

NAE staff,

I was just alerted to this Aug 31 article, "National Association of Evangelicals joins call for attention to climate change" (<https://baptistnews.com/article/national-association-of-evangelicals-joins-call-for-attention-to-climate-change/>).

May I respectfully suggest, well-intended that this report of yours might be, when religious person or group asserts that the 'science' of man-caused global warming is settled and all of us are under a moral imperative to do all we can to stop global warming, the religious person or group inadvertently places themselves into a serious religious moral dilemma, when an elemental question is asked: "which is the bigger sin — failing to stop a so-called global warming crisis which has increasing credibility problems with its underlying science assessments, or breaking the Commandment on Bearing False Witness against skeptic climate scientists by calling them 'industry-corrupted' as a tactic to ensure that the public dismisses skeptic scientists' massively detailed science-based criticisms aren't taken seriously?"

The global warming issue war is waged on two fronts: "settled science" and "crooked skeptics." I submit that it is an elemental sin of failing to undertake basic due diligence to see if there is a viable science-based 'second opinion' on this entire matter, and I submit that it is an even bigger sin to accuse well-meaning skeptic climate scientists of being 'industry-paid liars-for-hire' without checking the veracity of the accusation. Within your report, on page 49, you cite alleged "Christian climate scientist" Katharine Hayhoe, who herself has apparently committed that sin when she accused skeptic climate scientists of that treachery, as seen in this screenshot (<http://gelbspanfiles.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Hayhoe-Nova2.jpg>) of her accusation elsewhere. Her citation sources are both massively suspect as I detail here <http://gelbspanfiles.com/?p=2728> and here <http://gelbspanfiles.com/?p=5917>. I submit that if the latter of Ms Hayhoe's citation sources is placed under oath at either congressional hearings or in cross examinations within the current global warming damages lawsuits, the collapse of that person's credibility could implode the entire "crooked skeptic scientists" accusation by exposing it as something that may have strayed into epic libel /slander territory on the part of its core promulgators.

I'm not a climate scientist, I am no more than a common citizen who (after a decade+ of doing due diligence to determine if the "crooked skeptics" accusation is true) now has an email contact list that reads like a Who's Who of skeptic climate scientists and expert climate issue speakers who hold the same skepticism. From my own personal work researching the validity of the "crooked skeptics" accusation, I can point out at considerable depth how it has NO merit, and that the accusation has been promulgated by a core clique of enviro-activists, where some of their efforts have even infiltrated one particular church organization. I wrote an article on this topic years back at AmericanThinker ("The Case of the Curious Climate Covenant" https://www.americanthinker.com/articles/2010/12/the_case_of_the_curious_climat.html), and have a current blog post category at my GelbspanFiles blog where two of my posts explore the HUGE faults of the people behind the so-called "Moral Imperative to Stop Global Warming" (<http://gelbspanfiles.com/?cat=42>).

I am certain the NAE staff meant well with this report, but the reason perhaps why you all were not aware of the other side of the issue is because news outlets such as the PBS NewsHour, for example, have EXCLUDED skeptic climate scientists' detailed viewpoints from their program (I detail the NewsHour's specific bias here: http://gelbspanfiles.com/?page_id=3834).

Ask yourselves how big of a sin it is for such an influential body of people to deceive their viewing

audiences to that extent.

Then ask yourselves whether you should retract your entire 95 page report until after you've thoroughly examined and given fair treatment to skeptic scientists, e.g. the now 1200 behind this declaration <https://clintel.org/world-climate-declaration/> , along with all the skeptic scientists and other experts behind these reports: <http://climatechangereconsidered.org/>