

Climate Change: Who Are The Deniers Now?

Written by Dr. Tim Ball, Canada Free Press
Monday, 16 November 2009

“When you point your finger at someone, three fingers are pointing back at you.”
Anonymous

Finger pointing rarely includes facts, especially in the climate debate. The first finger said we were global warming skeptics, but was turned back when it was explained all scientists are skeptics.

The second finger claimed we were climate change deniers. It was turned back because the opposite is true; we're telling the public about the extent and speed of natural climate change. As Copenhagen nears, it's evident no agreement is possible so rhetoric, and alarmism abound. Finger pointing has a new form, being a denier is now a disease. They never consider the failure is due to facts proving the anthropogenic global warming (AGW) hypothesis wrong. With the left it is always someone else's fault.

Just the Facts

Extreme left journalist George Monbiot ignored all the facts I provided when he was pointing a finger at me. He's ignoring them again, which forces him to assume the deniers are at fault. He wrote, “There is no point in denying it: we're losing. Climate change denial is spreading like a contagious disease. It exists in a sphere that cannot be reached by evidence or reasoned argument; any attempt to draw attention to scientific findings is greeted with furious invective. This sphere is expanding with astonishing speed.”

The sphere is expanding for several reasons.

- * All evidence rejects the hypothesis that human CO₂ is causing warming or climate change.
- * Facts are gradually getting to the public despite obstructionism by journalists like Monbiot.
- * Temperature projections of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) are consistently wrong.
- * Record cold temperatures are occurring everywhere.
- * Motives of those pushing the need for reduction in CO₂ are being exposed.
- * Economic costs of a completely unnecessary action are emerging.

If you shoot the messenger it changes the question to, “Who is the denier now?”

Denialism is defined as “the practice of creating the illusion of debate when there is none.” It's a variation on “the science is settled” theme, but personalized to say you deny the facts that prove it's settled. I experienced it this week and learned there's no rational response. A person presented herself as a journalist writing an article on climate change. I don't refuse interviews and assume the person is seeking balance.

The article was about “denialism”, which the journalist claimed was a serious threat and I was a prime example. It evolved there was no balance, the journalist believed the science is settled and I was refusing to concede.

I explained how I am the antithesis of a denier. I explained how the scientific method was thwarted and the AGW hypothesis became fact before the research began. I was told this was clear evidence of my denial. As the chosen representative of denialism I wanted the facts and science I was supposedly denying. I asked what percentage CO2 was of greenhouse gases. The answer; “I ask the questions.” I ended the interview, an action that will probably appear as clear evidence of denial.

Leftist politicians are pointing the same fingers. Australian Prime Minister Rudd said in a recent speech, “climate-change skeptics, the climate-change deniers, the opponents of climate-change action are active in every country.”

He wrapped the charges in the standard environmentalist argument of the precautionary principle. Of the Australian opposition he said, “You are betting our jobs, our houses, our farms, our reefs, our economy and our future on an intuition on a gut feeling; on a political prejudice you have about science.”

It is the finger of guilt. What he denies is those impacts will occur if you implement his proposed climate-change action.
But who has the political prejudice?

Logic says it’s those who want to stifle debate, to silence individuals and groups. All I’ve ever sought is a full and open debate. It was what 59 fellow skeptics and I sought in a letter to the Canadian Prime Minister.

A new book with another twist accuses those trying to uncover the facts of a cover-up. I hesitate to give the book attention but as an example of the illogic, lies and nastiness in the climate change debate it must be exposed.

James Hoggan and Richard Littlemore’s form of the denialism charge is in their book titled, “Climate Cover-Up” subtitled, “The Crusade to Deny Global Warming.” They’ve likely achieved a new low with two major errors in the title. Nobody denies warming; the issue is the cause. The word “crusade” implies a religious quest, but the real crusade is to force acceptance of the hypothesis by personal attacks. Scientists as skeptics were subjected to an inquisition as befalls non-believers.

Disclosure; I’m a victim of their attacks and accusations. The false information about me leaves little doubt the rest is equally questionable. I was a threat from the beginning because I identified the hoax early in a peer-reviewed article, “An Iconoclast’s View of Climatic Change” in the 1992 Canadian Water Resources Journal. The editor published but with the bizarre condition he provide the title. When I saw his choice I agreed because, unknown to him I already realized I was challenging a religion. Hoggan and Littlemore falsely linked me to the oil and energy industry. They said my failure to follow through on a lawsuit to stop their false information was proof of guilt. Truth is I could not afford to continue the action. Besides, Hoggan was supporting the person who made the false accusations. The

book smears by suggestion, implies guilt by association, and uses various forms of ad hominem attacks. They don't discuss the scientific facts.

Hoggan and Littlemore are major players in the attacks and real cover-up. It is their expertise. Hoggan is a master of spin who owns a large Public Relations company. Littlemore is a political journalist. Hoggan set up a web page called Desmogblog and hired Littlemore and Kevin Grandia, to produce material replete with personal attacks, while ignoring the science.

Hoggan is Chair of the Board of the David Suzuki Foundation, a political environmental group that receives funding from oil and energy companies. With the twisted logic of true believers somehow this is not tainting and neither is money from government or any other agency. Hoggan's clients include alternative energy companies, like Ballard Engineering, who benefit from showing CO2 is causing global warming or climate change, but somehow that is not a conflict. But none of that is important; the issue is the science and the facts, which they consistently ignore. Knocked Out by the Facts

The final finger of denialism pointed so directly by Monbiot is, ironically, an eloquent description of his own position. The reason he writes, "There is no point in denying it: we're losing" is because the fingers have curled into a fist and it is aimed right back at him and the other real deniers. As James Howell (1594 – 1666) said, "Burn not thy fingers to snuff another man's candle."