

Excerpt from: *Car Guys Vs. Bean Counters*
By Bob Lutz, former Vice Chairman, General Motors
Portfolio/Penguin, 2011 pp. 34- 36.

Then there's the American media! With relatively rare exceptions, these men and women are well left of center, with over 70 percent of the profession cheerfully declaring themselves "liberal" in surveys. Products of a higher education system that is itself riddled with professors who are anything but conservative, most journalism majors receive a massive dose of anti-free market, anti-big business programming in college. I recall my own days at an esteemed institute of higher learning; even in business school, most professors believed and taught that there must be "a better way" than free-market capitalism. (Many people on the left, otherwise perfectly smart, sincerely believe that the only reason socialism failed miserably everywhere it's been tried is that the wrong people were in charge.)

A compounding factor is that, unlike in Europe, where an "economics correspondent" typically as a degree in economics, the journalism student in the United States merely learns "journalism": How to write, how to interview, how to develop sources, journalistic ethics . . . all good and legitimate skills when superimposed on some specific background in the area being covered. But that's never the case here. And so we have people reasonably adept at writing and interviewing not only reporting but actually opining and pontificating on corporate or financial matters of which they have only the most superficial understanding. What can one expect when reporters start on the society beat, move up to restaurant reviews, and follow that by a stint in crime reporting before suddenly being assigned to business reporting? How can sensible, accurate writing about such complex subjects possibly result?

Add to all of this the intense competitive pressure for scoops! With speed of the essence, quality and accuracy are relegated to the back of the bus. I have many good friends in the journalistic community. "Listen, Bob, the *Wall Street Journal* just published this negative piece on GM," one would typically call to say. "I know it's wrong, but my editor is pushing the hell out of me and wondering where *my* negative piece is. I have to write something, and it'll be a rehash of the *Journal* piece. Just wanted to let you know I've got no choice." This is journalism? This is an institution we are supposed to revere and respect?

Nowhere has my faith in media integrity been destroyed more thoroughly than in the so-called "global warming" discussion. Resolutely parroting the now-discredited prophecies of Al Gore and his absurd movie, *An Inconvenient Truth*, hardly any of the so-called mainstream media ever gave fair coverage to the large and growing army of CO₂-casused AGW (anthropogenic, or human-caused, global warming) skeptics. Every network (Fox excepted) and every major newspaper gives endless coverage to disappearing glaciers (they've been melting for almost four hundred years), polar bears on ice floes (hello – they can swim! And far from being "endangered,," the population is up sharply), rapidly rising ocean levels (they aren't), and higher ocean temperatures (they're actually lower).

It's all harmless, one could say, and how does this impact the automobile business anyway?

Once again, as happened so often in the past century, personal transportation, especially the automobile, has been singled out as the number one menace to the continuation of life on our planet. "Cars, Trucks Create 20% of CO₂," the headlines continually blared. It's simply not true. Even Timothy Wirth, the global warming guru under Clinton and Gore, was once forced to admit, under my somewhat insubordinate questioning, that vehicles contribute far less than that amount to carbon dioxide levels.

The math works like this: according to accepted computer simulations, the Earth's natural "carbon sinks" can absorb only 98 percent of the CO₂ created in a given period. Two percent is "excess" CO₂ and allegedly the cause of global warming. Cars and trucks emit 0.4 percent of total global CO₂, and this is the source of the infamous "20 percent" lie. Mathematically, 0.4 percent is, of course, 20 percent of 2 percent, so if the reporting had been about 20 percent of *excess* global CO₂, I would not have objected. I spoke to journalists about this many times and all understood (having done their own research at my urging) that you could pour concrete down the engine bores of every car and truck on the planet and the reduction in CO₂ would be a rounding error. But all claimed that "editorial policy" was that AGW was real and that cars and trucks were the major cause. It was useless, they said, to fight against it.

Meanwhile, things are getting increasingly tough for the "catastrophic global warming" gang, with renowned climatologists jumping off this limping, flat-tired bandwagon by the hundreds. The current state of the "movement" (religion actually) is succinctly summarized by author Art Horn in his May 17, 2010 contribution to the *Washington Times* entitled "Wounded Warmists Attack: It's What Happens When Prophecy Fails":

The global warming "science" community is feeling threatened by evidence and revealing emails – their funding, and therefore their careers, may be in peril. In reaction to this, they will mount an even more alarmist campaign to convince the world – and themselves – that humans cause global warming and that it must be stopped. As global temperature fails to rise in the future, we will be bombarded by increasingly shrill cries of global warming catastrophe. All will be considered proof of global warming. A more than willing media desperate for spectacular headlines will give them the front page.

A creature or group that is damaged psychically will respond like a wounded animal. The ensuing attack will be more aggressive and prolonged – an attempt to convince their "enemies" that they are correct . . .