

## Who is duping whom on climate change?

Phil Crafts

April 9, 2019

Let me get this straight. According to a recent letter writer, climate change caused by human activity is a hoax that both science and the mainstream media have succeeded in perpetrating through the use of fear tactics and the lie that there is something like a 97 percent consensus among climate change believers.

In truth, they are a left-wing conspiracy dedicated to the promotion of “the overthrow of industrial civilization.” And they are very good at duping the public, because science is as good as sex in selling products.

To find evidence for this grand plan, the writer notes that one need look no further than the refusal by “the media” to report certain facts that might challenge this hoax. Admirably, since the writer says he’s no scientist, he calls on one, a Dr. Richard Lindzen of MIT, to support that claim.

A quick bit of research into Lindzen shows that he was a most highly-respected climate scientist for most of his career, but whose more recent conclusions have fallen behind the wave of newer insights and drawn a good deal of criticism and rejection by his peers.

The letter refers to a recent lecture Lindzen gave at the Global Warming Policy Foundation in which he laid out his position that the current consensus on global warming and climate change is “thoroughly unscientific” and “an implausible conjecture backed by false evidence.”

It’s telling that he was invited to speak to this particular foundation, which turns out to be a lobby group in the United Kingdom whose stated aims are to challenge “extremely damaging and harmful policies” by governments which thwart challenges to the notion of human-caused global warming. It in short promotes climate change denial.

He also happens to be a “Distinguished Senior Fellow” at the CATO Institute’s “Center for the Study of Science.” The CATO Institute is a Washington-based think-tank founded as the Charles Koch Foundation in 1974. As such, its main goal is to prevent public agencies from regulating private corporations’ presumed right to pollute without restraint.

Is it possible that the professor, presented as the suppressed voice of the beleaguered 3 percent, is less than objective? Despite his impressive credentials, might he simply be wrong?

It strikes me as odd that the letter writer neglects to present these facts, and sort of makes one wonder who’s duping whom?

Phil Crafts

Leverett