



A Million from Michael Mann

June 2, 2025

Things aren't working out for [Michael Mann](#). The infamous "climate scientist" has been pursuing a years-long vendetta against critics of his methods and conclusions, and it's been a bumpy ride.

Mark Steyn and Rand Simberg accused him of manipulating data "in the service of politicized science." Instead of answering the criticism, Mann treated it as actionably defamatory.

In 2012, Mann launched a lawsuit against Simberg (of the Competitive Enterprise) and Steyn (then writing for *National Review*).

National Review [observes](#) that the criticism which offended Mann "was obviously protected by the First

Amendment," so that his suit should have been scuttled immediately.

Instead, judges antagonistic to free speech when they find the speech uncongenial enabled Mann's litigation to trundle on for years.

The story gets complicated, as [touched upon](#) a few months ago. In 2021, the tide seemed to be turning in favor of Steyn and Simberg, with a court [issuing](#) a favorable summary judgment. But in January 2024, a jury found Steyn and Simberg liable for defamation. The awards? Steyn was ordered to pay \$1 in compensatory damages and \$1 million in punitive damages, Simberg to pay \$1 in compensatory damages and \$1,000 in punitive damages.

That insane \$1 million amount was later [reduced](#) to \$5,000.

Now it is Mann taking the hit, with rulings that he must pay about a million bucks in legal fees to CEI and Rand Simberg (\$477,350) and *National Review* (\$530,820).

National Review urges Michael Mann to finally relinquish his authoritarian quest lest he lose even more.

Will he? It would be irrational to continue, but it was irrational at the start.

This is Common Sense. I'm Paul Jacob.