

[This piece](#) is worth reading. It doesn't have that much new content but it does take up a lot of the page. I must admit that I'm envious. It appears that the WSJ has rejected my OP-ED submission. In my piece, I discuss how the rise of [charter cities](#) in developing countries could offer individuals new coping strategies to adapt to climate change. I didn't fully realize that the WSJ page is not fully ready to acknowledge the challenge in the first place.

So, there are 16 scientists who are not convinced by the current evidence. Peter Gleick offers his thoughts on the [piece here](#).

Here is one of the quotes from the OP-ED.

"If elected officials feel compelled to "do something" about climate, we recommend supporting the excellent scientists who are increasing our understanding of climate with well-designed instruments on satellites, in the oceans and on land, and in the analysis of observational data. The better we understand climate, the better we can cope with its ever-changing nature, which has complicated human life throughout history. However, much of the huge private and government investment in climate is badly in need of critical review."

How does science make progress? Is there the equivalent of [Einstein's eclipse](#) that can settle some of these issues? What data would allow us to reject a hypothesis with confidence?