other organizations to work on a comprehensive national policy and program to address the adverse effects of environmental pollution, including the “greenhouse effect”. Within the last ten years, the AMA House of Delegates (HOD) has adopted a number of policies on climate change, air pollution, and sustainability. At the annual meeting in 2022, the AMA adopted policy declaring climate change a public health crisis that threatens the health and well-being of all individuals, with marginalized and disadvantaged populations expected to be disproportionately impacted by changing weather patterns.” American Medical Association, Addressing the Public Health Crisis of Climate Change,” <https://www.ama-assn.org/system/files/addressing-the-public-health-crisis-of-climate-change.pdf>.

sources, “investments,” and “justice”, in the name of climate but not with an anticipated climate outcome. This is unmistakably *ideology*.

This advocacy extends to, e.g., the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Heart Association and, for many years, the American Lung Association. Records obtained under state freedom of information laws reveal coordination on this of activist donors Energy Foundation and Grantham Foundation to route money through academic institutions on campaigns which then partner with these advocates to advance the policy agenda through polling-driven advocacy, recruiting “story tellers” to tell their “weather and climate stories” and “solution stories,” and—most important here—produce comments to influence federal decisionmaking.²³

In short, all is not what it seems when professionals and their societies weigh in on policy.

We reiterate here the behavior of the National Academies of Science, *supra*, and particularly its panel convened for the purpose of “addressing” this Review, which is chock full of pro-regulation, pro-disgorgement amici who are not neutral arbiters of “the science” but have already weighed in on these issues publicly and demanded specific public policy/legal outcomes. DoE should proceed with this Review and assessing public comments fully considering the fact that much advocacy promoting the crisis narrative is borne of ideological desire.

Other Considerations

By this Review, the Department seeks to add a small portion of the balance steered away the public record over many years. In its evaluation the Department should fully consider any commenter’s role and interests in creating or perpetuating the “manufactured” basis for a climate-crisis narrative, in perpetuating and expanding policies implemented in the name of said crisis, and participation in litigation seeking massive wealth transfers.

Further, as appropriate, the Department should acknowledge that its predecessors violated policy, procedural and scientific norms and otherwise improperly distorted the process to get their way, and advance an aligned cause, including through misrepresenting the true state of understanding of “climate”.²⁴

Additionally, it is useful to note that the scientific establishment gunning for this Review has a history of not only targeting “dissenting” arguments, assertions and even mere information, they also have a history of being wrong seemingly without parallel in any other context, profession, or discipline. This, too, is worth considering when evaluating public comment on the Review.²⁵

²³ See, e.g., records released in Virginia FOIA litigation by George Mason University, at <https://govoversight.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/09/GMU-Puerto-Rico-docs-not.pdf>.

²⁴ We note that a confession of error of law, fact or procedure that is supported by documents, illustrating the admitted wrongdoing, will be accepted by the courts. See *Ethyl Corp. v. Browner*, 989 F.2d 522, 524 (D.D.C. 1993) (holding that where there was significant new evidence, a remand was appropriate).

²⁵ For purely illustrative purposes, see, e.g., “1983 NBC News Broadcast Warns of ‘Catastrophic’ Global Warming by 1990s,” viewable on Grabien, <https://grabien.com/story?id=265441> (“A federal report today predicted possible catastrophic warming of the Earth by the 1990s with the strong climate change. I’m Jessica Savitch in New York.

COMMENT 2: *“U.S. policy actions are expected to have undetectably small direct impacts on the global climate and any effects [NB: again, while not expected to be detectable] will emerge only with long delays” (Review, at ix); “Thus, in contrast with conventional air pollution control, even drastic local actions will have negligible local effects, and only with a long delay. The practice of referring to unilateral U.S. reductions as “combatting climate change” or “taking action on climate” on the assumption we can stop climate change therefore reflects a profound misunderstanding of the scale of the issue.” Id., at 129; “Consequently, in contrast to the case of local air contaminants like particulates and ozone, even the most aggressive regulatory actions on GHG emissions from U.S. vehicles cannot be expected to remediate alleged climate dangers to the U.S. public on any measurable scale.” Id. at 130.*

The absence to date of clarity and emphasis on that point has led to jurisprudence arguing, in short, “the evidence shows ‘we must do “something”’; regulating (this or that sector’s GHG emissions are ‘something’; therefore, we must do that.” See generally, *Massachusetts v. EPA*, 549 U.S. 497, 127 S Ct. 1438 (2007).²⁶ *In truth, “climate” policy promises all pain, no gain.*

CONCLUSION

For reasons stated above, in its assessment of the record, including comments on the Review, the Department should not be sparing in its recognition of biases, conflicts, and histories of being routinely and often spectacularly wrong²⁷, with the mistakes curiously and in defiance of the laws of probability going in one direction: supporting a crisis narrative. The Department must recognize that it has been a significant participant in and beneficiary of the self-licking ice cream cone that is the climate industry—government institutions generate the basis for spending more on and giving more importance to these same government institutions in our lives, economy and national security. Until some balance is instilled into the record reflecting the reality of

More news later on this NBC station", referencing the National Research Council's "Changing Climate: Report of the Carbon Dioxide Assessment Committee," which predicted a significant global temperature increase due to elevated CO2 levels from fossil fuel combustion); see also “Fire and Ice,” Media Research Center, <https://www.mrc.org/fire-and-ice>, https://web.archive.org/web/20110219190007/http://old.businessandmedia.org/specialreports/2006/fireandice/fireandice_Bibliography.asp.

²⁶ See also, *Id.* 127 S Ct. at 1458 (citing to reliance by D.C. Circuit judge on affidavits in the record below stating, e.g., “[a]chievable reductions in emissions of CO2 and other [greenhouse gases] from U. S. motor vehicles would . . . delay and moderate many of the adverse impacts of global warming.” See also, “As Judge Tatel observed in dissent below, ‘EPA would presumably not bother with such efforts if it thought emissions reductions would have no discernable impact on future global warming.’” “In sum—at least according to petitioners’ uncontested affidavits—the rise in sea levels associated with global warming has already harmed and will continue to harm Massachusetts. The risk of catastrophic harm, though remote, is nevertheless real. That risk would be reduced to some extent if petitioners received the relief they seek...” The public record only supports a conclusion that this is true in some theoretical but not in any detectable, i.e., actual, sense and is no reasonable basis for regulation.

²⁷ For a brief inventory of some of the relevant mistaken projections and assumptions driving the crisis narrative, specifically those relevant to the Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) 2009 “Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings for Greenhouse Gases Under Section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act,” we refer you to the Comment to the EPA’s Proposed Reconsideration of 2009 Endangerment Finding and Greenhouse Gas Vehicle Standards Docket ID EPA-HQ-OAR-2025-0194-0093 RIN 2060-AW71 40 CFR Parts 85, 86, 600, 1036, 1037, and 1039, submitted by Benjamin Zycher, August 31, 2025.

observations compared with past pronouncements, policies and jurisprudence will continue to hinge on this inappropriately engineered record. Until then, the economic dislocation and threats to grid stability, the economy and national security will continue to mount, and government will continue to harm those interests it was established to protect.