

## Global Warming Warning

Something sinister is happening in the field of climate science. No, this time we do not mean their discovery that the Planet is Doomed (again) unless the governments of the world embark on an emergency orgy of concerted spending and regulation on a scale that dwarfs all precedent.

Some of the so-called climate-change 'sceptics' – not political stooges or cranks, but bona fide, competent scientists who, as is commonplace in science, disagree with the consensus in their fields – have been sounding an alarm. In a recent disturbing [article](#) Prof. Richard Lindzen (who is the Alfred P. Sloan Professor of Atmospheric Science at MIT) says that

Global-warming alarmists intimidate dissenting scientists into silence

Similarly, Prof. Bob Carter, a geologist engaged in paleoclimate research at James Cook University, Queensland [wrote](#) recently:

There are other reasons, too, why the public hears so little in detail from those scientists who approach climate change issues rationally, the so-called climate sceptics. Most are to do with intimidation against speaking out, which operates intensely on several parallel fronts.

The intimidation is presumably not perfectly effective, since Lindzen and Carter are speaking out. Indeed, recently sixty "leading scientists" wrote an [open letter](#) to Canada's new Prime Minister urging withdrawal from the Kyoto Treaty. Nevertheless these claims of intimidation from scientists are extremely bad news. Discovering the truth is hard. This institutions of science forbid intimidation and other forms of irrationality not merely for the comfort of scientists. It is because even small amounts of certain pathologies in the scientific process can completely halt progress, or worse, create the semblance of authority for illusory discoveries.

The issue of climate change, its causes and effects, is a highly technical one about which we at [The World](#) do not have the relevant expertise to be capable of passing judgement. The trouble is that the climate-science community, by casually or deliberately politicising its field, is increasingly destroying its own standing to

advise the rest of us. And if the truth emerges from such a process,

we shall be very lucky.

Wed, 04/12/2006 - 23:24 | [digg](#) | [del.icio.us](#) | [permalink](#)

## Centigradients

Your point is that the whole area of climate change science is fraught with politicization? No surprise there. Is the world getting warmer relative to measurements of previous decades? Yes it is. Fascinating! I have only one political/economic question. What parts of the world are getting drier and windier and wetter, and does this mean I should be more careful in my choice of where to live? I hear the British Isles may be getting much colder if the Gulf Stream shifts. Until the science gets better or at least more agreeable, I think I'll hedge my bets and stay in a warm lush place on slightly higher ground. I won't worry then about the politics of global warming or climate change.

by a reader on Sun, 04/16/2006 - 17:34 | [reply](#)

## politicisation of research

It isn't just the obvious candidates (climate change, heritability of IQ, evolution) that have become highly politicised within academia. Egalitarian ideology is creeping into every subject area. What is 'fair' or 'just' is taking precedence over what is true. Ends are taken to justify means. Hence, whatever the truth behind global warming (and it may well be much worse than even the scaremongers are saying) there seems little reason to trust official pronouncements. If things are unclear enough to require academic guidance, there will always be room for biased interpretation of the data. Who is there now who still stands up for principles such as objectivity (supposedly a bourgeois illusion, according to post-structuralists) or free speech?

by [culturesceptic](#) on Thu, 05/18/2006 - 09:24 | [reply](#)