

 **LETTER TO THE EDITOR**
DEBATE ABOUT
THE SOURCE OF
THE “97 PERCENT
CONSENSUS”: There’s
been some confusion!



By Stephen L. Bakke  June 20, 2014

Here’s what provoked me:

I submitted a letter to the editor questioning the validity of the claim by Obama and all climate change alarmists that there is a “97% consensus” in the scientific community about the path ahead for defining the causes and dealing with climate warming/change/disruption. I found the sources and tried to point out that the statistic is at least flawed in its development, and there really is no way one should make the “97%” claim. Then when my letter was printed in the newspaper, it was heavily edited and the title it was given was grossly misleading.

Guess what! Another writer took exception to my letter and accused me of not having read or understood the survey report in question. It seemed to me he was the one who was confused, but actually may have been misled by the title the editors assigned to my letter. In any case, on the surface it seemed to me he was mixing up two similar surveys that were performed on different populations and at different times. Following is what I was compelled to submit in rebuttal. (I must admit this process is kind of fun.)

Here’s my response:

Debate about the source of the “97% consensus” - there’s been some confusion!

I welcome Martin’s June 20 response to my letter which the editors labeled “Biased scientists.” Here we see the importance of a chosen title. My original letter was heavily edited and Martin assumed the heading delivered my message. My only message was to bring into question the validity of the “97% consensus” claimed by alarmists. I stated that 98% of the scientists surveyed were ignored.

Mr. Martin suggests I did not read or understand the survey report. While admitting to being a flawed soul, I would like to submit that according to my research, he too is confused. He claims that a large majority of the “ignored scientists” also acknowledge that warming has occurred and that human activity was a contributing factor. Fine, and in fact I’m in agreement there. But I understand that those 98% don’t generally believe that humans are the controlling factor, nor that U.S. policy will make any meaningful global difference. Most are “skeptics” like me.

I also believe Martin is bringing in some attributes of a later examination of climate scientists conducted by the University of Queensland, Australia. But that’s another debate.

To Martin and News-Press editors: My letter was NOT claiming “biased scientists” – it was only to point out that “97% is a flawed statistic.”