

The Media's New Climate Crisis

(First published 7/9/2007)

Steve McCullough

On Saturday, July 7, NBC and its affiliates took a lead role in advancing Al Gore's political agenda by devoting more than 75 hours of air time to his "Live Earth: The Concerts for a Climate in Crisis" extravaganza. In addition to NBC's prime time coverage, cable affiliate CNBC carried seven hours of coverage, Bravo gave the concerts 18 hours of air time, both the Sundance channel and the Universal HD channel broadcast 22 hours of coverage, and, finally, Telemundo aired a one-hour prime-time Spanish language special. Additionally, NBC cable-affiliate MSNBC interrupted its scheduled programming throughout the day with live reports from music concerts in London and New York which featured live performances by Madonna, Duran Duran, Phil Collins, Chris Rock and other "climate-enlightened" performers. And, of course, there was a worldwide appearance via hologram image by self-anointed environmental guru, author and Oscar-award winner Al Gore, himself. With all this fanfare, there must be no doubt that the world is headed for an impending climate disaster. The media have been trying to warn us about this disaster for years but doomsayers cannot decide whether it is global warming or global cooling that we should fear.

According to a special report entitled, "Fire and Ice", http://www.businessandmedia.org/specialreports/2006/fireandice_execsum.asp, recently published by the Media Research Center, "Journalists have warned of climate change for 100 years, but can't decide whether [sic] we face an ice age or warming." The report, extensively researched by the Media Research Center's Business & Media Institute, analyzes print media climate change coverage back to the late 1800's. In the mid-1800's the world was emerging from a 500-year period of cooling called the Little Ice Age. In 1895 the New York Times warned of a return to a glacial period, with potential catastrophic consequences for mankind. Headlines read, "Geologists Think the World May Be Frozen Up Again".

For the next 30-plus years the fear of global cooling dominated the media's climate stories. However, by the early 1930's, the ice age threat seemed to be waning as a new climate disaster arose. "America in Longest Warm Spell Since 1776; Temperature Line Records a 25-Year Rise" warned the New York Times on March 27, 1933. Scientific studies had determined that the earth's surface had warmed less than half a degree but, for the Times and other media outlets, that was evidence enough of a new crisis. Once again, dire consequences were predicted for mankind unless steps were taken immediately to curtail man-made carbon dioxide emissions.

The second climate change scare lasted until the 1970's when the New York Times proclaimed, "A Major Cooling Widely Considered to Be Inevitable". Throughout the decade of the '70's, most media jumped on the ice-age bandwagon. Time magazine printed diagrams illustrating how the Arctic circle had grown from 1968 to 1974. New Science editor Nigel Calder warned that, "The threat of a new ice age must now stand alongside nuclear war as a likely source of wholesale death and misery for mankind."

Doom and gloom was once again predicted unless extreme measures were taken to alleviate global cooling worries. In his book, "The Cooling", author Lowell Ponte cautioned in 1976 that cooling would lead to "world famine, world chaos, and probably world war, and this could all come by the year 2000."

As we know, by the year 2000, Ponte's predictions did not come true but, according to the media, earth was not yet safe. The pendulum had swung back and the media had changed gears once again. Al Gore arose as the standard bearer for climate change alarmists. "About 10 million residents of Bangladesh will lose their homes and means of sustenance because of the rising sea level, due to global warming, in the next few decades", stated Gore in his first book, "Earth in the Balance". The former vice-president and current environmental patron saint contends that massive government intervention is now needed in order for mankind to survive the latest global warming threat. The news media has almost totally bought into Gore's doomsday predictions and has given its support to numerous alleged solutions to the "climate problem".

What is the result of the climate change propaganda? Well, for one, it's good for the media business. The media treat global warming like it's a new idea and run countless stories from a seemingly unlimited number of climate "experts" about the problems, consequences and solution to the climate "crisis". Billions of dollars of research money is available for those who wish to investigate catastrophic climate change and make predictions of gloom and doom. Our government spends more than \$4 billion annually on climate change research. The environmental lobbying industry is very influential in Washington and puts \$1.5 billion annually into encouraging congress to pass more environmental legislation - higher taxes, government control of business, and regulation of natural resources. The infamous Kyoto treaty, if passed, would have cost the United States several hundred billion dollars each year while allowing the biggest polluters like China and India to continue, and even increase, their carbon dioxide output virtually unchecked. The US has made substantial gains in the reduction of pollutants while the EU countries who signed onto Kyoto have been financially penalized for being unable to meet their environmental goals.

The most damaging consequence of the global warming propaganda is perhaps the silencing of all debate. The media, as we have witnessed in the recent "Live Earth" coverage, has taken an advocacy position and has either dismissed or demonized anyone who may be skeptical. CBS reporter Scott Pelley compared those with contrary views about manmade global warming to Holocaust deniers, while another proclaimed, "the debate is over." Pelley completely abandoned his supposed journalistic objectivity by also stating that, "There becomes a point in journalism where striving for balance becomes irresponsible". The media want to ignore the fact that 30 years ago they were certain that there was little disagreement about a new ice age. Where is the balance in the media? Most scientists agree that the earth's temperature has warmed slightly in the last 100 years but many disagree that man is the blame. Before we all follow the lead of Pied Piper Gore shouldn't we hear all sides of the issue? That is what most expect from the media.

Editors and publishers are free to reprint this article as long as it is reprinted in its entirety and the signature line remains intact. Please direct a courtesy copy to stevemc2@comcast.net.