

Paid op-ed against climate change just a jargon dump

Tim Ball's and Tom Harris's article is classified as an oped, but it doesn't fit this genre.

Today (2/9/17) Chris Tomlinson, Houston Chronicle's business journalist, provided an easy way to see that Ball-Harris didn't pen an oped.

Tomlinson reviews statements from oil and gas companies and utilities about the need to cut emissions and limit warming. Tomlinson explains climate policies they support, including carbon taxes and methane regulations.

He also reports on steps they're taking despite lack of federal policy. For example, Xcel Energy (utility covering eight states) plans to derive 50 percent of its electricity from renewables by roughly 2025.

Energy companies don't deny climate change conclusions. They regret Congress hasn't provided "stronger and clearer signals to create the confidence to invest in and grow low-carbon businesses at scale." See how easy that is to understand!

Ball-Harris confuses us with pseudo-scientific information and a mind-numbing mass of words all allegedly disproving climate change. However, they ignore the fact energy companies acknowledge our need to limit emissions.

The public understands business facts more easily than we evaluate jargon dumps.

Paid propaganda from Ball-Hill isn't an oped. Its intent is to confuse readers, and disrupt public discussion of policy.

Judy Weiss

Brookline [LINK](#)