

# Coal fires and groupthink

Published: Tuesday, December 1, 2009 4:04 PM PST  
S.O.B.'s STORY (spouse of boss) DAN?HAMMES

Here's one you haven't heard.

Of course, with this particular topic, you don't hear much of anything that could be considered a contrarian view. That's because Global Warming (and yes, given the reverence with which it is treated by the media, it must be capitalized) is the altar at which liberals worship. While it is difficult to understand their devotion to this view it is impossible to dispute.

Which is why one would think that the news about Global Warming that broke last week would be as important as any about climate change (The new word recently coined by cheerleaders for Global Warming, not yet capitalized).

Except the news did not exactly break.

That is, not very many folks reported it. Not your newspaper, not the wire services, not the television networks. It is difficult to have a 'breaking news story' if none of the news outlets bother to break it.

That's not to say it was not a climactic - pardon the play on words - revelation in the world of Global Warming.

It was n and is. In fact, the story n if it were about any other topic n would have dominated media coverage for a week and destroyed the careers of dozens of scientists and politicians in the process.

Except nobody bothered to report it.

But before we get to that, let's get back to the other news you have not heard.

Underground coal fires in abandoned mines in China release as much CO2 in the atmosphere as all the cars and light trucks in the United States combined.

Wow.

First, who knew there were that many abandoned coal mines in China on fire? Second, what does this mean to the efforts by liberals to raise taxes on American families to reduce CO2 emissions?

The answer to the first question is Paul Feldman. He is an economist who first broke the story about the coal mine fires two years ago. His did so to illustrate that any treaty to limit CO2 emissions will be flawed. That is, while supporters of Global Warming theories can impose taxes to reduce CO2 emissions, who is going to extinguish the coal fires in China? And if nobody does n what's the point of the taxes? Well, other than to take money from American families and send it to people who get rich from Global Warming hysteria.

You know, people like Al Gore.

But the story you did not hear about last week is about the fraud perpetrated by various Global Warming enthusiasts, including scientists whose careers apparently depend on the globe warming.

Thousands of documents were hacked from the server used by the University of East Anglia

Climate Research Unit. The emails and documents show that scientists cheering for Global Warming falsified data, manipulated information and did what they could to discredit critics. They did this to sway politicians and public opinion to their doctrine.

In other words, they lied.

Big news, one would think. But as of last week only one television network covered the story. The New York Times did one report. One. The Wall Street Journal and Investors Business Daily have reported repeatedly on the story but few newspapers have devoted any space to the news.

That's weird.

Really odd when you consider the U.S. media drenches itself almost daily in reports about Global Warming. One would think that news about purloined documents that show scientists admitting to lying, manipulation and coercion would be of some interest to someone in the news business.

The point here is not to say the media is in cahoots with the Global Warming crowd; deliberately slanting news to sell a particular agenda. That is not what is happening.

Sure, it's true the media is biased n but that bias is not a result of some devilishly clever plot to control the world. It is a product of groupthink. Editors and reporters overwhelmingly believe in Global Warming so any information supporting their view is news. Information to the contrary is, well n just ridiculous.

Almost as ridiculous as scientists n the term is used loosely n manipulating data to support a theory. But it is this groupthink that prevents information about fires in China from being disseminated.

And why last week's story about lying scientists was not reported.

DAN HAMMES is publisher of this newspaper.