

Review of: "Climate Change Denial Theories, Skeptical Arguments, and the Role of Science Communication"

Daniel J. Soeder

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Overall, I found this to be an excellent paper that lays out the issues in a logical fashion and suggests possible solutions. I completely agree that scientists must learn how to explain the physics and consequences of climate change to the public in plain language. Everyone on Earth needs to understand this because we are all affected by it.

For the paragraph on p. 3 that begins "One notable scandal, known as "ClimateGate," occurred in 2009 at the University of East Anglia's Climate Research Unit," please consider ending it with either "is a challenge to be eliminated" or "is challenging to eliminate." The current phrasing of "challenging to be eliminated" is awkward.

P. 4: Suspicions of corruption in the IPCC report's peer review process by Seitz do nothing to help the credibility of any scientific endeavor, including his.

No one I know working in climate or environmental science is getting rich off their grant money. In fact, most researchers are working on shoestring budgets. The statement by Gray on P. 5 that scientists are lying about climate change to preserve their grant funding is unintentionally hilarious.

You make an excellent point on P. 7 that urgent Tweets by Greta Thunberg to stir up panic over an imminent climate disaster that does not happen just to gain support end up making everyone skeptical when there is an actual climate disaster on the horizon. She should know better. Throwing tomato soup at artworks is equally unhelpful. I think you could expand a bit on the role of social media in spreading both climate panic and climate denial because it seems to have become a major route for transmission.

The refusal of Florida Governor Ron DeSantis to accept \$350 million in federal funds for addressing climate change is particularly ironic, since most of Florida is less than a meter above sea level and will be one of the first places to go underwater when polar ice caps melt. They are also getting slammed with more intense hurricanes.

P. 8 section on Emission-producing corporations: You could add quite a bit to this section. An organized effort is attempting to discredit climate science using \$64 million in annual funds from 140 different conservative foundations, who generally conceal donations through the use of donor-directed philanthropies (Brulle, 2014). In the early 1990s, an organization called the Global Climate Coalition (GCC), representing the oil and coal industries, engaged E. Bruce Harrison to build a campaign sowing doubt about the science of climate change. Harrison's previous successes included discrediting research on the toxicity of pesticides for the chemical industry, discounting the hazards of smoking for the tobacco industry, and campaigning against tougher emissions standards for the auto industry. His firm was considered

one of the best. The tactics he developed for the GCC included claims that the science was unsettled and that reducing fossil fuel use would negatively affect American jobs, trade, and prices. Harrison specifically sought spokespeople who were scientists, economists, academics, or other experts because they carried greater credibility than industry representatives (Soeder, 2022).

Brulle, R.J., 2014, Institutionalizing delay: foundation funding and the creation of U.S. climate change counter-movement organizations: *Climatic Change*, v. 122, no. 4, p. 681–694

Soeder, Daniel J., 2022, *Energy Futures: Fossil Fuel, Greenhouse Gas, and Climate Change*: Cham, Switzerland: Springer Nature Switzerland AG, 289 p.

My review of the document with comments is attached as “supplementary data.” Best wishes for future publication.

Please send me the published version because I want to include it as a reference in the second edition of my *Energy Futures* book. Thank you.