

Trump's Science Denial

Trump's refusal to listen to scientists and experts is dangerous

Download this research in MS Word format here:

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=10lqdrANOOG07AxnLb21872avnJCEK20>

QUICK FACTS:

- Trump was [repeatedly warned](#) by scientists and experts about both [COVID-19](#) and [climate change](#).
- Trump [ignored](#) those [warnings](#), calling concerns about [both COVID-19](#) and [climate change](#) a “hoax.”
- When pressed, Trump downplayed the threats, initially [comparing COVID-19 to the flu](#) and [insisting he had things under control](#), and arguing that climate change is “[not a big problem at all](#)” and that the climate “[changes both ways](#).”
- When scientists spoke up, Trump attacked them:
 - On COVID-19, Trump called a study that showed the impacts of early inaction a “[political hit job](#)” and dismissing those who warned about

hydroxychloroquine because they “[aren't big Trump fans](#).” White House officials [blocked](#) a CDC report over [economic and religious concerns](#), [ousted](#) and official who raised concerns about an unproven drug touted by Trump.

- On Climate Change, Trump has a [long history](#) of attacking climate scientists, [claiming](#) they have a political agenda and dismissing them as “[hoaxsters](#)” and “[dollar sucking wiseguys](#).” Government scientists have even been [pushed out](#) or [forced](#) to stop work on climate issues.
- Trumps anti-science attitude has cost American lives during the COVID-19 crisis and will continue to cost hundreds of thousands of lives if climate change does unaddressed.

DIG DEEPER:

Trump was warned about climate change, pandemic preparedness, and COVID-19.

- Trump was warned about climate change by officials from NASA, the [Department of Defense](#), the [Centers for Disease Control](#) and the [National Institute of Health](#), and top [climate scientists](#).
- Trump was [warned](#) about the country's pandemic readiness. He was [warned](#) the U.S. could face shortages of ventilators and protective equipment. He was [warned](#) about the potential costs of a pandemic scenario.
- Trump was repeatedly warned about COVID-19. As early as January, Trump received warnings in his daily briefings about the [potential consequences](#) of the COVID-19 outbreak in China. The White House also [received](#) several memos that [detailed](#) the risks of coronavirus.
- [Click here to jump to more research below.](#)

Trump denied and ignored the warnings on climate change and the COVID-19 pandemic.

- Trump denied the science on climate change, repeatedly calling it a “[hoax](#).” He [refuted](#) a government report warning of the economic impact

of climate change and [disputed](#) the science linking human actions to climate change.

- Trump denied the science on the coronavirus pandemic, referring to the deadly virus as a “[hoax](#).” He [insisted](#) the virus would disappear by April as the weather got warmer, and despite the efforts of intelligence officials, he [refused](#) to do anything about it.
- [Click here to jump to more research below.](#)

Trump downplayed the significance of the threat posed both by climate change and COVID-19.

- Trump [downplayed](#) the threat of climate change as “not a big problem at all.” He [argued](#) the climate “changes both ways” and [implied](#) the term climate change was conceived because global warming was no longer working.
- Trump downplayed the seriousness of COVID-19, [comparing](#) the virus to the flu. In March, he [said](#) he was “not concerned at all” about coronavirus, [arguing](#) his administration had “tremendous control over” the virus, [while](#) Dr. Fauci acknowledged the worst was ahead.
- As coronavirus cases [reached](#) 2 million in June, Trump planned a large campaign rally in Tulsa, Oklahoma. The state’s top health official [urged](#) the campaign to postpone the event [following](#) the area’s largest spike in COVID-19 cases.
- [Click here to jump to more research below.](#)

Trump attacked the motivations of climate and COVID-19 scientists.

- Trump has a [history](#) of attacking climate scientists, [claiming](#) they have a political agenda and dismissing them as “[hoaxsters](#)” and “[dollar sucking wiseguys](#).”
- Trump has attacked COVID-19 scientists in the same fashion. He has called a study that urged early action against coronavirus a “[political hit job](#),” [lashed out](#) at scientists who contradict him, and [dismissed](#) warnings about hydroxychloroquine because they came from “people that aren’t big Trump fans.”
- [Click here to jump to more research below.](#)

Trump has cut scientists out of the administration's process on climate change and COVID-19.

- Climate scientists have been censored throughout the administration:
 - Trump's administration have censored climate scientists across the State Department, the U.S. Geological Survey, NASA, the EPA, the Interior Department, the U.S. park service and the Department of Energy, among others.
 - Leadership at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration compromised the agency's scientific integrity policy in releasing a statement supporting President Trump's false claims about Hurricane Dorian's path.
 - An inspector general's report found over 400 EPA workers believed their managers had interfered with or suppressed the release of scientific information. A separate survey found more than 600 workers had been instructed to omit the phrase climate change from their work.
- Trump has placed limits on public health studies. Trump's EPA sought to [limit](#) scientific and medical research used to determine public health regulations and [expanded](#) a proposed rule to limit public health science.
- EPA scientists have been overruled in the regulatory process of [mileage rollbacks](#) and on [exempting](#) Wisconsin's Racine County from smog safeguards.
- Trump has [limited](#) the environmental review [process](#) of federal actions, [limiting](#) the scope of information that needs to be considered in environmental assessments of proposed projects.
- Government scientists have been [forced](#) to stop work on climate issues, and in some cases, have been [pushed out](#) over their work on climate change. In addition, Trump's EPA [disbanded](#) a key scientific advisory panel on particulate air pollution.
- Trump has pushed out or silenced scientists in his administration's COVID-19 response. White House officials [blocked](#) a CDC report over [economic and religious concerns](#), and the former official overseeing the development of a coronavirus vaccine says he was [ousted](#) for raising concerns about an unproven drug touted by Trump.

- [Click here to jump to more research below.](#)

With his denial of science and refusal to listen to experts, Trump has missed opportunities to mobilize solutions to climate change and COVID-19.

- Trump failed to build a clean energy economy, with his administration [hampering](#) the green jobs industry, [slowing down](#) its growth, [cutting](#) its funding and [delaying](#) the funding for low-interest loans under the coronavirus relief bill.
- Trump's [tariffs](#) dealt a blow to the solar industry, his Interior Department [slowed down](#) the permitting process for the nation's first utility-scale offshore wind project, and his planned [rollback](#) of fuel emissions standards is predicted to harm the clean vehicle industry.
- Trump [failed](#) to lead on manufacturing protective equipment during the COVID-19 pandemic. His administration [turned down](#) opportunities to manufacture masks in the U.S. and fell months [behind](#) in implementing recommendations laid out by the National Security Council.
- [Click here to jump to more research below.](#)

Trump's ignorance costs lives.

- Trump's botched response to the COVID-19 pandemic cost. Columbia University [found](#) 54,000 coronavirus deaths could have been prevented if social distancing was implemented earlier, and Dr. Fauci [concluded](#) that if mitigation efforts were started earlier, lives could have been saved.
- Climate change is already costing lives. [Studies show](#) climate change is responsible for around 150,000 deaths each year, the U.S. has witnessed 46 climate or extreme weather disasters [costing](#) 3,604 lives since Trump took office, and more than 350 workers have [died](#) from heart-related illnesses in the last decade.
- [Click here to jump to more research below.](#)

CONTENTS

QUICK FACTS:	1
DIG DEEPER:	2
CONTENTS	6
RESEARCH:	8
TRUMP WAS WARNED	8
Warnings About Climate Change	8
Warnings About COVID-19	11
TRUMP DENIED & IGNORED THE WARNINGS	14
Climate Change Denial	14
Pandemic Denial.....	18
TRUMP DOWNPLAYED THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE THREAT	20
Downplaying the Significance Of Climate Change.....	20
Downplaying The Seriousness Of COVID-19.....	21
Early In The Crisis, Trump Compared COVID-19 To A Flu.....	21
Later Trump Planned Campaign Rallies Despite The Concerns Of Local Health Officials.....	22
TRUMP ATTACKED THE SCIENTISTS	24
Attacking The Motivations Of Climate Scientists.....	24
Attacking The Motivations Of COVID-19 Scientists.....	27
TRUMP CUTS SCIENTISTS OUT OF THE PROCESS	28
Scientists Pushed Out Or Silenced Over Climate Change.....	28
Climate Scientists Censored	28
Science Suppressed By Mid-Level Agency Employees.....	31
Limits On Public Health Studies	32
Scientists Overruled In The Regulatory Process	33
Environmental Review Processes Limited.....	34
Government Scientists Pushed Out Over Climate Change Work.....	35
Scientists Pushed Out Or Silenced In COVID-19 Response.....	37
MISSED OPPORTUNITIES TO MOBILIZE A SOLUTION	39
Failure To Build A Clean Energy Economy.....	39
Failure To Lead On Manufacturing Protective Equipment During Pandemic	42

TRUMP’S IGNORANCE COSTS LIVES..... 45
Trump’s Botched Pandemic Response Costs Lives 45
Climate Change Is Already Costing Lives 47

RESEARCH:

TRUMP WAS WARNED

WARNINGS ABOUT CLIMATE CHANGE

NASA Climate Change Website Pointed Out That 97% Of Scientists Agree: “Climate-Warming Trends Over The Past Century Are Very Likely Due To Human Activities.” According to NASA, “Multiple studies published in peer-reviewed scientific journals show that 97 percent or more of actively publishing climate scientists agree: Climate-warming trends over the past century are extremely likely due to human activities. In addition, most of the leading scientific organizations worldwide have issued public statements endorsing this position.” [[NASA Global Climate Change website, last updated 4/30/2020](#)]

NASA: What Difference Does It Make If Temperatures Go Up Another Half A Degree? “The Answer Is, A Lot.” In June of 2019, NASA’s Global Change website published an article titled “A Degree of Concern: Why Global Temperatures Matter” which posed the question: “You might be thinking, ‘Why should I care if temperatures go up another half a degree or one degree? Temperatures go up and down all the time. What difference does it make?’ The answer is, a lot. Higher temperature thresholds will adversely impact increasingly larger percentages of life on Earth, with significant variations by region, ecosystem and species. For some species, it literally means life or death. ‘What we see isn’t good – impacts of climate change are in many cases larger in response to a half a degree (of warming) than we’d expected,’ said Shindell, who was formerly a research scientist at NASA’s Goddard Institute for Space Studies in New York City. ‘We see faster acceleration of ice melting, greater increases in tropical storm damages, stronger effects on droughts and flooding, etc. As we calibrate our models to capture the observed responses or even simply extrapolate another half a degree, we see that it’s more important than we’d previously thought to avoid the extra warming between 1.5 and 2 degrees Celsius.’” [[NASA Global Climate Change, 6/19/2019](#)]

Department Of Defense Report Warned That “Climate Change Will Affect The Department Of Defense’s Ability To Defend The Nation. A Department of Defense report on climate change stated: “Climate change will affect the Department of Defense's ability to defend the Nation and poses immediate risks to U.S. national security. The Department is responding to climate change in two ways: adaptation, or efforts to plan for the changes that are occurring or expected to occur; and mitigation, or efforts that reduce greenhouse gas emissions. This Climate Change Adaptation Roadmap (Roadmap) focuses on the Department's climate change adaptation activities.” [[US Department of Defense 2014 Climate Change Adaptation Roadmap](#)]

Experts From The CDC And NIH Reported Climate Change “Is Affecting The Health And Well-Being Of The American People.” Chapter 14 of the Fourth National Climate Assessment focused entirely on human health. The executive summary found: “Climate-related changes in weather patterns and associated changes in air, water, food, and the environment are affecting the health and well-being of the American people, causing injuries, illnesses, and death. Increasing temperatures, increases in the frequency and intensity of heat waves (since the 1960s), changes in precipitation patterns (especially increases in heavy precipitation), and sea level rise can affect our health through multiple pathways. Changes in weather and climate can degrade air and water quality; affect the geographic range, seasonality, and intensity of transmission of infectious diseases through food, water, and disease-carrying vectors (such as mosquitoes and ticks); and increase stresses that affect mental health and well-being.” The Federal Coordinating Lead Authors on the chapter were John M. Balbus from the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences under the NIH and George Luber from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Additional authors represented Children’s Hospital Ohio, The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the University of Florida, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the American Geophysical Union, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the Kreske Foundation. [[Fourth National Climate Assessment Chapter 14: Human Health, 2018](#)]

2010 Survey Of Top Climate Experts Found 97-98% Agree On Anthropogenic (Man-Caused) Climate Change. Climate Scientists William R.L. Anderegg, James W. Prall, Jacob Harold, and Stephen H. Schneider published a paper in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences in April of 2010. According to the summary of the paper: “Although preliminary estimates from published literature and expert surveys suggest striking agreement

among climate scientists on the tenets of anthropogenic climate change (ACC), the American public expresses substantial doubt about both the anthropogenic cause and the level of scientific agreement underpinning ACC. A broad analysis of the climate scientist community itself, the distribution of credibility of dissenting researchers relative to agreeing researchers, and the level of agreement among top climate experts has not been conducted and would inform future ACC discussions. Here, we use an extensive dataset of 1,372 climate researchers and their publication and citation data to show that (i) 97–98% of the climate researchers most actively publishing in the field surveyed here support the tenets of ACC outlined by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, and (ii) the relative climate expertise and scientific prominence of the researchers unconvinced of ACC are substantially below that of the convinced researchers." [[Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, "Expert credibility in climate change," April 9, 2010](#)]

2013 Analysis Of Scientific Papers Concluded 97% Of Climate Scientists Agree That Humans Are Causing Global Warming. A study of peer-reviewed scientific literature examining 11,944 climate abstracts from 1991-2001 matching the topics 'global climate change' or 'global warming' found that 97.1% of articles expressing a position on anthropogenic (caused by man) global warming endorsed the consensus position that humans are causing global warming. [[John Cook et al 2013 Environ. Res. Lett. 8 024024](#)]

2016: John Cook, In Response To Climate Skeptic's Criticism Of 2013 Paper, Reconfirmed Consensus On Human-Caused Climate Change. In 2016, the authors of a 2013 paper frequently cited for establishing that 97% of climate scientists agree on anthropomorphic climate change published a reply to criticisms by climate skeptics of their earlier paper. According to the abstract of the 2016 paper: "The consensus that humans are causing recent global warming is shared by 90%–100% of publishing climate scientists according to six independent studies by co-authors of this paper. Those results are consistent with the 97% consensus reported by Cook et al (Environ. Res. Lett. 8 024024) based on 11 944 abstracts of research papers, of which 4014 took a position on the cause of recent global warming. A survey of authors of those papers(N = 2412 papers) also supported a 97% consensus. Tol (2016 Environ. Res. Lett. 11 048001) comes to a different conclusion using results from surveys of nonexperts such as economic geologists and a self-selected group of those who reject the consensus. We demonstrate that this outcome is not unexpected because the level of consensus correlates with expertise in climate science. At one point, Tol also reduces the apparent consensus by assuming that abstracts

that do not explicitly state the cause of global warming ('no position') represent nonendorsement, an approach that if applied elsewhere would reject consensus on well-established theories such as plate tectonics. We examine the available studies and conclude that the finding of 97% consensus in published climate research is robust and consistent with other surveys of climate scientists and peer-reviewed studies." [[John Cook et al 2016 Environ. Res. Lett. 11 048002](#)]

WARNINGS ABOUT COVID-19

In Early 2017, The Trump Transition Team Was Briefed On A Hypothetical Influenza Outbreak And Was Warned They Could Face Shortages Of Ventilators And Protective Equipment. In March of 2020, Politico reported on a briefing exercise that took place with the Trump transition team shortly before Donald Trump's inauguration involving a hypothetical pandemic of an influenza virus overwhelming hospitals abroad. According to Politico: "The Trump team was told it could face specific challenges, such as shortages of ventilators, anti-viral drugs and other medical essentials, and that having a coordinated, unified national response was 'paramount' — warnings that seem eerily prescient given the ongoing coronavirus crisis." [[Politico, 3/16/2020](#)]

September 2019: Council Of Economic Advisors Report Warned Of A Pandemic Scenario That Could Cost Half A Million Lives And Cause Trillions In Economic Damage. A September, 2019 report from the White House Council of Economic Advisors reported: "The Council of Economic Advisors (CEA) finds that in a pandemic year, depending on the transmission efficiency and virulence of the particular pandemic virus, the economic damage would range from \$413 billion to \$3.79 trillion. Fatalities in the most serious scenario would exceed half a million people in the United States. Millions more would be sick, with between approximately 670,000 to 4.3 million requiring hospitalization." [[Council of Economic Advisors "Mitigating the Impact of Pandemic Influenza through Vaccine Innovation." September 2019](#)]

A "Pandemic Playbook" Was Crafted In 2016 To Guide Government Response To A Pandemic. On March 25, 2020, Politico reported: "The NSC devised the guide — officially called the Playbook for Early Response to High-Consequence Emerging Infectious Disease Threats and Biological Incidents, but known colloquially as 'the pandemic playbook' — across 2016. The project was driven by career civil servants as well as political appointees, aware that global leaders had initially fumbled their response to the 2014-

2015 spread of Ebola and wanting to be sure that the next response to an epidemic was better handled. The Trump administration was briefed on the playbook's existence in 2017, said four former officials, but two cautioned that it never went through a full, National Security Council-led interagency process to be approved as Trump administration strategy. Tom Bossert, who was then Trump's homeland security adviser, expressed enthusiasm about its potential as part of the administration's broader strategy to fight pandemics, two former officials said." [[Politico, 3/25/2020](#)]

Warnings About Potential Consequences Of The Coronavirus Outbreak In China Were Included In Trump's Presidential Daily Brief In January And February. On April 27, 2020, the Washington Post reported: "U.S. intelligence agencies issued warnings about the novel coronavirus in more than a dozen classified briefings prepared for President Trump in January and February, months during which he continued to play down the threat, according to current and former U.S. officials. The repeated warnings were conveyed in issues of the President's Daily Brief, a sensitive report that is produced before dawn each day and designed to call the president's attention to the most significant global developments and security threats. For weeks, the PDB — as the report is known — traced the virus's spread around the globe, made clear that China was suppressing information about the contagion's transmissibility and lethal toll, and raised the prospect of dire political and economic consequences. But the alarms appear to have failed to register with the president, who routinely skips reading the PDB and has at times shown little patience for even the oral summary he takes two or three times per week, according to the officials, who spoke on the condition of anonymity to discuss classified material." [[Washington Post, 4/27/2020](#)]

A January Memo From Trade Adviser Peter Navarro Warned The White House Of The Risks Of Coronavirus. In April of 2020, the New York Times reported, "A top White House adviser starkly warned Trump administration officials in late January that the coronavirus crisis could cost the United States trillions of dollars and put millions of Americans at risk of illness or death. The warning, written in a memo by Peter Navarro, President Trump's trade adviser, is the highest-level alert known to have circulated inside the West Wing as the administration was taking its first substantive steps to confront a crisis that had already consumed China's leaders and would go on to upend life in Europe and the United States. 'The lack of immune protection or an existing cure or vaccine would leave Americans defenseless in the case of a full-blown coronavirus outbreak on U.S. soil,' Mr. Navarro's memo said. 'This lack of protection elevates the risk of the

coronavirus evolving into a full-blown pandemic, imperiling the lives of millions of Americans.” [\[New York Times, 4/6/2020\]](#)

A Second Memo From Peter Navarro To President Trump On February 23 Warned In The First Sentence Of The Potential Loss Of “As Many As 1-2 Million Souls” Due To COVID-19 Pandemic. On February 23, 2020, President Trump’s economic advisor Peter Navarro wrote a memo to the President which said in the very first sentence: “There is an increasing probability of a full-blown COVID-19 pandemic that could infect as many as 100 million Americans, with a loss of life of as many as 1-2 million souls.” [\[Peter Navarro Memorandum to President Trump, 2/23/2020 \(documents scanned by CNN\)\]](#)

TRUMP DENIED & IGNORED THE WARNINGS

CLIMATE CHANGE DENIAL

PolitiFact: Trump Repeatedly Called Climate Change A “Hoax” During And Before The 2016 Election. On June 3, 2016, PolitiFact reported: “On Dec. 30, 2015, Trump told the crowd at a rally in Hilton Head, S.C., ‘Obama’s talking about all of this with the global warming and ... a lot of it’s a hoax. It’s a hoax. I mean, it’s a money-making industry, okay? It’s a hoax, a lot of it.’ That’s three times using ‘hoax’ in one sentence. Trump has also used the word on Twitter since his 2012 tweet. On Jan. 25, 2014, Trump tweeted, ‘NBC News just called it the great freeze — coldest weather in years. Is our country still spending money on the GLOBAL WARMING HOAX?’ On Jan. 29, 2014, Trump tweeted: ‘Snowing in Texas and Louisiana, record setting freezing temperatures throughout the country and beyond. Global warming is an expensive hoax!’” The article concluded: “Trump has repeatedly called climate change a ‘hoax’ in speeches, tweets and media appearances, and while he hasn’t necessarily repeated the charge that China ‘invented’ climate change, he has said as recently as Jan. 18, 2016, that action on climate change ‘is done for the benefit of China.’” [[PolitiFact, 6/03/2016](#)]

- **(VIDEO) Trump: “So Obama’s Talking About All Of This With The Global Warming And The – A Lot Of It’s A Hoax.”** At a 2015 campaign rally in South Carolina, Donald Trump said: “So Obama’s talking about all of this with the global warming and the -- a lot of it’s a hoax, it’s a hoax. I mean, it’s a money-making industry, OK? It’s a hoax, a lot of it.” [[Donald Trump campaign rally in Hilton Head, SC, 12/30/2015 \(video via C-SPAN\)](#)]
- **(AUDIO) Trump On Climate Change: “Well It’s A Hoax. I Think The Scientists Are Having A Lot Of Fun.”** During the January 6, 2014 edition of Fox and Friends, Donald Trump called in to say: “This whole global warming hoax – you know, one of the great things, and if you notice, they call them tourists. All of those people on the ship in Antarctica that got caught in the ice. You know the ice is massive there. They started out in an area that didn’t have so much ice and then within in a period of four or five days they had miles and miles, they were surrounded by it. Well, they were global warming scientists. Now, the media is not saying that. They’re calling them tourists because it doesn’t play well to say they’re global warming scientists. They were going there to study global

warming. And this winter is brutal. I mean I'm in New York right now and the airports were closed, everything is closed. It's freezing. We haven't had a winter like this in a long time. And by the way – forget about New York – everywhere. It's freezing all over the country. You look at places like Texas they're setting record lows and Oklahoma where they never had problems. They have snow. So what's gone on, and it's not the - the hoax doesn't bother me." One of the hosts interjected to ask "now what do you mean hoax?" and Trump replied: "Well it's a hoax. I think the scientists are having a lot of fun. It was, I wouldn't say started – you know – just like Al Gore started the internet. He's the one that really is the big proponent. The problem we're doing is that we're making our manufacturing, our factories, and other things, we're making them non-competitive to other countries. [["Fox and Friends," Fox News, 1/6/2014](#)]

(VIDEO) Trump: "I'm Not A Huge Believer In The Global Warming

Phenomenon." Jake Tapper: Back in 2012, you tweeted 'The concept of global warming was created by the Chinese in order to make U.S. manufacturing non-competitive' Donald Trump: Well of course I'm being sarcastic you know... Tapper: That's not to be taken seriously? Trump: No it's a little bit serious, there's a little bit of seriousness there. Look, we are restricting our factories much more than China, I go to China. They have factories that are much more competitive, I'm not saying friendly, but they're certainly not environmentally friendly. I'm a huge believer in clean air, I'm not a huge believer in the global warming phenomenon... Tapper: But the overwhelming majority of scientists say it's real and it's manmade and things are happening- Trump: Oh there could be some manmade to- I'm not saying that there's zero- but not nearly to the extent- when Obama gets up said it's the number one problem in our country, and if it is, why is that we have to do our and clean up our factories now and China doesn't have to do it for another 30 or 35 years in their wonderful agreement, you know our wonderful negotiators." [["State of the Union," CNN, 6/28/15 \(segment at 02:40\)](#)]

(Audio) Trump On Climate Change: "It's Weather. You're Going To Have Bad Weather." "ISIS is a big problem and nuclear is a big problem because of the power of the weapons. That's going to be your climate change if we're not careful. The real climate change is going to be nuclear climate change if we're not smart and tough and very, very careful because that's a big danger and that's a real danger. I think Obama just said that the biggest threat that we have on the planet today is climate change, and a lot of people are saying, did he really say that? We have people chopping off heads and he's talking about climate change. I call it weather. I call it weather. You

know, the weather changes. You look back and they were calling it global cooling and global warming and global everything, but if you look back and the biggest tornados were in the 1890s, the biggest hurricanes were in the 1860s and 1870s. It's weather. You're going to have bad weather. So often I watch the evening newscasts and every time there is a rainstorm some place, and then they wonder why they don't do well, they say, 'It's raining here and it's raining there,' usually leading the program. I call it weather. Maybe there's a little bit of change, I don't happen to believe it's manmade."
[Palin Update, [7/27/15](#)]

(VIDEO) Trump On Climate Change: "I'll Change Back Again." Transcript of 60 Minutes interview with Donald Trump:

Lesley Stahl: Do you still think that climate change is a hoax?

President Donald Trump: I think something's happening. Something's changing and it'll change back again. I don't think it's a hoax, I think there's probably a difference. But I don't know that it's manmade. I will say this. I don't wanna give trillions and trillions of dollars. I don't wanna lose millions and millions of jobs. I don't wanna be put at a disadvantage.

Lesley Stahl: I wish you could go to Greenland, watch these huge chunks of ice just falling into the ocean, raising the sea levels.

President Donald Trump: And you don't know whether or not that would have happened with or without man. You don't know.

Lesley Stahl: Well, your scientists, your scientists--

President Donald Trump: No, we have--

Lesley Stahl: At NOAA and NASA--

President Donald Trump: We have scientists that disagree with that.

[Trump Interview On 60 Minutes, 10/14/2018
([Transcript](#), [Video](#))]

(VIDEO) Trump On Report That Warned Of Devastating Economic Impacts From Climate Change: "I Don't Believe It" Transcript of press interaction on the White House lawn:

Q: Have you read the climate report yet?

THE PRESIDENT: I've seen it, I've read some of it, and it's fine.

Q: They say economic impact could be devastating – of climate change.

THE PRESIDENT: Yeah. I don't believe it.

Q: You don't believe it?

THE PRESIDENT: No. No. I don't believe it. And here's the other thing – you're going to have to have China, and Japan, and all of Asia, and all of these other countries – you know, it – it addresses our country. Right now, we're at the cleanest we've ever been, and that's very important to me. But if we're clean but every other place on Earth on is dirty, that's not so good.

[[Trump Remarks Before Boarding Marine One, 11/26/2018 \(video via AP\)](#)]

- **Report That Trump Refused To Believe Was The Product Of 13 Government Agencies And Warned That The U.S. GDP Could Decline By 10% By The End Of The Century As A Result Of Climate Change.** In November of 2018, USA Today reported: "President Donald Trump told reporters Monday he's not buying the dire economic forecast that was included as part of an exhaustive climate change report his administration issued Friday. 'I don't believe it,' he said when asked about the conclusions of the 1,600-page National Climate Assessment that details the climate and economic impacts U.S. residents will see if drastic action is not taken to address climate change. In a worst-case scenario, top scientists from 13 federal agencies say in the report, climate change

– primarily caused by human activity – could deliver a 10 percent hit to the nation's GDP by the end of the century." [[USA Today, 11/26/2018](#)]

(VIDEO) Trump On Climate Change: “Man And Women, We Do Have An Impact, But I Don't Believe The Impact Is Nearly What Some Say, And Other Scientists That Dispute Those Findings Very Strongly.” “So you have different views on this, and is there climate change? Yeah. Will it go back like this, I mean, will it change back? Probably, that's what I think. I believe it goes this way, and I believe, man, meaning us people — man and women, to be politically correct, because everyone says man, but now we have to add women to that one, too — man and women, we do have an impact, but I don't believe the impact is nearly what some say, and other scientists that dispute those findings very strongly.” [[Trump Interview With Axios, 10/29/2018](#)]

PANDEMIC DENIAL

Trump On Coronavirus Concerns: “This Is Their New Hoax.” On February 28, 2020, NBC News reported: “President Donald Trump accused Democrats of ‘politicizing’ the deadly coronavirus during a campaign rally here on Friday, claiming that the outbreak is ‘their new hoax’ as he continued to downplay the risk in the U.S. ‘Now the Democrats are politicizing the coronavirus,’ Trump said. ‘They have no clue, they can't even count their votes in Iowa.’ ‘This is their new hoax,’ Trump continued, adding that attacking the White House’s response to the coronavirus had become the Democratic Party’s ‘single talking point.’” [[NBC News, 2/28/2020](#)]

Anonymous Intelligence Official Said “Donald Trump May Not Have Been Expecting This, But A Lot Of Other People In The Government Were – They Just Couldn't Get Him To Do Anything About it.” In March of 2020, the Washington Post reported: “Intelligence agencies ‘have been warning on this since January,’ said a U.S. official who had access to intelligence reporting that was disseminated to members of Congress and their staffs as well as to officials in the Trump administration, and who, along with others, spoke on the condition of anonymity to describe sensitive information. ‘Donald Trump may not have been expecting this, but a lot of other people in the government were — they just couldn't get him to do anything about it,’ this official said. ‘The system was blinking red.’” [[Washington Post, 3/20/2020](#)]

In January, Trump Sidelined A Coronavirus Conversation With HHS Secretary Azar To Ask When Vaping Products Would Be Back On The Market. On March 20, 2020, the Washing Post recounted the early efforts of HHS Secretary Alex Azar to brief President Trump on the emerging

coronavirus threat. According to the Washington Post, “Azar couldn't get through to Trump to speak with him about the virus until Jan. 18, according to two senior administration officials. When he reached Trump by phone, the president interjected to ask about vaping and when flavored vaping products would be back on the market, the senior administration officials said.” [[Washington Post, 3/20/2020](#)]

In February, Trump Insisted Coronavirus Would Disappear By April As The Weather Got Warmer. On February 10, 2020, USA Today reported: “Trump says Coronavirus will be gone by April when the weather gets warmer The president continued to suggest the Coronavirus outbreak, which has claimed 1,000 lives as of Monday, will be gone by April. He told the crowd that ‘in theory’ once the weather warms up Coronavirus, which he referred to as ‘the virus,’ will ‘miraculously’ go away. Trump did not offer any scientific explanation to back up his claim.” [[USA Today, 2/10/2020](#)]

TRUMP DOWNPLAYED THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE THREAT

DOWNPLAYING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF CLIMATE CHANGE

(AUDIO) Trump On Climate Change: “I Consider It To Be Not A Big Problem At All.” During a telephone interview on MSNBC’s Morning Joe, Richard Haass asked: “The pope is going to be coming to this country in a couple of days, and one of the issues he’s really made central to his own period in office is climate change. Last night, there was some conversation about it. People talked about George Chilton, a carbon tax. Other people have other ideas. Where do you come out? How seriously do you take it? What do you think the United States ought be doing about it?” Trump responded: “Yes, I consider climate change to be not one of our big problems. I consider it to be not a big problem at all. I think it’s weather; I think it’s weather changes. There could be some manmade something. But, you know, if you look at China, they’re doing nothing about it. Other countries are doing nothing about it. It’s a big planet. I do not view -- I view climate change as being -- the big problem we have is nuclear climate change. That’s what our climate change is and that’s our problem. And I’m a little surprised -- Putin is doing it; I don’t believe Putin is a believer at all. Putin is doing it for his own economic advantage if he is actually in favor of climate change.” [[MSNBC Morning Joe, 9/17/2015](#)]

Trump Said The Climate “Changes Both Ways” And Implied That The Term “Climate Change” Was Conceived Because “Global Warming...Wasn’t Working.” “Trump has been steadfast in shrugging off warnings from scientists about the potential impacts of climate change, reiterating in an interview with Piers Morgan on ‘Good Morning Britain’ this week that he does not regret pulling the United States out of a 2015 global climate accord aimed at curbing greenhouse gas emissions. ‘I believe that there’s a change in weather, and I think it changes both ways,’ he said. ‘Don’t forget, it used to be called global warming. That wasn’t working. Then it was called climate change. Now it’s actually called extreme weather because, with extreme weather, you can’t miss.’” [[Washington Post, 6/8/19](#)]

(VIDEO) Trump, Asked If He Believes In Climate Change: “There Is A Cooling And There Is A Heating,” And Ice Caps Are “At A Record Level.” “Mr. Morgan: Do you believe in climate change? Do you think it exists? Mr. Trump: There is

a cooling and there is a heating, and I mean, look: It used to not be climate change. It used to be global warming. Mr. Morgan: Right. Mr. Trump: Right? That wasn't working too well, because it was getting too cold all over the place. The ice caps were going to melt, they were going to be gone by now, but now they're setting records, O.K., they're at a record level." [Donald Trump's Interview With Piers Morgan, [1/28/18](#), 36:45]

(Video) Trump On Climate Change: "I Believe That There's A Change In Weather And I Think It Changes Both Ways." "MORGAN: The question is do you -- do you personally believe in climate change? TRUMP: I believe that there's a change in weather and I think it changes both ways. Don't forget it used to be called global warming, that wasn't working. Then it was called climate change, now it's actually called extreme weather." [Trump Interview With Piers Morgan, [6/4/19](#), 10:24]

DOWNPLAYING THE SERIOUSNESS OF COVID-19

Early In The Crisis, Trump Compared COVID-19 To A Flu

February 28th - Trump Compared COVID-19 To The Flu. According to NBC, Trump compared the coronavirus to the flu at a campaign rally: "35,000 on average each year die from the flu, that's a lot of people. So far we have lost nobody to coronavirus." [NBC News, [2/28/20](#)]

March 9th - Trump Tweeted That We Don't Shut Down Over The Flu, Suggesting COVID-19 Concerns Are Overblown. On March 9th, Trump tweeted: "So last year 37,000 Americans died from the common Flu. It averages between 27,000 and 70,000 per year. Nothing is shut down, life & the economy go on. At this moment there are 546 confirmed cases of CoronaVirus, with 22 deaths. Think about that!" [Twitter - @realdonaldtrump, [3/9/20](#)]

- **(VIDEO) March 11th - Fauci Said The Virus Is 10x Worse Than The Flu.** At a hearing on Coronavirus response and preparedness before the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, Dr Anthony Fauci said "I mean, people always say, well, the flu does this, the flu does that. The flu has a mortality of 0.1 percent. This has a mortality rate of 10 times that. That's the reason I want to emphasize we have to stay ahead of the game

in preventing this." [[House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 3/11/2020](#)]

(VIDEO) Trump In Early March On Coronavirus Outbreak: "No, I'm Not Concerned At All. No I'm Not. No. We've Done A Great Job." At a press conference with Brazil's President Bolsonaro before a dinner at Trump's Mar-a-Lago resort, Trump was asked:

Q: Are you concerned that the virus is getting closer to the White House and D.C.?

Trump: No, I'm not concerned at all. No, I'm not. No, we've done a great job.

[[Donald Trump press briefing with Brazilian President Bolsonaro at Mar-a-Lago, 3/8/2020 \(video via C-SPAN\)](#)]

(VIDEO) March 15th – Trump Said The Coronavirus Is 'Something That We Have Tremendous Control Over.' According to the White House transcript, Trump said in a press briefing that 'We see what's happening. We see what's going on in other countries. We're looking at — we're learning from watching other countries, frankly. This is a very contagious — this is a very contagious virus. It's incredible. But it's something that we have tremendous control over.' [White House, [3/15/20 \(video via YouTube\)](#)]

- **(VIDEO) March 15th – Fauci Said 'The Worst Is Ahead Of Us.'** According to the White House transcript, at the same press briefing Trump claimed the virus was under control, Fauci claimed the opposite: 'Because as I've said many times, and I'll repeat it: The worst is, yes, ahead for us. It is how we respond to that challenge that's going to determine what the ultimate endpoint is going to be.' [White House, [3/15/20 \(video via YouTube\)](#)]

Later Trump Planned Campaign Rallies Despite The Concerns Of Local Health Officials

In Mid-June 2020, The U.S. Passed 2 Million COVID Cases. According to The Washington Post: "As the United States approaches five months since from the first coronavirus patient was confirmed, the country on Thursday surpassed the staggering milestone of 2 million cases, according to data analyzed by The Washington Post. The United States as of Thursday had at least 2,012,031 confirmed cases of the coronavirus, with people testing positive in all 50 states." [[Washington Post, 6/11/2020](#)]

Despite The Concerns Of Oklahoma's Top Health Official, Trump Planned A Campaign Rally For June 20th In Tulsa. According to The Washington Post: "Besieged by criticism for scheduling a campaign rally in Tulsa on Juneteenth, an observance of the end of U.S. slavery in a city notable for a historic outburst of racist violence, President Trump on Friday relented and bumped the event back by one day. But Tulsa's top health official is urging the campaign to again postpone — not over politics but over public health. As novel coronavirus cases have set new daily records in Oklahoma in recent days, Tulsa Health Department Director Bruce Dart warned over the weekend that a rally expected to draw more than 19,000 Trump supporters could ignite a bigger crisis. 'Covid is here in Tulsa, it is transmitting very efficiently,' Dart told the Tulsa World on Saturday. 'I wish we could postpone this to a time when the virus isn't as large a concern as it is today.'"

[\[Washington Post, 6/15/2020\]](#)

New York Times Headline: Tulsa Officials Plead For Trump To Cancel Rally As Virus Spikes In Oklahoma. According to The New York Times: "Officials in Tulsa, Okla., are warning that President Trump's planned campaign rally on Saturday — his first in over three months — is likely to worsen an already troubling spike in coronavirus infections and could become a disastrous 'super spreader.' That spike has local officials and public health experts concerned about welcoming the nation's first indoor mass gathering since Mr. Trump declared a national emergency in mid-March, an influx of thousands of people interacting inside and outside, amounting to a sprawling coronavirus petri dish. 'There's just nothing good about this, and particularly in an enclosed arena,' said Karen Keith, a Tulsa County commissioner who oversees the area where the rally is supposed to take place. 'I don't want people to lose a parent. I don't want them to lose a grandma. I don't want them to lose a family member over this.'" [\[New York Times, 6/16/2020\]](#)

TRUMP ATTACKED THE SCIENTISTS

ATTACKING THE MOTIVATIONS OF CLIMATE SCIENTISTS

(AUDIO) Trump On Climate Change: "Well It's A Hoax. I Think The Scientists Are Having A Lot Of Fun." During the January 6, 2014 edition of Fox and Friends, Donald Trump called in to say:

DONALD TRUMP: This whole global warming hoax – you know, one of the great things, and if you notice, they call them tourists. All of those people on the ship in Antarctica that got caught in the ice. You know the ice is massive there. They started out in an area that didn't have so much ice and then within in a period of four or five days they had miles and miles, they were surrounded by it. Well, they were global warming scientists. Now, the media is not saying that. They're calling them tourists because it doesn't play well to say they're global warming scientists. They were going there to study global warming. And this winter is brutal. I mean I'm in New York right now and the airports were closed, everything is closed. It's freezing. We haven't had a winter like this in a long time. And by the way – forget about New York – everywhere. It's freezing all over the country. You look at places like Texas they're setting record lows and Oklahoma where they never had problems. They have snow. So what's gone on, and it's not the – the hoax doesn't bother me.

STEVE DOOCY: Now what do you mean hoax?

DONALD TRUMP: Well it's a hoax. I think the scientists are having a lot of fun. It was, I wouldn't say started – you know – just like Al

Gore started the internet. He's the one that really is the big proponent. The problem we're doing is that we're making our manufacturing, our factories, and other things, we're making them non-competitive to other countries.

[["Fox and Friends," Fox News, 1/6/2014](#)]

Trump Tweeted That Climate Scientists Were "Hoaxsters." In February 2014, Trump tweeted, "Massive record setting snowstorm and freezing temperatures in U.S. Smart that GLOBAL WARMING hoaxsters changed name to CLIMATE CHANGE! \$\$\$\$" [[Twitter - @RealDonaldTrump, 2/5/2014](#)]

Trump Tweeted That Climate Scientists Were "Dollar Sucking Wiseguys." In February 2014, Trump tweeted, "It's not climate change, it's global warming. Don't let the dollar sucking wiseguys change names midstream because the first name didn't work" [[Twitter - @RealDonaldTrump, 2/17/2014](#)]

(VIDEO) On Environmental Policy, Trump Said "We Must Reject The Perennial Prophets Of Doom And Their Predictions Of The Apocalypse." In remarks to the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland in January of 2020, Donald Trump said:

This is not a time for pessimism; this is a time for optimism. Fear and doubt is not a good thought process because this is a time for tremendous hope and joy and optimism and action. But to embrace the possibilities of tomorrow, we must reject the perennial prophets of doom and their predictions of the apocalypse. They are the heirs of yesterday's foolish fortune-tellers – and I have them and you have them, and we all have them, and they want to see us do badly, but we don't let that happen. They predicted an overpopulation crisis in the 1960s, mass starvation in the '70s, and an end of oil in the 1990s. These alarmists always demand the same thing: absolute power to dominate, transform, and control every aspect of our lives. We will never let radical socialists destroy our economy, wreck

our country, or eradicate our liberty. America will always be the proud, strong, and unyielding bastion of freedom.

[\[Trump remarks at the World Economic Forum, 1/21/2020 \(video via CNN\)\]](#)

(VIDEO) Trump Reacting To Scientists Linking Climate Change To Hurricanes: "Scientists Also Have A Political Agenda." Transcript of 60 Minutes interview with Donald Trump:

LESLEY STAHL: You know, I-- I was thinking what if he said, "No, I've seen the hurricane situations, I've changed my mind. There really is climate change." And I thought, "Wow, what an impact."

PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Well-- I'm not denying.

LESLEY STAHL: What an impact that would make.

PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: I'm not denying climate change. But it could very well go back. You know, we're talkin' about over a millions--

LESLEY STAHL: But that's denying it.

PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: --of years. They say that we had hurricanes that were far worse than what we just had with Michael.

LESLEY STAHL: Who says that? "They say"?

PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: People say. People say that in the--

LESLEY STAHL: Yeah, but what about the scientists who say it's worse than ever?

PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: You'd have to show me the scientists because they have a very big political agenda, Lesley.

LESLEY STAHL: I can't bring them in.

PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Look, scientists also have a political agenda.

[Trump Interview On 60 Minutes, 10/14/2018 ([Transcript](#), [Video](#))]

ATTACKING THE MOTIVATIONS OF COVID-19 SCIENTISTS

AP Headline: “Trump Lashes Out At Scientists Whose Findings Contradict Him.” On May 22, 2020, the Associated Press reported: “As President Donald Trump pushes to reopen the country despite warnings from doctors about the consequences of moving too quickly during the coronavirus crisis, he has been lashing out at scientists whose conclusions he doesn’t like. Twice this week, Trump has not only dismissed the findings of studies but suggested — without evidence — that their authors were motivated by politics and out to undermine his efforts to roll back coronavirus restrictions.” [[Associated Press, 5/22/2020](#)]

The Hill Headline: “Trump Calls Study On Taking Earlier Action Against Coronavirus A 'Political Hit Job.'” President Trump on Thursday dismissed as a ‘political hit job’ a Columbia University study that showed thousands of lives lost to the coronavirus could have been saved with earlier social distancing measures. The president defended his actions to combat the pandemic after The New York Times published findings from the university's disease modelers that roughly 36,000 fewer people in the U.S. would have died from COVID-19 if the country imposed restrictions just one week earlier. ‘I was so early. I was earlier than anybody thought. I put a ban on people coming in from China,’ Trump told reporters as he departed the White House for a trip to Michigan. ‘Columbia is an institution that's very liberal,’ he added. ‘I think it's just a political hit job, you want to know the truth.’” [[The Hill, 5/21/2020](#)]

Trump Dismissed Criticism Of Hydroxychloroquine Because He Thought It Came From “People That Aren’t Big Trump Fans.” On May 22, 2020, the Associated Press reported: “Yet Trump has made clear that, at least when it comes to hydroxychloroquine, he has prioritized anecdotal evidence, including a letter he told reporters he’d received from a doctor in Westchester, a county in New York, claiming success with the drug. Asked this week what evidence he had that the drug was effective in preventing COVID-19 — contrary to FDA guidance — Trump responded: ‘Are you ready? Here’s my evidence: I get a lot of positive calls about it.’ ‘The only negative I’ve heard,’ he added, ‘was the study where they gave it -- was it the VA? —

with, you know, people that aren't big Trump fans.” [[Associated Press, 5/22/2020](#)]

TRUMP CUTS SCIENTISTS OUT OF THE PROCESS

SCIENTISTS PUSHED OUT OR SILENCED OVER CLIMATE CHANGE

Climate Scientists Censored

NBC News Headline: “The Trump Administration Scrubs Climate Change Info From Websites. These Two Have Survived.” In July of 2018, NBC News reported: “Reports of climate science being scrubbed from U.S. government websites arrived early in President Donald Trump’s tenure. And the hits keep coming. From the Environmental Protection Agency, to the Energy Department, to the State Department and beyond, references to climate change, greenhouse gases and clean energy keep disappearing.” [[NBC News, 7/17/2018](#)]

State Department Intelligence Analyst’s Testimony To Congress Was Blocked Over Climate Change Analysis. In July of 2019, Foreign Policy magazine reported: “State Department intelligence analyst who recently resigned warned that the White House is systematically suppressing science and objective analysis on how large a threat climate change is to national security. Rod Schoonover, an analyst with the State Department’s Bureau of Intelligence and Research, resigned in protest this month after the White House blocked his prepared testimony before a congressional intelligence panel on the national security implications of climate change. Schoonover said what he planned to say did not adhere to the Trump administration’s position on climate change. Schoonover’s departure is the latest example of how the Trump administration’s seismic shift on environmental policies has played out behind the scenes inside Washington’s policymaking machine, including at the State Department, as environmental studies are quashed, intelligence assessments muzzled, and even public references to climate change quietly scrubbed from U.S. government websites. He joins a batch of

other civil servants and experts who were either forced out of their government jobs or quit over the Trump administration's heavy-handed approach to assessments on climate change." [[Foreign Policy, 7/31/2019](#)]

Trump Administration Censored Climate Change References In USGS Press Releases. In July of 2019, E&E News reported: "A March news release from the U.S. Geological Survey touted a new study that could be useful for infrastructure planning along the California coastline. At least that's how the Trump administration conveyed it. The news release hardly stood out. It focused on the methodology of the study rather than its major findings, which showed that climate change could have a withering effect on California's economy by inundating real estate over the next few decades. An earlier draft of the news release, written by researchers, was sanitized by Trump administration officials, who removed references to the dire effects of climate change after delaying its release for several months, according to three federal officials who saw it. The study, published in the journal *Scientific Reports*, showed that California, the world's fifth-largest economy, would face more than \$100 billion in damages related to climate change and sea-level rise by the end of the century. It found that three to seven times more people and businesses than previously believed would be exposed to severe flooding." [[E&E Climatewire, 7/8/2019](#)]

Associated Press Headline: "Emails: Trump Official Pressed NASA On Climate Science." In June of 2019, the Associated Press reported: "Once a skeptic about climate change, Jim Bridenstine came around to the prevailing view of scientists before he took over as NASA administrator. That evolution did not sit well with a Trump environmental adviser, nor a think-tank analyst he was consulting, according to newly disclosed emails that illustrate how skepticism of global warming has found a beachhead in the Trump White House. 'Puzzling,' says the May 2018 exchange between William Happer, now a member of President Donald Trump's National Security Council, and Thomas Wismuller of the Heartland Institute, which disavows manmade climate change. Their exchange calls scientifically established rises in sea levels and temperatures under climate change 'part of the nonsense' and urges the NASA head — who was copied in — to 'systematically sidestep it.' It cannot be discerned whether it was Happer or Wismuller who put that pressure on the new NASA chief. Their exchange is included in emails from 2018 and 2019 that were obtained by the Environmental Defense Fund under the federal Freedom of Information Act and provided to The Associated Press. But the emails show that Happer, who was then advising Trump's Environmental Protection Agency, kept up the pressure after he

joined the National Security Council late last year.” [[Associated Press, 6/14/2019](#)]

Science Magazine Headline: “Trump White House Quietly Cancels NASA Research Verifying Greenhouse Gas Cuts.” In May of 2019, Science Magazine reported: “You can't manage what you don't measure. The adage is especially relevant for climate-warming greenhouse gases, which are crucial to manage—and challenging to measure. In recent years, though, satellite and aircraft instruments have begun monitoring carbon dioxide and methane remotely, and NASA's Carbon Monitoring System (CMS), a \$10-million-a-year research line, has helped stitch together observations of sources and sinks into high-resolution models of the planet's flows of carbon. Now, President Donald Trump's administration has quietly killed the CMS, Science has learned.” [[Science Magazine, 5/9/2018](#)]

An Investigation Found NOAA Leadership Violated Its Scientific Integrity Policy By Releasing A Statement Supporting President Trump's False Claims About Hurricane Dorian's Path Threatening Alabama. According to The Washington Post: “In a long-awaited report, an investigation conducted on behalf of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) found that agency leadership violated its scientific integrity policy through actions that led to the release of a statement that backed President Trump's false statement about the path of Hurricane Dorian. The NOAA statement, issued Sept. 6, 2019, contradicted its own meteorologists at a weather forecast office in Birmingham, Ala. The scandal over the forecast for Hurricane Dorian has come to be known as ‘Sharpiegate,’ after President Trump displayed a modified NOAA forecast map during an Oval Office briefing to depict the storm threatening Alabama.” [[Washington Post, 6/15/2020](#)]

The Investigation Found The Agency's Statement Supporting Trump's Claims “Compromised NOAA's Integrity And Reputation As An Independent Scientific Agency.” According to Washington Post: “The report, whose findings were accepted by NOAA's leadership and released Monday, found that Neil Jacobs, the acting administrator, and former NOAA deputy chief of staff and communications director Julie Kay Roberts twice violated codes of the agency's scientific integrity policy. [...] First, it found that Jacobs and Roberts violated NOAA's code for science supervision and management for not giving the NWS Birmingham office an opportunity to engage in the drafting of the unsigned NOAA statement in which they were reprimanded. Second, it concluded that Jacobs and Roberts violated the same code for their role in developing and releasing the statement, which ‘compromised NOAA's integrity and reputation as an independent scientific agency.’” [[Washington Post, 6/15/2020](#)]

Science Suppressed By Mid-Level Agency Employees

Mid-Level Agency Employees, Wary Of Scrutiny From Senior Officials, Sought To Undermine Climate Science. According to The New York Times: “Efforts to undermine climate change science in the federal government, once orchestrated largely by President Trump’s political appointees, are now increasingly driven by midlevel managers trying to protect their jobs and budgets and wary of the scrutiny of senior officials, according to interviews and newly revealed reports and surveys.” [[New York Times, 6/15/2020](#)]

An Inspector General Report, Made Public In May 2020, Found That Over 400 EPA Employees Surveyed In 2018 Believe A Manager Had Interfered With Or Suppressed The Release Of Scientific Information. According to The New York Times: “An inspector general’s report at the Environmental Protection Agency made public in May found that almost 400 employees surveyed in 2018 believed a manager had interfered with or suppressed the release of scientific information, but they never reported the violations.” [[New York Times, 6/15/2020](#)]

A 2018 Union Of Concerned Scientists Survey Of Employees Across 16 Agencies Identified The EPA And The Department Of Interior As Having The Least Trustworthy Leadership In Scientific Integrity. According to New York Times: “A separate Union of Concerned Scientists survey in 2018 of more than 63,000 federal employees across 16 agencies identified the E.P.A. and Department of Interior as having the least trustworthy leadership in matters of scientific integrity.” [[New York Times, 6/15/2020](#)]

A Survey Released In April 2020 Found More Than 600 Workers Had Been Instructed To Omit The Phrase ‘Climate Change’ From Their Work, And More Than 700 Said They Avoided Working On Climate Change Or Using The Phrase. According to The New York Times: “Findings published in the peer-reviewed journal PLOS ONE in April on a subset of those agencies found that 631 workers agreed or strongly agreed that they had been asked to omit the phrase ‘climate change’ from their work. In the same paper, 703 employees said they avoided working on climate change or using the phrase.” [[New York Times, 6/15/2020](#)]

In April 2020, A U.S. Geological Survey Chemist Was Blocked From Including His Government Affiliation On An Academic Paper That Discussed The Natural Solutions To Climate Change. According to The New York Times: “A case in point: When John Crusius, a research chemist at the United States

Geological Survey, published an academic paper on natural solutions to climate change in April, his government affiliation never appeared on it. It couldn't. Publication of his study, after a month's delay, was conditioned by his employer on Dr. Crusius not associating his research with the federal government. 'There is no doubt in my mind that my paper was denied government approval because it had to do with efforts to mitigate climate change,' Dr. Crusius said, making clear he also was speaking in his personal capacity because the agency required him to so. 'If I were a seismologist and had written an analogous paper about reducing seismic risk, I'm sure the paper would have sailed through.'" [[New York Times, 6/15/2020](#)]

DOE Officials Flagged References To The Paris Climate Agreement In A Report On The Accord's Carbon Reduction Targets, And Later Nixed Funding For The Research After The Author Chose To Keep The Wording But Not Mention The EPA's Grant. According to The New York Times: "A subsequent paper examined how meeting the Paris Agreement's carbon reduction targets would affect extreme weather events. When Dr. Diffenbaugh submitted it for approval, he was told Energy Department officials felt it was 'solid on the science' but contained 'red flag words' like Paris Agreement, emails show. His choice was to either remove those phrases and acknowledge the agency funding, or keep them and not mention the grant. Dr. Diffenbaugh and Stanford decided that the research should not be changed and would be published with the so-called red-flag words and the disclosure of funding sources. Department officials later notified the project leaders that funding would be cut in half. Dr. Diffenbaugh's project was zeroed out." [[New York Times, 6/15/2020](#)]

The U.S. Park Service Tried To Delete Mentions Of Humanity's Role In Climate Change In A Report On Sea Level Rise. According to The New York Times: "That same summer, the Park Service tried to delete every mention of humanity's role in climate change in a report on sea level rise. Its lead author, Dr. Caffrey, objected. It was released after more than a year's delay without the attempted edits. Dr. Caffrey, however, said she was then demoted before her position was eliminated." [[New York Times, 6/15/2020](#)]

Limits On Public Health Studies

November 2019: Trump's EPA Was Preparing To Limit Scientific And Medical Research That Can Be Used To Determine Public Health Regulations. In November of 2019, the New York Times reported: "The Trump administration is preparing to significantly limit the scientific and medical research that the

government can use to determine public health regulations, overriding protests from scientists and physicians who say the new rule would undermine the scientific underpinnings of government policymaking. A new draft of the Environmental Protection Agency proposal, titled Strengthening Transparency in Regulatory Science, would require that scientists disclose all of their raw data, including confidential medical records, before the agency could consider an academic study's conclusions. E.P.A. officials called the plan a step toward transparency and said the disclosure of raw data would allow conclusions to be verified independently." [[New York Times, 11/11/2019](#)]

March 2020: Trump's EPA Expanded A Proposed Rule To Limit Public Health Science. On March 17, 2020, Bloomberg reported: A proposal to expand the scope of the EPA's much-debated 'secret science' rule beyond its use in regulations will be published Wednesday in the Federal Register. The underlying rule proposal would prevent the agency from considering scientific studies that aren't or can't be made public in rulemaking. The proposed supplement expands the proposal so that it would apply to 'influential scientific information,' even if that information isn't used in writing regulations." [[Bloomberg, 3/17/2020](#)]

White House Revisions To "Secret Science" Rule Showed An Effort To Find Legal Authority To Do What The Administration Wanted To Do. On March 10, 2020, The White House has released a working copy of EPA's latest controversial "secret science" proposal replete with red edits. The document shows there is a battle going on within the administration over what language to use on a rule that aims to retool the scientific research underpinning EPA policy." The article went on to report: "It is unclear whether OIRA staff ordered the changes or whether EPA requested them during the three-month review period. What is clear is many changes were legal in nature, noted Stuart Shapiro, a former regulatory analyst at the Office of Management and Budget in the Clinton and George W. Bush administrations. Specifically, White House officials have tried to find the legal authority to underpin the agency's rewrite of the science guidelines. Critics say they lack the authority — period." [[E&E Greenwire, 3/10/2020](#)]

Scientists Overruled In The Regulatory Process

Washington Post Headline: "EPA Staff Warned That Mileage Rollbacks Had Flaws. Trump Officials Ignored Them." On May 19, 2020, the Washington Post reported: "In its rush to roll back the most significant climate policy enacted by President Barack Obama — mileage standards designed to reduce pollution from cars — the Trump administration ignored warnings

that its new rule has serious flaws, according to documents shared with The Washington Post.” The Post noted later in the article: “The documents, however, reveal that EPA staff were sidelined as they warned that the revised standards had several defects. Commenting on the preamble’s assertion that the government’s ‘action will result in reductions in climate change-related impacts and most air pollutants compared to the absence of regulation,’ EPA staffers wrote in an internal document in February that ‘this is not correct’ from the agency’s perspective. ‘The action revising the [greenhouse gas] standards will result in increased climate impacts and air pollution emissions compared to the existing standards,’ agency staff wrote in the margins.” [\[Washington Post, 5/19/2020\]](#)

Emails Revealed That Trump’s EPA Administrator Intervened, Over The Objections Of Scientists To Exempt Racine County From Smog Safeguards.

In May of 2019, the New York Times reported: “Newly released emails show that Environmental Protection Agency scientists raised strong objections to a 2018 decision by Scott Pruitt, who was head of the agency at the time, to exempt most of southeastern Wisconsin from federal limits on smog. The decision by Mr. Pruitt was notable because it came as Gov. Scott Walker, a Republican, was campaigning for a third term and trying to bring a Foxconn factory, and thousands of new manufacturing jobs, to a part of the state where pollution levels already exceeded federal limits.” [\[New York Times, 5/24/2019\]](#)

Environmental Review Processes Limited

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Is A Bedrock Environmental Law That Requires Federal Agencies To Assess The Environmental Impacts Of Certain Actions.

According to the Harvard University Environmental & Energy Law program: “In 1969, Congress enacted the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), which requires federal agencies to assess the environmental impacts of certain proposed actions. It can be thought of as a ‘look before you leap’ law. NEPA quickly became part of the bedrock of U.S. environmental law and a guarantee that the government will consider potential consequences and alternatives before it acts. Under NEPA, federal agencies must perform an environmental review for each proposed ‘major federal action.’ Major actions include permit decisions, adoption of agency policy, formal planning, agency projects, and other actions. The environmental review process may involve consultation and collaboration with other expert agencies like the Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. NEPA provides transparency by requiring that draft reviews be publicly disclosed and open for public comment. The final environmental reviews can

be challenged in court, allowing for accountability." [[Harvard University Environmental & Energy Law Program, 8/15/2018](#)]

Trump Announced Sweeping Changes To Environmental Review Process To Speed The Construction Of Fossil Fuel Infrastructure. In January of 2020, The Hill reported: "The White House on Thursday issued sweeping changes to one of the nation's bedrock environmental laws, allowing greater industry involvement in environmental reviews of projects and diminishing the role climate change plays in those assessments. The changes target the 50-year-old National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), which requires agencies to evaluate how pipelines, highways and some oil and gas development affects the environment and nearby communities. The law has been a repeated target of President Trump, who has vowed to speed the construction of fossil fuel infrastructure and eliminate barriers to construction projects." [[The Hill, 1/9/2020](#)]

Trump's Changes To The Environmental Review Process Would Limit Agency's Obligation To Obtain Relevant Information On Proposed Actions. According to a blog post from the NRDC: "For years, CEQ has required agencies to obtain the information that they need to make a decision. If the means to obtain such information are unknown or the costs to obtain the information are exorbitant, the agency must identify the information that is incomplete or missing and explain why it is relevant. Trump's proposal changes 'not exorbitant' to 'not unreasonable.' [...] NEPA's purpose is to ensure informed decision-making yet Trump's proposal explicitly excuses them from undertaking new scientific and technical research that might be needed." [[NRDC.Org, 3/9/2020](#)]

Government Scientists Pushed Out Over Climate Change Work

CDC Climate Change Scientist Was Ordered To Drop Work On Climate Issues. In August of 2019, Reuters reported: "A climate scientist for the Trump administration's health protection agency who was ordered to drop work on climate issues will file a whistleblower complaint this week with the U.S. Office of Special Counsel, his lawyers said on Wednesday. George Luber, who ran the climate and health program at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, is an expert on the health impacts of climate change including risks to hospitals and public health infrastructure and of diseases borne by mosquitoes and ticks as they increasingly move into northern regions as temperatures rise. Luber has been a contributor to U.S.

government reports including the National Climate Assessment, which last year warned that climate change could cost the U.S. economy billions of dollars." [[Reuters, 8/14/2019](#)]

Washington Post: Hundreds Of Scientists Have Been “Forced Out, Silenced, Or Muted Since President Trump Took Office.” In January of 2020, the Washington Post reported: “Dozens of government computers sit in a nondescript building here, able to connect to a data model that could help farmers manage the impact of a changing climate on their crops. But no one in this federal agency would know how to access the model, or, if they did, what to do with the data. That’s because the ambitious federal researcher who created it in Washington quit rather than move when the Agriculture Department relocated his agency to an office park here last fall. He is one of hundreds of scientists across the federal government who have been forced out, sidelined or muted since President Trump took office.” [[Washington Post, 1/23/2020](#)]

Trump’s EPA Disbanded A Key Scientific Advisory Panel On Particulate Air Pollution. In October of 2018, the New York Times reported: “An Environmental Protection Agency panel that advises the agency’s leadership on the latest scientific information about soot in the atmosphere is not listed as continuing its work next year, an E.P.A. official said. The 20-person Particulate Matter Review Panel, made up of experts in microscopic airborne pollutants known to cause respiratory disease, is responsible for helping the agency decide what levels of pollutants are safe to breathe. Agency officials declined to say why the E.P.A. intends to stop convening the panel next year, particularly as the agency considers whether to revise air quality standards.” [[New York Times, 10/11/2018](#)]

Civil Servants Quit Or Were Forced Out Over The Trump Administration’s “Heavy-Handed Approach To Assessments On Climate Change.” In July of 2019, Foreign Policy magazine reported: “State Department intelligence analyst who recently resigned warned that the White House is systematically suppressing science and objective analysis on how large a threat climate change is to national security. Rod Schoonover, an analyst with the State Department’s Bureau of Intelligence and Research, resigned in protest this month after the White House blocked his prepared testimony before a congressional intelligence panel on the national security implications of climate change. Schoonover said what he planned to say did not adhere to the Trump administration’s position on climate change. Schoonover’s departure is the latest example of how the Trump administration’s seismic shift on environmental policies has played out behind the scenes inside Washington’s policymaking machine, including at the State Department, as

environmental studies are quashed, intelligence assessments muzzled, and even public references to climate change quietly scrubbed from U.S. government websites. He joins a batch of other civil servants and experts who were either forced out of their government jobs or quit over the Trump administration's heavy-handed approach to assessments on climate change." [[Foreign Policy, 7/31/2019](#)]

SCIENTISTS PUSHED OUT OR SILENCED IN COVID-19 RESPONSE

Former Official In Charge Of Vaccine Development Filed A Whistleblower Complaint Alleging He Was Ousted For Raising Concerns About An Unproven Drug Touted By Trump. On May 5, 2020, CNN reported: "Dr. Rick Bright, the ousted director of the office involved in developing a coronavirus vaccine, formally filed an extensive whistleblower complaint Tuesday alleging his early warnings about the coronavirus were ignored and that his caution at a treatment favored by President Donald Trump led to his removal. 'I was pressured to let politics and cronyism drive decisions over the opinions of the best scientists we have in government,' Bright said on a call with reporters after filing his complaint. Bright said in the complaint he raised urgent concerns about shortages of critical supplies, including masks, to his superiors in the Trump administration but was met with skepticism and surprise. While Bright said some officials shared his concerns -- including top White House trade adviser Peter Navarro -- he describes an overall lack of action at the top of the administration even as the virus was spreading outside of China." [[CNN, 5/5/2020](#)]

New York Times Headline: "White House Blocks C.D.C. Guidance Over Economic and Religious Concerns." On May 7, 2020, the New York Times reported: "As President Trump rushes to reopen the economy, a battle has erupted between the White House and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention over the agency's detailed guidelines to help schools, restaurants, churches and other establishments safely reopen. A copy of the C.D.C. guidance obtained by The New York Times includes sections for child care programs, schools and day camps, churches and other "communities of faith," employers with vulnerable workers, restaurants and bars, and mass transit administrators. The recommendations include using disposable dishes and utensils at restaurants, closing every other row of seats in buses and subways while restricting transit routes between areas experiencing different coronavirus infection levels, and separating children at school and camps into groups that should not mix throughout the day. But White House

and other administration officials rejected the recommendations over concerns that they were overly prescriptive, infringed on religious rights and risked further damaging an economy that Mr. Trump was banking on to recover quickly. A spokesman for the C.D.C. said the guidance was still under discussion with the White House and a revised version could be published soon." [[New York Times, 5/7/2020](#)]

Associated Press Headline: "Docs Show Top WH Officials Buried CDC Report." On May 8, 2020, the Associated Press reported: "The decision to shelve detailed advice from the nation's top disease control experts for reopening communities during the coronavirus pandemic came from the highest levels of the White House, according to internal government emails obtained by The Associated Press. The files also show that after the AP reported Thursday that the guidance document had been buried, the Trump administration ordered key parts of it to be fast-tracked for approval. The trove of emails show the nation's top public health experts at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention spending weeks working on guidance to help the country deal with a public health emergency, only to see their work quashed by political appointees with little explanation." [[Associated Press, 5/8/2020](#)]

CDC Official: "We've Been Muzzled." On May 20, 2020, CNN reported: "Rising tensions between CDC leadership and the White House over the perception that the agency has been sidelined has been a developing story in the media for weeks. But now, mid- and higher-ranking staff members within the agency -- six of whom spoke with CNN for this story -- are starting to voice their discontent. Those six spoke on condition of anonymity for fear of reprisals. 'We've been muzzled,' said a current CDC official. 'What's tough is that if we would have acted earlier on what we knew and recommended, we would have saved lives and money.'" [[CNN, 5/20/2020](#)]

MISSED OPPORTUNITIES TO MOBILIZE A SOLUTION

FAILURE TO BUILD A CLEAN ENERGY ECONOMY

Under Trump, Clean Energy Developers Faced A Slew Of Threats That Could Slow Down The Industry's Growth. According to Time Magazine: "Less than a year into President Trump's time in office, clean energy developers face a slew of unanticipated threats from the White House and Republicans in Congress that could slow the industry's growth in ways unimaginable just a year ago." [[Time Magazine, 12/8/2017](#)]

In 2018, Jobs In Solar Declined In Part Due To Trump's Tariffs On Steel And Solar Panels. According to E2's Clean Jobs America 2019 report, 2018 saw a decline in solar jobs due in part to tariffs on steel and solar panels. [[2019 Clean Jobs America Report, E2, March 2019](#)]

- **In 2018, Solar Jobs Declined By 3.2 Percent, Or 8,000 Jobs, Compared To 2017.** According to The Solar Foundation's National Solar Jobs Census for 2018: "This year's National Solar Jobs Census found that solar employment experienced its second decline since The Solar Foundation first began tracking jobs in 2010. As of November 2018, the solar industry employs over 242,000 solar workers, representing a decline of 3.2%, or 8,000 fewer jobs, since 2017." [[National Solar Jobs Census 2018, The Solar Foundation, February 2019](#)]
- **The Solar Foundation Pointed To Uncertainty Over The Trump Administration's Solar Tariffs As A Key Factor Spurring The Industry's Decline In 2018.** According to The Solar Foundation's National Solar Jobs Census for 2018: "Key factors behind the decline in solar jobs from 2017 to 2018 include: Uncertainty over the outcome of the Section 201 trade case before the new solar tariffs were announced in January 2018. This uncertainty led to project delays, especially for the larger, utility-scale installations." [[National Solar Jobs Census 2018, The Solar Foundation, February 2019](#)]
- **Trump's Solar Tariffs Cost The U.S. 62,000 Jobs And Nearly \$19 Billion In New Industry Investment.** According to The Hill: "Tariffs on solar panels implemented under President Trump have significantly harmed the U.S."

solar industry, according to a new analysis released Tuesday. More than 62,000 jobs and nearly \$19 billion in new private sector investment has been lost due to the 2018 tariffs Trump placed on solar imports, according to the study by the Solar Energy Industries Association (SEIA). The number of jobs lost is nearly double the toll the SEIA first estimated when Trump announced the tariffs. [[The Hill, 12/03/2019](#)]

- **Trump's Tariffs On Solar Imports Also Cost An Additional \$10.5 Million Per Day In Unrealized Economic Activity.** According to The Hill: "The group additionally estimated that the tariffs cost the U.S. more than \$10.5 million per day in unrealized economic activity. From a climate perspective, the SEIA also estimated that reduced solar panel deployment activity in the U.S., stemming from the tariffs, would increase emissions equivalent to 5.5 million cars." [[The Hill, 12/03/2019](#)]

The Trump Administration Has Dealt Several Blows To The Wind Power Industry, Including Withholding Approval For The Country's First Utility-Scale Offshore Wind Project. According to NBC News: "The Interior Department surprised and alarmed wind industry supporters in August, when the agency unexpectedly announced it was withholding approval for the country's first utility-scale offshore wind project, a \$2.8 billion complex of 84 giant turbines. Slated for building 15 miles (24 kilometers) off Martha's Vineyard, Vineyard Wind has a brisk 2022 target for starting operations. Its Danish-Spanish partners already have contracts to supply Massachusetts electric utilities. Investors backing more than a dozen other big wind farms are lined up to follow Vineyard Wind with offshore wind projects of their own." [[NBC News, 9/30/2019](#)]

Trump's Planned Rollback Of Obama-Era Fuel Efficiency Standards Was Set To Harm The Clean Vehicle Industry By Removing Requirements That Automakers Invest In Hybrid, Electric And Low-Pollution Vehicles. According to the New York Times, "The Trump administration is expected on Tuesday to announce its final rule to rollback Obama-era automobile fuel efficiency standards, relaxing efforts to limit climate-warming tailpipe pollution and virtually undoing the government's biggest effort to combat climate change. [...] The new rule creates short-term regulatory relief for automakers, lifting requirements that had forced them to invest heavily in developing and marketing hybrid, electric and low-pollution vehicles." [[New York Times, 3/31/2020](#)]

- **Automakers Said Trump's Rollback Would Reduce The Competitiveness Of The U.S. Industry, Leaving U.S. Companies Behind As Foreign Manufacturers Produce Efficient Vehicles To Meet Fuel Efficiency Stands**

In Other Global Markets. According to Forbes: “The Trump administration says that the freeze will help sell more cars, but as the United Auto Workers union and 17 major automakers have told the Trump administration, it will reduce the competitiveness of U.S. vehicle manufacturing – U.S. companies will be left behind as foreign manufacturers produce increasingly efficient vehicles to meet fuel efficiency and GHG emissions standards in other global markets.”
[[Forbes, 8/7/2019](#)]

- **The Administration's Own Analysis Showed Trump's Rollback Of Vehicle Fuel Efficiency Standards Could Cost Hundreds Of Thousands Of Jobs.** According to the Washington Post, “An environmental adviser to the Trump administration projects that its attempt to reverse Obama-era fuel-efficiency standards could have a steep long-term toll on the U.S. economy and eventually cost the country hundreds of thousands of jobs. [...] The Trump administration's proposal to freeze standards on tailpipe emissions for new cars and light trucks at 2020 levels, or otherwise watering down their stringency, would create 236,000 fewer jobs by 2035 than if the Obama-era standards stayed intact, according to the paper published late last month in the peer-reviewed Journal of Policy Analysis and Management.” [[Washington Post, 4/2/2019](#)]

Trump Repeatedly Sought Deep Cuts To Renewable Energy Funding.

According to the New York Times: President Trump's budget proposal for 2018 envisions a flurry of changes to domestic energy policy, reaping billions of dollars in one-time revenue from oil and gas resources while cutting research into future energy technologies that could pay long-term dividends. [...] At the same time, the budget would cut \$3.1 billion from energy research programs at the Energy Department, an 18 percent reduction from last year's spending. These programs are aimed at developing innovative technologies like better batteries for electric vehicles or carbon capture for coal and gas plants — all of which could one day help reduce greenhouse gas emissions and combat global warming.” [[New York Times, 5/23/2017](#)]

- **2020: Trump's Proposed Budget Slashed Funding For A Range Of Environmental Programs And Cut The EPA's Budget By 26 Percent.** According to The Hill: “President Trump's budget would eliminate 50 EPA programs and impose massive cuts to research and development, while also nixing money for the Energy Star rating system. The Energy Star program, which measures the efficiency of electronics and appliances, would instead rely on businesses to pay a fee to participate in the program.” [[The Hill, 2/10/2020](#)]

Trump's Department Of Energy Delayed The Release Of \$43 Billion In Low-Interest Loans For Clean Energy Projects Provided Under The Covid-19 Relief Bill. According to the New York Times: "As the government struggles to keep businesses afloat through the pandemic, the Trump administration is sitting on about \$43 billion in low-interest loans for clean energy projects, and critics are accusing the Energy Department of partisan opposition to disbursing the funds. [...] The loans — which would aid renewable power, nuclear energy and carbon capture and storage technology — had some bipartisan support even before the coronavirus pushed 30 million people onto the unemployment rolls. But some supporters of the program said it was being held back by a president who has falsely claimed wind power causes cancer and consistently sought deep cuts to renewable energy spending, including the loan program." [[New York Times, 4/30/2020](#)]

FAILURE TO LEAD ON MANUFACTURING PROTECTIVE EQUIPMENT DURING PANDEMIC

Through January And February, Trump Failed To Mobilize Plans And Supplies To Prepare For A Major Outbreak Of COVID-19 In The United States. On April 27, 2020, the Washington Post reported: "The administration's first major step to arrest the spread of the virus came in late January, when Trump restricted travel between the United States and China, where the virus is believed to have originated late last year. But Trump spent much of February publicly playing down the threat while his administration failed to mobilize for a major outbreak by securing supplies of protective equipment, developing an effective diagnostic test and preparing plans to quarantine large portions of the population." [[Washington Post, 4/27/2020](#)]

The Trump Administration Fell Months Behind Taking The Recommendations For Security Protective Equipment Laid Out In The NSC's "Pandemic Playbook." On March 25, 2020, Politico reported: "The Trump administration, state officials and even individual hospital workers are now racing against each other to get the necessary masks, gloves and other safety equipment to fight coronavirus — a scramble that hospitals and doctors say has come too late and left them at risk. But according to a previously unrevealed White House playbook, the government should've begun a federal-wide effort to procure that personal protective equipment at least two months ago. 'Is

there sufficient personal protective equipment for healthcare workers who are providing medical care?’ the playbook instructs its readers, as one early decision that officials should address when facing a potential pandemic. ‘If YES: What are the triggers to signal exhaustion of supplies? Are additional supplies available? If NO: Should the Strategic National Stockpile release PPE to states?’ The strategies are among hundreds of tactics and key policy decisions laid out in a 69-page National Security Council playbook on fighting pandemics, which POLITICO is detailing for the first time. Other recommendations include that the government move swiftly to fully detect potential outbreaks, secure supplemental funding and consider invoking the Defense Production Act — all steps in which the Trump administration lagged behind the timeline laid out in the playbook.” [\[Politico, 3/25/2020\]](#)

Headline: “In The Early Days Of The Pandemic, The U.S. Government Turned Down An Offer To Manufacture Millions Of N95 Masks In America.” On May 9, 2020, the Washington Post reported: “It was Jan. 22, a day after the first case of covid-19 was detected in the United States, and orders were pouring into Michael Bowen’s company outside Fort Worth, some from as far away as Hong Kong. Bowen’s medical supply company, Prestige Ameritech, could ramp up production to make an additional 1.7 million N95 masks a week. He viewed the shrinking domestic production of medical masks as a national security issue, though, and he wanted to give the federal government first dibs. ‘We still have four like-new N95 manufacturing lines,’ Bowen wrote that day in an email to top administrators in the Department of Health and Human Services. ‘Reactivating these machines would be very difficult and very expensive but could be achieved in a dire situation.’ But communications over several days with senior agency officials — including Robert Kadlec, the assistant secretary for preparedness and emergency response — left Bowen with the clear impression that there was little immediate interest in his offer.” [\[Washington Post, 5/9/2020\]](#)

CDC Medical Workers Expressed Serious Concerns About The Lack Of Effective Resources To Protect Them From Contracting The Virus. On March 7, 2020 Reuters reported: “As coronavirus cases exploded across the world, federal medical workers tasked with screening incoming passengers at U.S. airports grew alarmed: Many were working without the most effective masks to protect them from getting sick themselves. Screeners with the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention asked their supervisors this week to change official protocols and require stronger masks, according to an internal document reviewed by Reuters. On Friday evening, they learned their worst fears were realized: Two screeners, both working at Los Angeles

International Airport (LAX), had tested positive for the virus." [[Reuters, 3/7/2020](#)]

Trump's Administration Came Up With "Project Airbridge" To Bring Personal Protective Equipment To The U.S. From Overseas. On May 12, 2020, the Morning Call reported: "Owens and Minor Inc. has been working closely with the administration on personal protective equipment efforts during the pandemic. The Virginia company has been part of the federal government's Project Airbridge, an effort to bring personal protective equipment to the U.S. from overseas. It also was one of five companies tapped by the Department of Health and Human Services to supply approximately 600 million N95 respirator masks over the next 18 months, according to the firm's website." [[Morning Call, 5/12/2020](#)]

TRUMP'S IGNORANCE COSTS LIVES

TRUMP'S BOTCHED PANDEMIC RESPONSE COSTS LIVES

By May 3, 2020, Trump Had To Double His Previous Prediction Of How Many Would Die From COVID-19 In The U.S. To As High As 100,000. On May 3, 2020, the New York Times reported: "President Trump predicted on Sunday night that the death toll from the coronavirus pandemic ravaging the country may reach as high as 100,000 in the United States, twice as many as he had forecast just two weeks ago, even as he pressed states to reopen the shuttered economy." [[New York Times, 5/3/2020](#)]

By May 28, 2020, The U.S. COVID-19 Death Toll Surpassed 100,000. On May 28, 2020, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) issued a press release announcing: "Today the number of people in the United States who have died from COVID-19 surpassed 100,000. Families, friends, coworkers, loved ones and community members are grieving for each person who has been lost to this disease. Reaching the milestone of 100,000 persons lost in such a short timeframe is a sobering development and a heart-breaking reminder of the horrible toll of this unprecedented pandemic." [[Centers for Disease Control and Prevention press release, 5/28/2020](#)]

As Of August 16, 2020, the U.S. COVID-19 Death Toll Was Over 168,696. [[Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, updated 8/16/2020](#)]

White House Delayed Action For A Week After CDC Recommended A Travel Advisory For Europe. According to CNN: "In the early weeks of the US coronavirus outbreak, staff members in the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention had tracked a growing number of transmissions in Europe and elsewhere, and proposed a global advisory that would alert flyers to the dangers of air travel. But about a week passed before the alert was issued publicly -- crucial time lost when about 66,000 European travelers were streaming into American airports every day. The delay, detailed in documents obtained by CNN, is the latest example to emerge of a growing sense of disconnect between the CDC and the White House. In interviews with CNN, CDC officials say their agency's efforts to mount a coordinated response to the Covid-19 pandemic have been hamstrung by a White House whose decisions are driven by politics rather than science." [[CNN, 5/20/2020](#)]

White House Was Focused On China Instead Of Europe. According to CNN: “A senior official inside the CDC told CNN that the agency also alerted the White House to the virus's rapid spread across Europe, but that ‘the White House was extremely focused on China and not wanting to anger Europe ... even though that's where most of our cases were originally coming from.’ Some experts say the worst consequence of the frayed relationship is a general sense that the CDC has lost its place as the face and voice of public health in the midst of a 100-year pandemic.” [[CNN, 5/20/2020](#)]

(VIDEO) Dr. Fauci: “Obviously, You Could Logically Say, That If You Had A Process That Was Ongoing, And You Started Mitigation Earlier, You Could Have Saved Lives.” On the April 12, 2020 edition of CNN's “State of the Union,” Jake Tapper asked Dr. Anthony Fauci: “Do you think lives could have been saved if social distancing, physical distancing, stay-at-home measures had started third week of February, instead of mid-March?” Fauci responded: “You know, Jake, again, it's the what would have, what could have. It's -- it's very difficult to go back and say that. I mean, obviously, you could logically say, that if you had a process that was ongoing, and you started mitigation earlier, you could have saved lives. Obviously, no one is going to deny that. But what goes into those kinds of decisions is -- is complicated. But you're right. I mean, obviously, if we had, right from the very beginning, shut everything down, it may have been a little bit different. But there was a lot of pushback about shutting things down back then.” [[CNN State of the Union, 4/12/2020](#)]

Columbia University Researchers Found That 55% Of Deaths Reported As Of May 3, 2020 Could Have Been Prevented If Social Distancing Measures Were Implemented One Week Earlier. According to a research paper published by epidemiologists at the Department of Environmental Health Sciences at Columbia University: “We find significant reductions of the basic reproductive numbers in major metropolitan areas in association with social distancing and other control measures. Counterfactual simulations indicate that, had these same control measures been implemented just 1-2 weeks earlier, a substantial number of cases and deaths could have been averted. Specifically, nationwide, 61.6% [95% CI: 54.6%-67.7%] of reported infections and 55.0% [95% CI: 46.1%-62.2%] of reported deaths as of May 3, 2020 could have been avoided if the same control measures had been implemented just one week earlier. We also examine the effects of delays in re-implementing social distancing following a relaxation of control measures. A longer response time results in a stronger rebound of infections and death. Our findings underscore the importance of early intervention and aggressive response in controlling the COVID-19 pandemic.” [[Sen Pei, Sasikiran](#)]

[Kandula, & Jeffrey Shaman, "Differential Effects of Intervention Timing on COVID-19 Spread in the United States" 3/20/2020\]](#)

- **Washington Post Headline: "Social Distancing A Week Earlier Could Have Saved 36,000 American Lives, Study Says."** On May 21, 2020, the Washington Post reported: "What if those sweeping measures imposed by March 15 — a federal warning against large gatherings, health screenings at airports, states of emergency declared by governors and mayors — had been announced a week earlier? New research from Columbia University epidemiologists offered one possible answer on Wednesday. If the same kind of social distancing had been in place seven days earlier, their study found, the United States could have prevented 36,000 deaths through early May — about 40 percent of fatalities reported to date." [[Washington Post, 3/21/2020](#)]
- **If Social Distancing Measures Had Been Implemented March 1st, It Could Have Saved 54,000 Lives.** In a May 21, 2020 story about a Columbia University study that examined the potential effects if policymakers had begun social distancing measures at an earlier date during the COVID-19 pandemic, the Washington Post reported: "Move it back even further, and the results are more dramatic. If the United States had mustered the same kind of political and public will against the virus on March 1, the researchers found, 54,000 fewer Americans would have died of the illness. By Friday, the nationwide death toll had surpassed 93,000." [[Washington Post, 3/21/2020](#)]

CLIMATE CHANGE IS ALREADY COSTING LIVES

Scientific American: "Researchers Believe That Global Warming Is Already Responsible For Some 150,000 Deaths Each Year Around The World." In June of 2009, Scientific American reported; "Researchers believe that global warming is already responsible for some 150,000 deaths each year around the world, and fear that the number may well double by 2030 even if we start getting serious about emissions reductions today. A team of health and climate scientists from the World Health Organization (WHO) and the University of Wisconsin at Madison published these findings last year in the prestigious, peer-reviewed science journal Nature. Besides killing people, global warming also contributes to some five million human illnesses every year, the researchers found. Some of the ways global warming negatively affects human health—especially in developing nations—include: speeding

the spread of infectious diseases such as malaria and dengue fever; creating conditions that lead to potentially fatal malnutrition and diarrhea; and increasing the frequency and severity of heat waves, floods and other weather-related disasters." [[Scientific American, 6/17/2009](#)]

The US Has Experienced 46 Climate Or Extreme Weather Disasters Costing 3,604 Lives And More Than \$462 Billion Since Trump Took Office. According to data collected by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA) National Centers for Environmental Information (NCEI), the United states has sustained 46 weather and climate disasters since 2017 where overall damages/costs reached or exceeded \$1 billion. The total combined cost of these disasters added up to \$462,607,700,000 when CPI-adjusted to 2020 dollars. These disasters cost a combined 3,604 lives, with 2,981 lives lost from 2017's Hurricane Maria alone. [[NOAA National Centers for Environmental Information](#)]

More Than US 350 Workers Have Died From Heat-Related Illness In The Past Decade. In July of 2019, Kaiser Health News reported: "It's a scene that plays out on airport tarmacs, in farm fields and on construction sites across the country: workers falling ill after laboring in hot or humid conditions for long hours without enough water and rest. Over the past decade, more than 350 workers nationwide have died from heat-related illness, according to data compiled by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Tens of thousands have had heat-related illnesses serious enough that they missed at least one day of work." [[Kaiser Health News, 7/16/2019](#)]