

**Donald Rapp**

[spaceclimate.net](http://spaceclimate.net)

[2010/01/01 at 6:01pm](#)

The Internet provides a platform for all manner of donkeys to bray at will, hiding behind the cloak of anonymity provided by their use of pseudonyms. One particular egregious example is deepclimate.org, a weblog that specializes in moronic commentaries about climate change. The names and backgrounds of the followers and participants in deepclimate.org are unknown, and it seems likely that they may be mainly janitors, trash collectors and hash slingers, based on the idiotic comments that they send in. They subscribe to a belief system like a religion, and like all religious zealots, strike out at anyone with differing views. Their belief system is the orthodoxy that global warming in the 20th century was entirely due to greenhouse gases, mainly CO<sub>2</sub>, and that further growth of CO<sub>2</sub> in the 21st century will produce great hardship and cost for mankind. They maintain this belief system in the face of considerable evidence to the contrary and viciously attack anyone who does not subscribe to their beliefs. They also believe that since most of the growth of CO<sub>2</sub> in the past was due to emissions by developed nations, the developed nations should transfer a good deal of their wealth to undeveloped nations even though the undeveloped nations have produced most of the growth in world population – overpopulation is a much greater threat than global warming. Furthermore, they are so zealous in their orthodoxy that their anger, hatred and destructive fervor is vented on anyone and everyone who stands in their way.

In recent weeks, deepclimate.org came across my book “Assessing Climate Change” and its followers carried out a campaign to attack me, in reality for opposing their religion, but supposedly for a fantasized plagiarism. What they did was to compare the wording of a few passages in my book with a report written prior to my book by a Professor Wegman. First they accused me of ghost writing the Wegman Report. That produced about 50 entries on the blog in which they vilified me and threatened to expose me. Then, they made a U-turn and accused me of having plagiarized the Wegman Report, and added another 50 entries on the blog where they further vilified me and threatened to expose me as the “great satan” of climate change. They ignored the fact that in a hundred places in the book, I quoted the comments of various investigators with proper attribution, and more specifically, in half a dozen places I quoted the words of Wegman and gave proper attribution to him. It may well be that in one or two places I used paragraphs from Wegman without attribution, and if so, it was clearly an inadvertency – an oversight. There could be nothing for me to gain by not attributing these passages to him since I had already stated in the book that I had based my discussion on his work and I gave him full credit in half a dozen places. Hence, to accuse me of plagiarism was clearly a vituperative aggressive act having no basis whatsoever. Yet, the donkeys on deepclimate.org still, to this day, continue this irrational vilification. One must wonder about these people, hiding behind a cloak of anonymity, with nothing better to do than read passages of my book and the Wegman Report, comparing them word by word, in a vain attempt to prove some form of malfeasance. There are 300 pages of technical detail in the book and none of this was attacked; only a false fantasy that somehow I was in league with Wegman on one or two pages of the book; first as his ghostwriter, and then as his plagiarizer. And who are these masked men that won’t reveal themselves? These janitors, trash collectors and hash slingers on deepclimate.org are not

my judge and jury. Who appointed them to try to find something prurient in my book? I don't have to answer to them or explain myself to them.

The deepclimate.blog also cast aspersions at my qualifications for writing a technical review of climate change, pointing out that I had not published in the field – which is true. This might have been a legitimate issue to bring up, had it not been done in such nasty aggressive tone, in which it deprecated the many accomplishments in my life. When I first submitted this book manuscript to the publisher for consideration for publishing, they sent it out for review. The first reviews came back negative. The reviewers said: “Who is this guy? He has no right to write a book on climate.” They did not attack the writing; only the writer. So, I asked the publisher to send out the book to other reviewers keeping my name out of it and not revealing who wrote it. The reviews came back glowing. There is a widespread belief that only someone who has published papers in climatology for a decade or two is qualified to write a book on climate change. I dispute that. Most researchers in climatology spend their lives within one narrow niche of the subject, but climatology consists of a very diverse range of subtopics. Climate researchers are typically not qualified to write a synoptic book covering all of these various topics. By contrast, I, being both a scientist and an accomplished system engineer, have demonstrated a rare talent to move into a field, read hundreds of papers and dozens of books, and assimilate them into a synoptic, comprehensive overview of the entire field. I have done this in a number of areas. Like Howard Cosell (“I Never Played the Game”) it is possible to be a great commentator in a sport where you never appeared on the field. The morons on deepclimate.org know who I am. Indeed, they have gone to great lengths in their personal vendetta to find out things about me, and who I am affiliated with, and made threats to contact these institutions with their bogus claims. Why are they motivated to do this? Because I remain at large, as a threat to their orthodoxy. They looked up my other books (on Mars missions, ice ages, ...) and used that as ammunition against me, instead of recognizing my ability to assimilate a field and write about it. I don't know who the morons on deepclimate.org are. They mostly hide their true names and affiliations. Of the few that did appear to (perhaps unwittingly) reveal what appears to be their names, further use of Google suggested that they are ardent blog contributors with no technical expertise in climatology or indeed any other branch of learning.

Yet, I am not hard over in opposition to their orthodoxy. I am ready and willing to examine the possibility that greenhouse gases produced the warming of the past 130 years, and that the future of the world is in jeopardy with further CO<sub>2</sub> emissions – provided that sufficient technical proof is provided. So far, I do not see that proof in the data. There is plenty of counter evidence in the data. At this point, I don't see how a rational person can draw definitive conclusions. But I continue to study the matter. I agree that rising CO<sub>2</sub> is a source of concern, that it may be contributing somewhat to climate change, and that we should continue to study the matter. My mind is open. I do not subscribe to an orthodoxy with religious fervor. But the donkeys on deepclimate.org are the Taliban of climate change – and just as dangerous. The cost of pursuing the policies that derive from their belief system will be measured in the trillions.