

## Political witch hunt on climate skeptics funding sources

By Lorraine Yapps Cohen

March 5, 2015

Climate [skeptics](#) -- the scientists who disagree with the specter of global warming disaster -- are the targets of a governmental witch hunt.

[Arizona Daily Independent](#) reports that Congressman Raúl Grijalva (D-AZ) is going after several researchers who dared to present evidence that the government's position on [climate change](#) is wrong.

Knowledgeable sources familiar with the science have it that presidential Science Advisor, [John Holdren](#), is behind Congressman Grijalva's witch hunt. Grijalva is presumed to have little knowledge of the identities of the major climate skeptics without advice from Holdren, who calls [climate skeptics](#) 'heretics' and coined the term 'deniers.' Such a directive would have been something the president knew about and approved.

Following in witches' footsteps, Senators Ed Markey of Massachusetts, Sheldon Whitehouse of Rhode Island, and Barbara Boxer of California, requested one hundred or more energy companies and trade groups for specific recipient [information on their research funding](#).

Dr. Roger Pielke, Jr., Professor of Environmental Studies at the Center for Science and Technology Policy Research at the University of Colorado at Boulder, is one of the targeted scientists. His position argues government's error in associating increasing disaster costs with greenhouse gas emissions.

Such a statement challenges the orthodoxy of anthropogenic global warming. Immutable on the science, Pielke rather is being investigated for the sources of his research funding, the Arizona Daily Independent added.

The implication is that research money from fossil fuel companies to any skeptics is bad. Why? Because the government is not fond of dissent, particularly the climate dissent arising from research supported by companies that produce energy from any form of fossilized hydrocarbons, the favored, abundant, cheap, energy-dense source of power.

At the same time, companies that produce the more dilute and expensive power from wind, solar, or corn are magnets for government monies. Those who develop the wind, solar, or corn

technologies get government subsidies and mandates. Government funding for green energy alternatives is not bad, it's good. It's crony capitalism.

Besides, government has an endless supply of money for funding the science that is high on the liberal agenda. Those funds come in the form of taxpayer dollars.

Industrial funding is bad whereas government funding is good. **Roy Spencer** calls it hypocrisy and the skeptics witch hunt as just the beginning of silencing climate dissent. Others have noted the **political fraud** that exists in the climate agenda.

The biggest misconceptions about climate research funding is that government funding is unbiased. That belief is false. Government funds the research that produces politically correct answers. Otherwise, such funding ceases to flow into institutional coffers. As an example, Scripps Institute did not receive **\$25 million grant** in 2011 to discover no effects on the oceans from global warming. No effect means no more grant.

Roy Spencer is quick to add:

*Government funding might be good to advance human knowledge in benign areas of inquiry, such as the mating habits of the Arctic sea slug. When it comes to research topics with massive political and economic implications [like global warming]... political appointees ... prefer research with outcomes that support their government programs.*

Research that is valued – and valuable – is the science that asks the questions for which there are people who want to know the real answers. This excludes government, which funds the research that delivers the answers the government demands.

Dick Lindzen, distinguished astrophysicist, professor emeritus of atmospheric sciences at MIT, and senior fellow of the Cato Institute, put science as political agenda this way:

*When an issue becomes a vital part of a political agenda, as is the case with climate, then the politically desired position becomes a goal rather than a consequence of scientific research. We have the new paradigm where simulation and programs have replaced theory and observation, where government largely determines the nature of scientific activity.*