

From: Robert H. Frank rhf3@cornell.edu 
Subject: Re: Your intro textbook and climate change
Date: November 30, 2017 at 5:04 PM
To: Yoram Bauman yoram@standupeconomist.com
Cc: Antonovics, Kate kantonov@ucsd.edu, Ori Heffetz oh33@cornell.edu

RF

Dear Professor Bauman,

No one likes to get a grade of D-, of course, but thank you for taking the time to offer your feedback.

You're clearly right to object to my not having used the most recent data from the IPCC and other sources. Although our seventh edition is about to go into production, that's a shortcoming we'll do our best to rectify.

Let me add, however, that I find the tone of your critique rather puzzling. You are clearly an expert on the subject of climate change, which, as you have discerned, I am not. But you seem to have concluded that my failure to cite the most recent IPCC reports somehow brands me as hostile to efforts aimed at mitigating global warming. Many conservatives in the United States continue to deny that climate change is even a real phenomenon. I have repeatedly argued against this claim in my New York Times columns ([here](#), [here](#), [here](#), [here](#), [here](#), [here](#), [here](#), [here](#), and [here](#), for example), hoping to persuade readers that enacting a carbon tax is one of our most urgent public policy priorities. So I hope you'll understand my dismay at your portrayal of me as an enemy of carbon taxation in your report.

Most of the reports about global warming that I've read since the original MIT study I cited suggest that each new study paints a more pessimistic picture than earlier ones—glaciers melting more rapidly, extreme weather events occurring more frequently, sea levels rising faster than predicted, and so on. It has long been my view that no rational community would fail to act against this threat, even if the costs of ameliorative action were many times higher than even the most pessimistic estimates. You'll see in [this piece](#), for example, that my point in assuming a \$300 carbon tax was to demonstrate that even a tax several times higher than experts think would be necessary would do no more than raise gasoline prices to levels currently paid by Europeans. Given how easy it would be to switch to more fuel efficient vehicles, as Europeans have, the cost to Americans of adjusting to a tax even that high would be utterly trivial. That fact clearly weighs in favor of taking action, doesn't it? And yet you write as if the triviality of the tax burden would actually weigh against taking action. I'd be curious to hear your reasoning here.

Sincerely,

Robert H. Frank
HJ Louis Professor of Management and Professor of Economics
Johnson Graduate School of Management
327 Sage Hall
Cornell University
607-255-8501



**“Building a successful life
requires a deep conviction
that you are the author of
your own destiny. Building a**