

0.7 Tobacco Playbook, climate anti-science

Robert Proctor summarized tobacco doubt-creation strategies documented in his new book [PRO2012 pp.290-291], drawn from LTDL and elsewhere. His handy list is excerpted here. Proctor notes that tobacco paid for much real science that was irrelevant, for the sake of confusion. That seems to happen only rarely for climate, where the more common tactic tries to slip bad papers past unwary editors.

- (0) 'One of the more common has been simply to assemble and reproduce statements by authorities willing to deny the hazard. ...
1. Publicize statements from scholars skeptical of the hazard. Fund the research of these scholars to entice them to testify in court or regulatory hearings.
 2. Publicize examples of people living to a ripe old age despite decades of smoking.
 3. Raise questions about "anomalies that seem paradoxical. ...
 4. Redefine terms, Deny there is "tar" in cigarettes and insist on using words like *biological activity* or *hyperplasia* rather than *cancer* or *pre-cancer*.
 5. Wrap yourself in the authority of science. Contrast the "rush to judgment" approach of anti-tobacco "fanatics" with the cautious "wait and see" attitude of the industry. Insist on laboratory proof when faced with statistical evidence,...
 6. State that the evidence linking tobacco and disease is merely "statistical" and then deride statistics as an improper method for reasoning about causality. Finance your own epidemiology and publish this in engineering journals if medical journals won't take it. Then hire experts to say such studies are "difficult to refute" and make sure such remarks get coverage in the popular press.
 7. Put a positive spin on uncomfortable facts. ... body not as weak in the face of carcinogenic onslaughts but strong in its capacity to resist such onslaughts.
 8. Construct graphs and charts in such a way as to make it look like cancer trends are chaotic ("graphic agnotology") ...
 9. Hire journalists to write industry-sympathetic articles in the popular press.
 10. Undermine the authority of health organizations such as the American Cancer Society, the Surgeon General, the American Heart Association, or the National Cancer Institute. Denigrate these as "advocacy" or "government" organizations aligned with an anti-tobacco "cause" or "movement" (with an "agenda," etc.). Imply that such organizations are irremediably biased
 11. Hire historians to rewrite history from the industry point of view and then use such scholars as experts in court. ...
 12. Proclaim the smoking and health controversy to be "nothing new."
 13. Keep people smoking by reassuring them that the industry is doing everything it can to make cigarettes as safe as possible.
 14. Always keep thinking of new ways to defend the industry.'

Of course, behind the scenes, the reader finds [PRO2012 p.114]

'Herbert then reported on his interview with David Goerlitz, the jut-jawed Winston Man model, **Goerlitz then asked whether any of the company's executives smoke and got this answer: "Are you kidding? We reserve that right for the poor, the young, the black and the stupid."**

The following adapts Proctor's list to climate anti-science:

- (0) **Petitions: OISM and Singer's numerous petitions, Open Letters, Heartland Legislative Guide, Experts lists, NIPCC, ICCCs.**
1. Publicize statements from scholars skeptical of AGW. **Epidemiology left more room for real scholars to argue, but the few who deny AGW get quoted often.**
 2. Publicize examples of people living to a ripe old age despite decades of smoking. **Cherry-pick dates, places cooling, glaciers growing. Ignore others.**
 3. Raise questions about "anomalies" that seem paradoxical. ... **Cold winters.**
 4. Redefine terms, Deny there is "tar" in cigarettes **Claim AGW is not real, for any of numerous conflicting reasons.**
 5. Wrap yourself in the authority of science. Contrast the "rush to judgment" approach of **climate "alarmists" or "warmists"** with the cautious "wait and see" attitude of **"realists"**. Insist on laboratory proof ...
 6. State that there is **no evidence linking human activity and warming and try to challenge basic physics of heat-trapping gases and conservation of energy.** Finance your own **climate studies** and publish this in **Energy&Environment, OpEds or blogs** if *Nature and Science* won't take it. Then hire experts to say such studies are "difficult to refute" and make sure such remarks get coverage in the popular press, **such as Wall Street Journal OpEds.**
 7. Put a positive spin on uncomfortable facts. ... **CO₂ is good for plants, warming is good for tourism, the Earth has been warmer long ago, people adapt, etc, etc.**
 8. Construct graphs and charts in such a way as to make it look like **temperature trends are chaotic ("graphic agnotology") ... \$Y.1 on satellites .**
 9. Hire journalists to write industry-sympathetic articles in the popular press. **yes.**
 10. Undermine the authority of **science** organizations such as the **IPCC, NASA GISS, UK Hadley Center, climate scientists in general.** Denigrate these as "advocacy" or "government" organizations aligned with an anti-**economy** "cause" or "movement" (with an "agenda," etc.). Imply that such organizations are irremediably biased or one-sided.
 11. Hire **any fakexpert** to rewrite history from the industry point of view ...
 12. Proclaim **"climate has changed before" or "warmer in MWP."**
 13. Keep people using **fossil fuels and avoiding even slight motion towards efficiency or renewables** by reassuring them that **nothing (mercury, etc) is harmful and air quality has improved anyway, so no more need be done.**
 14. Keep thinking of new ways to defend **status quo, incl. fossil industry.**