

# There is no debate — climate change is real

Posted on Aug 16, 2015 at 9:54 p.m.

I appreciated the News Tribune publishing the Aug. 8 commentary, “Yes: It adds morality to a scientific consensus for action,” which was in answer to the question, “Should we heed the pope’s warning about climate change?” The commentary supported Citizens’ Climate Lobby’s carbon-pricing proposal to cut emissions and fight climate change faster than the EPA.

However, I didn’t appreciate that the commentary was published as part of a “Pro/Con.” The other commentary was headlined, “No: It misreads science and will doom billions to poverty.” It was duplicitous. The writer didn’t mention she’s affiliated with the Acton Institute, part of a network of organizations funded by fossil-fuel tycoons. She carries on the fossil-fuel industry’s fraudulent campaign to manufacture doubt about climate science. There’s no doubt about the science.

The commentary quoted a letter urging the world to help the poor of the world by giving them fossil fuels so they won’t die using wood to cook. Really? The poor don’t need us building them centralized natural-gas power plants and running electrical wires long distances to every village. Rather, villages would be well-served with their own solar panels and no long-distance wiring.

Behind the writer’s introduction (“faithful Catholics such as me”) one could sniff out not the sweet smoky scent of biblical incense from today’s Catholic Masses but the nauseating scent of self-interest fossil-fuel interests infuse into public discussions of climate change.

This “Pro/Con” debate about the pope was a thinly veiled continuation of the false debate fossil-fuel interests long have been manufacturing.

Katharine Hayhoe, climate scientist and Evangelical Christian, told Citizens' Climate Lobby she'll not participate in false debates: Hear the science and solutions, but stop presenting a false other side.

There's no debate. We need climate action. As long as Congress is owned by fossil-fuel interests, the president rightly provides regulations to cut emissions. But carbon pricing would be faster and more equitable. The only debate is writing carbon-pricing legislation and what to do with the revenue.

Rabbi Judy Weiss  
Brookline, Mass.

[LINK](#)