

Let's hear both sides

Editor, Daily News:

I am not a scientist nor a novelist.

I recall more than 50 years ago my college professor reminding us that a theory made without studying all material on the subject is unscientific. He used the example, "See the black cow in the field?" The correct scientific response is, "At least it is black on this side."

The global-warming issue is so politicized that to question the science on the issue labels one as someone in denial.

My position is that there has never been a scientific debate involving both sides of the issue. There is not enough space to list the scientists (around 100, most are Ph.D.s) who would like to have an opportunity to express another point of view. They are from the largest and most prestigious universities and institutes worldwide and the concluding sentence in their report dated Nov. 19, 2008, to President Barack Obama is:

"Mr. President, your characterization of the scientific facts regarding climate change and the degree of certainty informing the scientific debate is simply incorrect."

The statement is followed by all the names with titles and affiliations and was published in The Wall Street Journal by the Cato Institute (www.catoinstitute.org). Is there any room for another point of view without the character assassination asserted in the column by Ben Bova?

— Robert Gicking