



Written by [Alex Newman](#) on December 11, 2010

Skeptics Have Their Say at COP16, Press Refuses to Report

Amidst prayers to ancient Mayan goddesses, dire predictions of climate catastrophe, and alarmist proposals to ban everything from children to kerosene lamps, a few eminently qualified “skeptics” of the United Nations’ global-warming alarmism held a press conference at the summit in Cancun to share their views.



Organized by the Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow (CFACT), a market-oriented non-profit organization that deals with environmental and development issues, the press conference was promoted as “an opportunity for journalists to balance their coverage of COP16 by listening to all points of view.” Very few reporters, however, bothered to show up — let alone balance their coverage.

An activist in a polar bear suit did attend. He was wearing a sign reading “I am fine.” Somebody from a British newspaper showed up too. She wrote a scathing article about the press conference, which she described as “bizarre.” And that was about the extent of the coverage.

But as the announcement of the event explained, it is important that the media take a look at what other scientists are saying. “The scientific case for catastrophic man-made global warming continues to erode along with public support around the globe,” CFACT stated. And if reporters had listened to what the experts had to say, they might have realized that the UN’s global-warming “science” is certainly not “settled.”

Among the speakers was Lord Christopher Monckton, the Chief Policy Advisor to the Science and Public Policy Institute and science-policy advisor to Minister Margaret Thatcher when she was British Prime Minister. One of the leading figures battling the alarmism, he explained that, even if man is contributing slightly to warming, the solution is obviously not to create a costly global carbon regime administered by a world government — a proposal that is particularly attractive to many United Nations delegates.

“I think the world is in danger of throwing away its democracy, prosperity and freedom if it carelessly accepts what seems to me unresolved science and economics,” Monckton told the press conference. “To try to stop this problem by cutting carbon is like King Canute trying to stop the tide.”

Another speaker, University of Alabama research scientist Dr. Roy Spencer, was easily among the most qualified experts at the entire COP16 summit. In addition to writing best-selling books on climate science, Spencer used to serve as a senior scientist for climate studies at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).



Written by [Alex Newman](#) on December 11, 2010

Among other things, Spencer told the assembled journalists that it would be irresponsible to force poor people to stop burning fossil fuels in favor of expensive and inefficient alternatives. He also attacked a paper published in the journal *Science* about clouds and their effect on climate change, calling it “a step backward for climate research,” and released a [statement](#) condemning the paper’s timing and conclusions.

“Unfortunately, the central evidence contained in the paper is weak at best, and seriously misleading at worst. It uses flawed logic to ignore recent advancements we have made in identifying cloud feedback,” he said. “In fact, the new paper is like going back to using only X-rays for medical imaging when we already have MRI technology available to us.”

As for the release date of the paper — the day before the end of COP16, and the best possible day for it to support the now-discredited Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change — Spencer said he was suspicious.

“I suspect — but have no proof of it — that Dessler was under pressure to get this paper published to blunt the negative impact our work has had on the IPCC’s efforts,” explained Spencer, who published another paper recently that he said contradicts the conclusions of the new article in *Science*. “But if this is the best they can do, the scientists aligning themselves with the IPCC really are running out of ideas to help shore up their climate models, and their claims that our climate system is very sensitive to greenhouse gas emissions.”

CFACT President David Rothbard also offered some comments. “There is not now and never has been a scientific consensus supporting catastrophic man-made warming, nor is consensus an appropriate scientific approach,” he said at the press conference. “Science must be grounded in such inconvenient approaches as fact, openness and verification.”

Rothbard said that everyone involved has been afraid of challenging “climate orthodoxy” because it might damage their careers or lead to retaliation. But now, the tide is turning.

“As the errors and falsehoods behind the warming campaign continue to come to light, the public has voted with its feet and no longer support it. Many thousands who previously feared to speak up are now eager to challenge warming propaganda which won’t do well in an even-handed discussion,” Rothbard said. “If your paycheck is dependent on the global warming industry, this would be a smart time to start seeking career counseling.”

Another newsworthy event at the press conference that barely made a blip on the world media radar was the release of a report listing over 1,000 dissenting scientists who disagree with the UN’s theories — almost 20 times more scientists than authored the discredited IPCC report. Climate Depot founder Marc Morano, who prepared the report, called it a “consensus buster.” The document contains a wealth of choice quotes from real scientists, including from some who have worked or continue to work with the IPCC.

Considering that the Cancun climate summit is dominated by so-called experts willing to sign petitions aimed at banning water — [literally](#) — it’s no surprise that the CFACT press conference did not receive the coverage it deserved. Plus, with dictators hoping to grab some climate loot, Western regimes hoping to impose carbon taxes and new suffocating regulations, and activists paid to promote the climate hysteria, most COP16 attendees [probably weren’t interested](#) in science or the truth anyway. Maybe that’s why the movement has become a [laughingstock](#) around the world.

Photo: Lord Monckton



Written by [Alex Newman](#) on December 11, 2010

Related articles:

[Record Cold at Cancun Climate Confab](#)

[COP16 Reaches Non-binding Climate Deal, UN Rejoices](#)

[Cap and Trade by Stealth: U.S. States Partner With Foreign Governments](#)

[COP16 Attendees Sign Petition to Ban Water, Harm U.S.](#)

[Will EPA Admit Economic Impact of Regulations?](#)

[Climate "Experts" Propose Global One-child Policy, Socialism, Taxes, Carbon Rationing](#)

[WikiLeaks Reveals U.S. & EU Climate Bullying, Bribery, Espionage](#)



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative,
non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.