



## Scientific Censorship: Climate Fanatics Urge Removal of Study Questioning Evidence of a “Climate Crisis”

Claiming that four Italian scientists who published a peer-reviewed paper earlier this year finding that there is not yet evidence of any “climate crisis” wrote the study in “bad faith,” climate fanatic scientists are urging that the journal that published the study remove it from public view.

The [study in question](#) comes to the conclusion that the so-called “climate crisis” that the mainstream media say is already upon us is not evident — at least yet — and that it is counterproductive to claim that such a crisis exists.

The [study](#), done by four Italian scientists — physicist Gianluca Alimonti, professor of agrometeorology Luigi Mariani, atmospheric physicist Franco Prodi, and physicist Renato Angelo Ricci — states that “the climate crisis that, according to many sources, we are experiencing today, is not evident yet.”

Further, the Italian study calls into question the wisdom of leaving such a “crisis” for our children without the necessary tools — fossil fuels, etc. — they will need to adapt to such a crisis should it ever come to bear.

“Leaving the baton to our children without burdening them with the anxiety of being in a climate emergency would allow them to face the various problems in place (energy, agricultural-food, health, etc.) with a more objective and constructive spirit, with the goal of arriving at a weighted assessment of the actions to be taken without wasting the limited resources at our disposal in costly and ineffective solutions,” the Italian study states.


The study was first published in January, and has been cited by mainstream media outlets such as Sky News Australia. Only now are other scientists, interviewed by French news service AFP, calling for the paper to be memory-holed.

“They are writing this article in bad faith,” said Friederike Otto of the Grantham Institute for Climate Change and the Environment.

So, although the Italian study was peer reviewed — the gold standard of haughty scientists everywhere — some climate scientists would rather that it simply go away, possibly so that they don’t have to react to its conclusions.

The alarmist scientists quickly dove into character assassination of the Italian scientists involved.

Saying that the Italian study was written “by people not working in climatology and obviously



Dzmitry Dzemedovich/iStock/Getty Images Plus



Written by [James Murphy](#) on September 30, 2022

---

unfamiliar with the topic and relevant data,” Stefan Rahmstorf of the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research claims that the Italian scientists — three physicists and a professor of agrometeorology — simply do not possess the acumen to comment on the subject.

“It is not published in a climate journal — this is a common avenue taken by ‘climate sceptics’ in order to avoid peer review by real experts in the field,” he complained.

In a true case of the pot calling the kettle black, Rahmstorf said, “They simply ignore studies that don’t fit their narrative and have come to the opposite conclusion.”

Climate fanatics and the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) would *never* “cherry pick” scientific data to come to their own conclusion, apparently.

Richard Betts, head of Climate Impacts Research at Britain’s Met Office, believes that the Italian study was done only to challenge the climate crisis narrative: “The paper gives the appearance of being specifically written to make the case that there is no climate crisis, rather than presenting an objective, comprehensive, up-to-date assessment.”

Then came the censorship calls.

“I do not know this journal, but if it is a self-respecting one it should withdraw the article,” Rahmstorf concluded.

Otto agreed, saying, “If the journal cares about science they should withdraw it loudly and publicly, saying that it should not have been published.”

When asked by AFP how the Italian study could be published, given the fact that it appears to be at odds with mainstream climate science, the publisher, Springer Nature, said only, “We can’t comment at this time.”

Certainly honest scientists can disagree on conclusions drawn from data. Such disagreements lead to finding the truth, after all. Any scientific conclusion should be rigorously challenged, again and again, with the ultimate goal of locating truth.

But one thing honest scientists should *never* do is attempt to silence other scientists with dissenting views. That’s not science; it’s authoritarian politics.



## Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



### What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.

**Subscribe**