

Joel M. Killion

Professor XXXX

BIO-111-HY1

20 February 2012

### The Global Warming Debate

In 1975, *Newsweek* presented the famous “Cooling World” graph that pointed to an impending Ice Age, likened to the bitter winters that engulfed much of Europe and North America between 1600 and 1900. Then, in 1999, Climatologist Michael Mann and his colleagues introduced us to the renowned “hockey stick” chart portraying Earth’s climate as stable before human-induced global warming caused temperatures to skyrocket. In both instances, panic ensued, driving many to assume we would either freeze or fry. And now, since earth’s temperature has been somewhat level over the past ten to fifteen years, the phrase “global warming” has been replaced with “climate change.” Of course, while some hold firmly to this climate change purview, insisting “the debate is over,” others are not so sure.

If man-made climate change is true, a fundamental transformation of daily life is required – likely through “painful” sweeping governmental intervention– for every man, woman, boy, and girl on the planet (Holt); however, if it is not true, then little to no action is needed. With that said, it is vital that we have a thorough, open-minded debate around the empirical evidence on this matter so that we can truly determine if this is a viable issue or not.

As for the costs and benefits of either further debating this matter versus acting immediately to curb man-made climate change, the question must be asked: Why should action be taken when man-made climate change is still merely a hypothesis? The idea that we ought to discuss and even commit billions or trillions of dollars to the prevention of what is yet unproven

is impulsive at best. Obviously, we all should be strong supporters of a clean environment and should seek to keep our land, air, and waters free of real pollution, such as particulates, heavy metals, and pathogens. Certainly, we must use common sense in how we handle our waste and take personal responsibility for how we treat our planet. But, to hastily jump to conclusions that do not exist is reckless.

In regards to our role in convincing underdeveloped countries to take more action, America has no business telling any other nation how it should run its public or private sector affairs. And again, as already stated, taking action on the basis of any point of view that has not been thoroughly vetted is unwise.

Currently, there is a great deal of concern about the current and future state of the environment. And, because of documentaries like Al Gore's *An Inconvenient Truth* – released in 2006 – many have joined what is now called the “green” or “environmental” movement, advocating broad governmental involvement as the holistic cure for what they believe could be universally catastrophic if immediate action is not taken. However, there are others who share a very different perspective and are exposing the fallacies underlying this position. The following is a summary of some of the evidence being presented as a counter-argument to Gore's hypothesis:

1. While making a distinction between carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) and pollutants, Dr. William Happer, of the *George C. Marshall Institute*, states that

“Carbon is the stuff of life. Our bodies are made of carbon. A normal human exhales around 1 kg of CO<sub>2</sub> (the simplest chemically stable molecule of carbon in the earth's atmosphere) per day. Before the industrial period, the concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere was 270 ppm [parts per million]. At the present time, the

concentration is about 390 ppm, 0.039 percent of all atmospheric molecules and less than 1 percent of that in our breath. About fifty million years ago, a brief moment in the long history of life on earth, geological evidence indicates, CO<sub>2</sub> levels were several thousand ppm, much higher than now. And life flourished abundantly” (Happer).

Also, as Christopher Monkton, of the *Science and Public Policy Institute*, has said,

“[Carbon dioxide] is food for plants and trees. Tests have shown that even at concentrations 30 times those of the present day even the most delicate plants flourish. Well-managed forests, such as those of the United States, are growing at record rates because the extra carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is feeding the trees. Carbon dioxide, in geological timescale, is at a very low concentration at present. Half a billion years ago it was at 7000 parts per million by volume, about 18 times today’s concentration.” (“35 Inconvenient Truths...”)

2. In July 2008, Monkton, in a peer-reviewed report entitled, “Climate Sensitivity Reconsidered,” stated that surface “temperatures have not risen for a decade and have been falling since the phase-transition in global temperature trends that occurred in late 2001 (“Climate...”). In fact, considering a much broader historical context,

“The HadCRUT3 surface temperature index shows warming to 1878, cooling to 1911, warming to 1941, cooling to 1964, warming to 1998 and cooling through 2011. The warming rate from 1964 to 1998 was the same as the previous warming from 1911 to 1941. Satellites, weather balloons and ground stations all show cooling since 2001. The mild warming of 0.6 to 0.8 C over the 20th century is well within the natural variations recorded in the last millennium” (“Myths...”).

3. In the last thirty years, despite Gore's claims, there has been virtually no change in the amount of sea ice in the world ("The Cryosphere...").
4. According to a new study from researchers at *Syracuse University*, the Medieval Warming Period was more likely global rather than merely isolated to Europe, as some in the scientific community have declared as proof of man-made climate change (Klimas).
5. The *United States Geological Survey* (USGS) has shown that there has been no change in the number or size of earthquakes over the last twenty years ("Earthquake Information for the 1990s" and "Earthquake Facts and Statistics").
6. As to the "settled science" and "consensus" arguments, it should be noted that John Coleman, founder of *The Weather Channel*, along with 30,000 scientists – including 9,000 PhDs – has challenged Al Gore and his scientists on numerous occasions to a global warming debate, but Gore has turned them down every time (WakeUpCall4World); in fact, he has turned down many other debates over the last few years (Bast), including a debate with Christopher Monckton. Yet, Gore and many in the environmental movement keep saying the debate is over, based on what they call "scientific consensus." Perhaps someone should inform Gore and his associates that since 1998 over 31,487 American scientists, including 9,029 with PhDs, have signed the *Global Warming Petition Project* (Global), which states that  
  
"There is no convincing scientific evidence that human release of carbon dioxide, methane, or other greenhouse gasses is causing or will, in the foreseeable future, cause catastrophic heating of the Earth's atmosphere and disruption of the Earth's climate. Moreover, there is substantial scientific evidence that increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide produce many beneficial effects upon the natural

plant and animal environments of the Earth.’ The signers include ‘2,660 physicists, geophysicists, climatologists, meteorologists, oceanographers, and environmental scientists who are especially well qualified to evaluate the effects of carbon dioxide on the Earth’s atmosphere and climate’ and ‘5,017 scientists whose fields of specialization in chemistry, biochemistry, biology, and other life sciences make them especially well qualified to evaluate the effects of carbon dioxide on the Earth’s plant and animal life.’” (Beisner)

In closing, despite popular opinion, the issue of global warming and man’s effect upon it is far from settled science. However, since the man-made climate change issue has become so politically-correct in the media that fair coverage of both sides of the debate has become virtually impossible, most are not aware that another view even exists. And, since critical thinking has been all but lost in recent generations, most have not and still do not question popular sentiment but blindly follow group-think as if it is fact. Nevertheless, there is a growing awareness that there is much more to this than meets the eye. As scandals like Climategate I and II and the overreaching agendas of national and international governments (i.e. the Kyoto Protocol, Cap-and-Trade, Agenda 21, etc.) are exposed, those who have their eyes open to the broader picture understand that this is about much more than “saving the planet.” Personal agendas, special interests, emotionalism, and the almighty dollar – on both sides of the political aisle – have influenced the climate change issue far more than many are willing to admit, and as a result, the facts are being skewed or left in the dust altogether. The question is: Will we follow the crowd or will we, in the words of Thomas Jefferson, “Question with boldness” and follow where the evidence takes us, regardless of our personal preconceptions? (Jefferson)

### Works Cited

- Bast, Joseph. "Why Won't Al Gore Debate?" The Heartland Institute. 27 June 2007. Web. 14 June 2012.
- Beisner, Ph.D., E. Calvin. "Scientific Orthodoxies, Politicized Science, and Catastrophic Global Warming." *Cornwall Alliance*. N.p., 15 Nov. 2006. Web. 16 June 2012.  
<<http://www.cornwallalliance.org/docs/scientific-orthodoxies-politicized-science-and-catastrophic-global-warming.pdf>>.
- The Cryosphere Today*. University Of Illinois at Urbana-Campaign, n.d. Web. 14 June 2012.  
<<http://arctic.atmos.uiuc.edu/cryosphere>>.
- "Earthquake Facts and Statistics." *United States Geological Survey*. N.p., n.d. Web. 14 June 2012. <<http://earthquake.usgs.gov/earthquakes/eqarchives/year/eqstats.php>>.
- "Earthquake Information for the 1990s." *United States Geological Survey*. N.p., n.d. Web. 14 June 2012. <[http://earthquake.usgs.gov/earthquakes/eqarchives/year/info\\_1990s.php](http://earthquake.usgs.gov/earthquakes/eqarchives/year/info_1990s.php)>.
- Global Warming Petition Project*. N.p., n.d. Web. 16 June 2012.  
<<http://www.petitionproject.org>>.
- Happer, Dr. William. "The Truth About Greenhouse Gases." *George C. Marshall Institute*. 3 June 2011. Web. 6 June 2011.
- Holt, Mytheos. "'Painful Every Step of the Way': Top EPA Official Inadvertently Tells the Truth about the White House's Environmental Agenda." *The Blaze*. N.p., 4 June 2012. Web. 14 June 2012. <<http://www.theblaze.com/stories/painful-every-step-of-the-way-top-epa-official-inadvertently-tells-the-truth-about-the-white-houses-environmental-agenda>>.

Jefferson, Thomas. *GoodReads*. GoodReads, n.d. Web. 16 June 2012.

<<http://www.goodreads.com/quotes/show/10730>>.

Klimas, Liz. "New Evidence Suggests 'Medieval Warming Period' Was Global: Proof of Naturally-Occurring Global Warming?" *The Blaze*. N.p., 26 Mar. 2012. Web. 14 June 2012. <<http://www.theblaze.com/stories/new-evidence-suggests-medieval-warming-period-was-global-proof-of-naturally-occurring-global-warming>>

Monckton, Christopher W. "Climate Sensitivity Reconsidered." *Science and Public Policy Institute*. Science and Public Policy Institute, July 2009. Web. 14 June 2012.

<[http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/monckton/climate\\_sensitivity\\_reconsidered.pdf](http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/monckton/climate_sensitivity_reconsidered.pdf)>.

Monckton, Christopher W. "35 Inconvenient Truths: the Errors in Al Gore's Movie." *Science & Public Policy Institute*. Science & Public Policy Institute. 19 Oct. 2007. Web. 14 May 2012.

"Myths / Facts." Friends of Science, n.d. Web. 19 June 2012.

<<http://www.friendsofscience.org/index.php?id=3>>.

WakeUpCall4World. "Al Gore sued by over 30,000 Scientists for Global Warming fraud / John Coleman." *YouTube*. YouTube, 9 June 2009. Web. 14 June 2012.

<<http://youtu.be/z6l1Cp3MYCQ>>