

Judging by their actions, it certainly doesn't seem like climate alarmists believe their own claims

I know they undoubtedly see me, a good man, as their enemy. To the Warmers, I and every other fellow skeptic of the anthropogenic (man-caused) climate change hysteries are to be dismissed as "deniers", or perhaps a mere, "contrarian, science mangler, doubt spreader, and denialist."

Given that they view me with such utter contempt, I understand that it's highly unlikely that those belonging to this religion of Warmerism will express any interest at all in my advice to them on this topic. But I'm going to give it anyway.

From far-left propaganda sites like ThinkProgress to well-trafficked blogs at Scientific American, the Warmers are desperate to figure out how to talk to those of us resisting their attempted power grab; column after column asks how to persuade us, convince us, and convert us to their cause. And frankly, I don't think they're coming close. So here's my recommendation for any Warmer interested.

First, forget all the data manipulations, cool it with your panic-stricken projections, and drop the absurd appeals to "consensus". It's not selling us. Oh, and the fact that every global warming calamity that your computer models have predicted has never come close to happening isn't helping your cause.

Ultimately, the real issue is that we don't believe you because we know that you don't believe you.

For instance, if global warming activist Prince Charles actually believed that "we simply cannot waste any more time", and that world leaders needed to immediately take "bold and imaginative action" to stop the effects of carbon-induced climate change, would he have really flown 16,000 miles on 3 different private jets and a helicopter in just 11 days?

Of course not. Despite his rhetoric, Prince Charles obviously doesn't really fear that the earth is imminently imperiled. Neither does New York Times columnist and climate change devotee Thomas Friedman who famously panicked on paper a few years ago,

"[W]e never know when the next emitted carbon molecule will tip over some ecosystem and trigger a nonlinear climate event – like melting the Siberian tundra and releasing all of its methane, or drying up the Amazon or melting all the sea ice in the North Pole in summer."

If this was actually Friedman's conviction – if he was truly wringing his hands about the emission of carbon molecules – we'd find him living among the true eco-warriors, chaining himself to a tree and drinking only the dew that accumulates each morning on large, leafy vegetation. Instead, Friedman lives in a palatial, carbon-belching mansion situated right next door to the Bethesda Country Club.

Now, don't misunderstand this to be a rant about hypocrisy. This isn't about inconsistency, it's about believability. Perhaps an example would be helpful to illustrate my point.

I'm one of millions of people around the world that are convinced that Jesus of Nazareth was who He said He was. I'm confident that the evidence proves beyond reasonable doubt that He

lived, was crucified, and resurrected from the grave, offering humanity its only hope of escaping an eternity of facing God's righteous judgment against sin. If we were wrong about that (we're not), it's still obvious to anyone that our belief is genuine. How? It changes the way we live our lives.

We abstain from seemingly enticing worldly pleasures to honor His teaching.

We wake up weekly to go and worship Him corporately.

We give massive amounts of our personal finances to build His kingdom.

We face persecution and even martyrdom for our faith without flinching.

Conversely, imagine someone claiming to believe that Christ was their Lord and Savior, but their life never exhibited any change. They never went to church, there was no improvement in the way they treated their neighbor, they spoke like the world, lusted like the world, and offered no visible evidence beyond mere profession that they were truly Christ followers. In that case, anyone could (and would) rightly question whether they actually believed what they were saying.

That's the point, Warmers.

You don't need to write a thousand articles on how to sway us. You don't need to pump out more hockey stick graphs, issue dire predictions that the Eastern seaboard won't survive the decade, or continue exploiting children as your mouthpieces. Begin changing my mind by changing the way you live. Until then, save your breath...you know, to cut back on carbon.

[Peter Heck](#)

29.01.2020

Source : <https://disrn.com/opinion/opinion-this-is-not-how-to-convince-us-climate-change-is-a-problem>