

ON THE PUBLIC'S PERCEPTION OF GLOBAL WARMING:
NOT AS 'DUMB' AS SOME BELIEVE

by

Russel Cook (USA)

Reprinted from

ENERGY &
ENVIRONMENT

VOLUME 23 No. 5 2012

MULTI-SCIENCE PUBLISHING CO. LTD.
5 Wates Way, Brentwood, Essex CM15 9TB, United Kingdom

ON THE PUBLIC'S PERCEPTION OF GLOBAL WARMING: NOT AS 'DUMB' AS SOME BELIEVE

Russell Cook

Phoenix, AZ USA

There is a growing irony about the man-caused global warming issue that has every potential of exposing the entire thing as being an ideologically-driven movement which was never supportable from its start.

Various public polls lately show an ever-downward slide of opinion about the importance of the man-caused global warming issue. Such polls prompt many articles from environmentalist writers suggesting that, in light of the science being long settled, this worrisome situation with average citizens and 'anti-global warming' politicians could be reversed through better communication from the media and climate scientists. If only they weren't so ignorant, you see.

Typical of this kind of pontificating was an announcement¹ back in mid March of 2011 about the Google organization spearheading an effort to 'take on climate change skeptics with a new technology effort'. The article noted public and political ignorance was being perpetuated by skeptic scientists who have been given too big of a 'megaphone'. To quote Google's senior environment program manager Amy Luers, "The public's understanding of science across all disciplines is extremely low, because the scientific community is really siloed from the community in general."

Sorry, Ms Luers, on the issue of global warming, no. We have been inundated with the so-called scientific community's side of man-caused global warming ever since the late 1980s, beginning with the testimony of NASA scientist James Hansen at a hot summer hearing chaired by Senator Tim Wirth. A "google search" of that event results in a 10th year anniversary recount² of it by the *Washington Post* saying "...the heat itself became a kind of congressional exhibit. It was 98 degrees on June 23, 1988, and the warmth leaked in through the three big windows in Dirksen 366, overpowered the air conditioner, and left the crowd sweating..." Further searching results in a 2007 PBS *Frontline* Wirth confession³, where he said he'd opened the windows the night before in order to make the room overly hot.

Such contradictions in aren't just in minor story telling details, they spread far into the mainstream media inundation about the issue.

The mainstream media does *not* tell us about these contradictions. Instead, we hear those from various new media sources, we do our own internet searches via Google or

¹ <http://solveclimateneeds.com/news/20110318/google-climate-change-fellows-science-new-media>

² http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/06/22/AR2008062201862_pf.html

³ <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/hotpolitics/etc/script.html>

other sites, and we learn more about those for ourselves, in addition to finding more contradictions.

That's where the 'ignorance' irony is seen.

This huge problem of what the media refuses to tell us - which anyone can find - casts a negative appearance on the entire global warming crisis as being questionable from its beginnings, and now on the verge of total collapse. Emphasis on the word "**anyone**", which prompts us to ask why the mainstream media chooses not to investigate the sea of red flags seen in all of the issue's contradictions.

It doesn't take an especially long time in internet searches to reveal that the heart of the man-caused global warming side boils down to three basic points:

1. a consensus of scientists says the idea of man-caused global warming is settled
2. skeptic scientists are funded by big oil and coal industries in exchange for false reports which confuse the public into believing it isn't settled.
3. the media is not obligated to give a few skeptic scientists equal time with IPCC scientists because of the two prior points

Regarding point #1, we soon see how the mainstream media makes no effort to quantify what a consensus of scientists is, and we also discover the so-called proof of a "928-to-0" consensus of science papers quoted in Al Gore's *An Inconvenient Truth* movie is flatly contradicted⁴. Nor does it take long to find how point #3 is repeated in numerous places⁵ going all the way back to 1995, even though very few skeptic scientists actually got any lengthy media coverage over the last fifteen years.

The central point #2 is the most troubling, when it comes to contradictions. Many attribute it to the segment in Gore's movie immediately after the "928-to-0" science papers bit, where he spells an accusation phrase out across the screen in capital red letters about skeptic scientists being paid to "*reposition global warming as theory, rather than fact.*" In the book accompanying his movie⁶ and in his other writings, Gore says this phrase was seen in an energy industry memo "discovered by the Pulitzer Prize-winning reporter Ross Gelbspan".

Careful scrutiny of assertions around the phrase reveals problems that would keep intrepid reporters busy for months. Gelbspan never won a Pulitzer, he did not discover the coal industry association PR campaign memos containing the phrase, Gore misidentifies the phrase as coming from oil companies, as does a main lawyer in one of the three global warming nuisance lawsuits⁷, the actual memo is never seen in its full context in any print or online publication relying on it for "proof" of skeptic scientists' corruption, and when the memo is actually seen (in my online articles showing it via an obscure Greenpeace archive scan link⁸) it appears that Gelbspan took the phrase out of context. Perhaps most troubling of all, Al Gore's own words in his 1992 *Earth in the Balance* book indicate he saw⁹ these memos about four years before Gelbspan's first public mention of them.

⁴ <http://www.populartechnology.net/2009/10/peer-reviewed-papers-supporting.html>

⁵ <http://www.globalwarming.org/2011/06/02/media-too-fair-to-climate-skeptics-say-reporters-whove-been-unfair-to-skeptics/>

⁶ <http://books.google.com/books?id=93M6C24ac9MC&pg=PA263>

⁷ <http://cdn.breitbart.com/Big-Government/2010/11/27/Global-Warming-Nuisance-Lawsuits-Are-Based-on-a-Fatal-Flaw>

⁸ <http://research.greenpeaceusa.org/?a=view&d=2950>

⁹ <http://www.climatedepot.com/a/11168/Climate-Depot-Exclusive-Smearing-Skeptic-Scientists-What-did-Gore-know-and-when-did-he-know-it>

The problems don't stop there, this is only the tip of the proverbial iceberg.

A perfect case in point is IPCC Vice Chair Jean-Pascal van Ypersele's August 2011 pronouncement that we should shun skeptic scientist Dr S Fred Singer because of ties to fossil fuel industries. Rather than accept this without question, we look into it and soon see he has his own appearance of a conflict of interest, since he wrote a paper commissioned by Greenpeace while rising through the ranks of the IPCC¹⁰. We are treated to numerous mainstream media stories of Dr Singer's alleged corruption, but not a word about Ypersele's Greenpeace connection, even though it dates back to 2004. Not a scrap of evidence is found to prove that fossil fuel industries influenced Singer's work, but as Donna Laframboise documents at her web site, the IPCC is seen relying on information from Greenpeace reports and people tied to that organization¹¹.

Is the public blindly ignorant about global warming and we need Google to set us straight, or do we instead have an entire ideology that cannot support its core reason for existence? Why else would we find a non-stop effort to make sure critics of man-caused global warming are marginalized in every possible way, repeated by a mainstream media that should have first explained away all of the red flags associated with the whole thing?

The irony of it all. Global warming mitigation is grinding to a halt not because of public ignorance, but rather because we are increasingly more aware of everything wrong with it. No need to trust me on this, you may search the internet for yourself.

Russell Cook is neither a scientist nor a journalist, just an ordinary citizen. His collection of writings on this issue can be seen at a web page titled "The '96-to-present smear of skeptic scientists: <http://www.globalwarmingskeptics.info/thread-1939-post-11632.html#pid11632>

¹⁰ http://www.americanthinker.com/blog/2011/08/climate_science_and_corruption.html

¹¹ <http://nofrakkingconsensus.com/2010/01/28/greenpeace-and-the-nobel-winning-climate-report/>

