

# Nonpartisan studies confirm climate change

Reiner Kuhr argues (My View, March 13) that Americans need more objective analysis of climate change costs without mentioning all the objective analyses that have already been prepared — even by Republicans.

Consider a pragmatic proposal by traditional Republicans George Shultz and James Baker, calling for a national carbon tax paid by fossil fuel companies and distributed to the public so it's nonregressive. When will Congress start debating the issue, and enact a version?

Studies exploring how to deal with climate change have been done by nonpartisan organizations, by academics who are Republican and Democrat.

Consider a study by Citibank from 2015. Analyzing just the costs of fossil fuel purchases and more infrastructure vs. the costs of new renewable energy infrastructure, Citibank concluded it's cheaper to invest in renewables instead of fossil fuels. Reinsurance giant MunichRe scrutinizes extreme weather events and analyzes the costs in lives and damage. Our military has studied climate change's risks and costs — how do you value peace and troop lives?

At some point, we must act like adults, read the gazillion studies and choose the best, or politically least fraught, option.

Judy Weiss

Brookline

[LINK](#)