

# The Augusta Chronicle

## Study other side of climate change

Priscilla Bence

July 20, 2019

What started as an anti-science movement in the 1960s has evolved into popular hatred of facts or not questioning groupthink when it comes to scientific findings that have two sides.

There has been bad science all through the ages. Everyone said the world was flat and Columbus' voyage proved different. DDT hysteria resulted in 1972 legislation banning it, causing millions of deaths as a result of malaria - many more than would have died from cancer related to DDT use. This year it's the unwarranted measles shot fear, which caused a low immunization rate that led to outbreaks and deaths.

Today we have a popular belief that global warming is caused by humans, but the science is not conclusive on this. References include "Climate Confusion," by Roy Spencer; "Taken by Storm," by Christopher Essex and Ross McKittrick; "The Skeptical Environmentalist," by Bjorn Lomborg; and Blue "Planet in Green Shackles," by Vaclaw Klaus.

The Competitive Enterprise Institute and the Cato Institute have published books, too. The richest nations, including the U.S., are capitalistic and have the least pollution because of their ability to have good environmental policies and controls.

Humans contribute to global warming but at a rate of about 1%, not enough to implement measures of reducing CO2 emissions that would cost millions of jobs and lead to worsening poverty. The cost-benefit analyses are clearly in favor of conservative stewardship.

We do know that Earth is in a warming period of about 1,500 years. Reading "the other side" on this argument convinced me that warm climates increase food production. Also, ice ages or warming periods cause migrations. Who would mind if people started moving north to retire over the next 100 years?

Priscilla Bence