

One form of the *golden rule* may be stated: “He who has the gold rules”. This is particularly true in climatology. The most prominent alarmists are typically college professors or researchers in National Laboratories, who derive most of their funding from Government agencies such as NSF, NOAA, NASA, DOE, etc. If global warming were not a major catastrophe facing mankind, why would these agencies want to invest heavily in climatology? At the same time, these agencies themselves are under scrutiny in these days of budget cuts and economic austerity. They need a cause célèbre to justify continued high-level funding of the agencies. Thus, we have a neat little mutual co-dependency between the *funders* and the *fundees* working to their mutual advantage. Global warming is the “goose that laid the golden egg” for the agencies and the climatologists.

At the other end of the scale, there are claims that some naysayers were funded by special-interest groups. On the Internet it is claimed that Exxon funded National Center for Policy Analysis and the Heritage Foundation to publicize naysayer ideas. However the amounts of funding involved (\$75,000 and \$50,000, respectively) were miniscule compared to the hundreds of millions doled out by Government agencies to alarmists to push their agendas. Nature magazine claimed:

“The Heartland Institute plans to spend \$1.8 million on its climate programme this year. Of that, \$413,000 will go to supporting the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC), a small group of skeptics who have set themselves up as a counterweight to the IPCC. Made up of ... a few dozen colleagues, the NIPCC mines the scientific literature for nuggets of contrary evidence and doubt — often the kind of uncertainties that scientists readily acknowledge in their publications. The NIPCC also ignores mountains of evidence about the adverse effects of global warming and instead strings together a confident story that makes rising carbon dioxide concentrations seem entirely beneficial.”

The Heartland Institute is known as a right-wing conservative

organization. However, the accusation made by Nature magazine against the Heartland Institute is exactly transferrable to most of the college professors who espouse the alarmist viewpoint. These professors mine the scientific literature for nuggets of supporting evidence favoring the alarmist viewpoint — often ignoring the kind of uncertainties that scientists should, but don't acknowledge in their publications. The alarmists also ignore mountains of evidence and instead string together a confident story that makes rising carbon dioxide concentrations seem unreasonably harmful.

Other claims of funding of climate naysayers by oil and coal companies exist on the Internet. As far as I can tell, some of this is probably true, but again, such funding is trivial compared to Government funding for alarmists. The stakes are much higher for alarmists.