

You're not entitled to an opinion, because you're not an "expert."

Can you imagine anyone still speaking this way after the conduct of the so-called "experts" over the past three years? But they do, dear reader. They do.

There are so many ways to respond to the "shut up because you're a stupid rube" argument.

One is to note how badly the "experts" performed. Shockingly badly. My new book -- the one our critic thinks I had no business writing -- provides endless examples.

Second is to note that anyone can read a chart. If Lockdownistan itself, California, ended up with worse all-cause mortality than open Florida, *that is the only thing you need to know*. And you don't need a Ph.D. to understand it. During these years a Ph.D. actually seems to have inhibited understanding.

Third is to point out that "science" per se can't tell you whether you should impose the destructive restrictions of the past few years. Even if you knew they did some good, which of course they didn't, you'd still be left with a value judgment: is this good outcome worth all the devastation it will cause in other areas? Nothing you'll find in a test tube can answer a philosophical question like that, and it's bizarre superstition to think it can.

Fourth, much of what I'm doing in this book is comparing expert predictions with actual outcomes. How is that not allowed? You mean I can't say the experts said X would happen if we did Y, but X did not in fact happen?

They're of course doing the same thing with "climate change" (and in plenty of other areas, too). Measures that will have profound impacts on your life are closed off to you for comment because the holy experts have spoken.

But again, let's stipulate for the sake of argument that climate change is both real and something that human behavior can reverse in a significant way -- and that is a pretty generous stipulation. Even so, there are massive costs to the various things the climate fanatics want to do, not least of which involves depriving the developing world of affordable energy, and condemning many of their people to death. Does "science" per se demand this? Of course not.