

The Other Global Warming Story

❑ How am I supposed to know if global warming is a worldwide crisis or not? I'm a journalist, not a scientist. All I know is what I read in the papers. And what I just read in the Wall Street Journal won't make the global warming true believers too happy.

The piece I read is an op-ed signed by 17 scientists with some pretty serious credentials, and runs under the headline, "No Need to Panic About Global Warming." The signers include a physics professor from Princeton, a technology professor from Cambridge, and a professor of atmospheric sciences from MIT. There's also the head of the Laboratory of Biochemical Genetics and Metabolism at Rockefeller University, a member of the National Academy of Sciences and the aerospace engineer who designed Voyager. There are more with the same kind of heady credentials. Al Gore is not among them.

The piece starts out with this: "A candidate for public office in any contemporary democracy may have to consider what, if anything, to do about 'global warming.' Candidates should understand that the oft-repeated claim that nearly all scientists demand that something dramatic be done to stop global warming is not true. In fact, a large and growing number of distinguished scientists and engineers do not agree that drastic actions on global warming are needed."

But how can this be? The New York Times and other really important newspapers are always telling us that if we don't do something about global warming yesterday, we'll all be goners tomorrow. Hey, even Scott Pelley, now the anchor of the CBS Evening news, once did a one-sided piece about global warming for *60 Minutes*, and when he was asked about the lack of balance he said he didn't have to find a Holocaust denier just

because he interviewed someone who survived the Holocaust.

Get it? Anyone who doubts the “official” version of global warming is no better than a dope who denies the Holocaust. But the Journal op-ed tells a different story.

“Although the number of publicly dissenting scientists is growing,” the op-ed reads, “many young scientists furtively say that while they also have serious doubts about the global-warming message, they are afraid to speak up for fear of not being promoted – or worse.” By worse, the authors mean you might lose your job if you say the “wrong” thing. Scientists, I guess, can be closed-minded, just like stupid people.

But what about the facts? Don’t the facts support the argument that global warming is a ticking time bomb just waiting to go off? Well, not really. “Perhaps the most inconvenient fact, “ the op-ed states, “is the lack of global warming well over 10 years.”

That really is an inconvenient fact, isn’t it!

The piece asks a question: “Why is there so much passion about global warming?...”

The authors give us a clue. They tell us to “Follow the money,” explaining that “Alarmism over climate is of great benefit to many, providing government funding for academic research and a reason for government bureaucrats to grow. Alarmism also offers an excuse for governments to raise taxes, taxpayer-funded subsidies for businesses that understand how to work the political system, and a lure for big donations to charitable foundations promising to save the planet.”

We even learn that a Nobel Prize winner in physics recently resigned from the prestigious American Physical Society because he could not accept the Society’s policy that says: “The evidence is incontrovertible Global warming is occurring.”

Like I said, I'm no scientist, so what do I know? Glad you asked. I know that just about every mainstream journalist this side of Pluto believes global warming is real, mainly caused by man, and will destroy us if we don't act. If so many journalists believe that ... then I know it's probably not true.