

[News](#) | [Weather](#) | [Traffic](#) | [Video](#) | [onPolitix](#) | [Sports](#) | [On Your Side](#) | [Entertainment](#) | [On Air](#) | [Community](#)

[Participate](#) | [WAVY Experts](#) | [Home](#) : [Blogs](#)

Colluding? Hmmm...

 June 29th, 2011 at 8:40 pm by [Don Slater](#) under [Uncategorized](#), [Weather](#)

A couple of years ago, I did an on-air report analyzing whether climate change was real or a hoax. The scientific community even then was virtually unanimous in stating that with a high degree of probability, Global Climate Change was imminent and was man-made. But there were a few who denied that climate change was real. I set up a list of 60 scientists who had expressed serious doubt about the reality of global climate change...and began to examine the curriculum vitae and employment of each of those scientists. I only made it through about 15 or 20 of the scientists and stopped there; there was no reason to continue. Other than the one dentist and two M.D.s (really!), the remainder of the scientists were geologists or others with active interests in the petroleum industry.


There has since been very strong evidence that climate change-denying scientists have been paid off by oil interests to actively deny climate change. These scientists were paid off by a number of oil interests including [Exxon-Mobil](#), the [American Petroleum Institute](#), and especially, [the Koch Brothers](#). For the report, I also interviewed one of the leading climate change “denialists”, Dr. Patrick Michaels from the Cato Institute. At the time, I was a bit confused as to why an actual climatologist might be denying global warming. But later study revealed that his employer (Cato Institute) was founded and continues to be funded by the Koch Brothers.

Every now and then, a scientific skeptic of climate change will step forward. And that scientist’s motives and credibility come into question once again...[because of who’s paying them](#)...lots of whos! And it appears that Exxon-Mobil has broken its promise not to fund climate skeptics.

Of course, normal scientific studies are fully open to peer review; they are not paid to write conclusions which tilt to a paid, foregone conclusion.

[Permalink](#) | [ShareThis](#) | [1 Comment](#)

One Response to “Colluding? Hmmm...”

-  *Kevin* says:
[June 30, 2011 at 1:30 am](#)

This editorial lacks any evidence and thoroughness and is relying purely on rhetoric. If you are claiming that these scientists are being paid off you need to show evidence. Working for a company may cloud one's conclusions but is far different from being paid off. The same could be said for the many of scientists investing or working for solar, wind and alternative energy companies. Are they being paid off??

[Reply](#)