

Well, I figured I'd be fair and give commenter "nc6228" a week or so to come up with the frightening "what else" he mentioned below. Notice how well that turned out. I figured I'd give Keating a fair chance to extricate himself out of the corner he painted himself into over those remarks about Gelbspan's "Pulitzer win" & citation of a way-outdated Desmog bio. Notice how well he did with that. Then Tom Harris joins in, and collectively none of you provides an iota of evidence proving he is 'motivated by payment' or that he, I or any other person in your sights is dishonest. Chanting the accusation does not make it valid. Citing Wikipedia as a source of damaging evidence against Harris was particularly amusing, and citing both Desmog and ExxonSecrets as sources only reinforces my main thrust about a single source for the 'corrupt skeptics' accusation. Keating would actually know what I'm talking about there if only he read my GelbspanFiles blog. He claims I attack Gelbspan at my blog (how? with repetition that his mother wears army boots?) and then fully admits he never read it.

So is anyone actually surprised at the label Keating evokes out of Harris? Me, I ask questions. What does it mean when a blogger hurls accusations and a guy like me arrives to ask "where's the beef?", only to be met with rants about me being an intimidator / climate denier / shill / henchman / harasser? Is this appearance problem an indicator of a far deeper problem across the spectrum of global warming believers, when such rants predictably pop in the face of legitimate questions? Questions which could very well be raised as devil's advocate ones by global warming believers just to be sure they can stand up to critics?

Gents, you know what I am, an irritant quite literally of your own creation, an itch of doubt you never knew you had until you scratched it, and now that doubt won't go away. I won't return as a commenter here, but the doubt in your mind -- on why you have no evidence of treachery you can point proving 'skeptics lie because they were instructed and paid to do so' -- is something you can't erase. The anti-tobacco people had their "Doubt is our Product" Brown & Williamson memo, and all you have is your "reposition global warming as theory rather than fact" memo which commenter "cunudiun" blindly pointed to over at his attack against me in the PBS NewsHour comment section, clueless of how I shoot that thing down and how the so-called 'discoverer' of it is in a world of hurt.

So when it comes to destroying the credibility of skeptic scientists or skeptic speakers, or ordinary idiots like me, YOU. HAVE. NOTHING. and the lack of evidence you could otherwise point to straightaway with no sidestepping or name calling is a headache now firmly lodged in your brains. Call me an optimist: there is total relief from this pain, and it is found in within yourselves in the form of objective critical thinking. Why have your leaders failed you, and why are they the ones seemingly making out like the One Percenters you despise so much?

You'll thank me later on, hard as that may be to comprehend right now. But in the meantime, look in the mirror and keep repeating until it takes hold, "It doesn't matter what I believe, it only matters what I can prove!"