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Hannibal Dimbo English Comp II June 11 , 2009 Is global warming our fault? There is no denying the phenomenon known as “ Global Warming “ But is it our fault? I hope to prove to all who read this that it is in no way, shape or for our, as the human race’s, fault. Before we go any further into this obscure branch of science, it is important to know just what “ Global Warming” really is, starting at its most basic definition. According to the IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Control), Global warming is the “ increase in the average temperature of the Earth’s near-surface air and the oceans since the mid-twentieth century and its projected continuation”. Global surface temperature increased 0.

74 ± 0. 18 °C (1. 33 ± 0. 32 °F) during the 100 years ending in 2005. The aforementioned Panel attributes Anthropogenic (man made) greenhouse gases to most of the observed temperature change in the last 100 years and that natural phenomena such as solar variation and volcanoes have had a SLIGHT warming effect but a COOLING effect since then. Since these basic conclusions have been endorsed by 40 scientific societies and academies of science, we have no choice but to accept them as true for the moment.

Climate model projections summarized in the latest IPCC report indicate that global surface temperature will likely rise a further 1. 1 to 6. 4 °C (2. 0 to 11. 5 °F) during the twenty-first century.

[1] The uncertainty in this estimate arises from the use of models with differing climate sensitivity, and the use of differing estimates of future greenhouse gas emissions. Some other uncertainties include how warming and related changes will vary from region to region around the globe. Most studies focus on the period up to 2100. However, warming is expected to continue beyond 2100, even if emissions stop, because of the large heat capacity of the oceans and the long lifetime of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. [2][3] So from here we can conclude with a fair amount of certainty that not all of the temperature change is our fault. But you don’t look entirely convinced, so we will continue. The Environmental Extremists would have us believe that because of human interference, the O-zone layer is going to leave us because of our using energy sources that give off so called “ dangerous emissions”, but they re forgetting a key player in our planet’s temperature change: The Sun. Reason: 1The influence of the sun has been overlooked, for whatever reason, in the climate models as a contributor to the warming observed between 1975 and 1998.

Those who support the theory of anthropogenic global warming (AGW), now known as anthropogenic climate change so that recent cooling can be included in their scenario, always deny that the sun has anything to do with recent global temperature movements. I’m not sure how you can forget something that big, but I have brought a little light on the subject. The reason people exclude the Sun is because of the Total Solar Irradiance. Total Solar Irradiance (TSI) is defined as the amount of radiant energy emitted by the Sun over all wavelengths that fall each second on 11 sq ft (1 sq m) outside the earth’s atmosphere. And therein lies the problem. The TSI varied so little over that period of time, that it cannot explain the warming that was observed.

TSI, I don’t believe, can tell the whole story because it really isn’t defined all that well and there is too much left up to chance as regards the different ways the Sun can affect the Earth. Strangely enough, I haven’t seen TSI used by AGW enthusiasts, despite the clear limits it has as an indicator of solar influence. The following link shows the pattern of TSI from 1611 to 2001. http://www. junkscience.

com/Greenhouse/irradiance. gif The graph shows that the TSI levels were basically level in 1961 if you average out the peaks and troughs from solar cycles 19-23. However, those solar cycles show substantially higher levels than we have seen before.

So, because of the height of the TSI level, we can’t rule it out as the IPCC and climate modellers have done. Now the main issue here is that having achieved such high levels of TSI by 1961, the sun was already producing more than enough heat required to maintain a stable Earth temperature. So, on another point, we are slowly disproving the AGW theory. Reason 2: Another relevant point is known as Forcing. The Earth’s climate changes in response to external forcings, including changes in greenhouse gas concentrations, variations in Earth’s orbit around the Sun,[4][5][6] changes in solar luminosity, and volcanic eruptions. [12] The thermal inertia of the oceans and slow responses of other ndirect effects mean that climate can take centuries or longer to adjust to changes in forcing. Climate commitment studies indicate that even if greenhouse gases were stabilized at 2000 levels a further warming of about 0.

5 °C (0. 9 °F) would still occur. [13] That last line of thought tells us that even if we cut our greenhouse gas emissions, the temperature would still rise. Further putting blame away from us. Reason 3: Global dimming, a gradual reduction in the amount of global direct irradiance at the Earth’s surface, may have partially counteracted global warming during the period 1960-1990.

Human-caused aerosols likely precipitated this effect. Scientists have stated with 66–90% confidence that the effects of human-caused aerosols, along with volcanic activity, have offset some of the warming effect of increasing greenhouse gases. [1] Another really cool point that puts the blame even further away from us is the Pacific Decadal Oscillation. The Pacific Decadal Oscillation (PDO) is a temperature pattern in the Pacific Ocean that spends roughly 20-30 years in the cool phase or the warm phase.

According to the Skeptical Scientist, in 1905, PDO switched to a warm phase, 1946, however, it was in a cool phase. In 1977, PDO was in another warm phase. Interestingly enough, in 1998, PDO showed a few years of a cool phase. Note that the cool phases seem to coincide with the periods of cooling (1946-1977) and the warm phases seem to coincide with periods of warming (1905-1946, 1977-1998). It’s probably no coincidence.

Warm (cool) PDO regimes tend to encourage El Ninos (La Ninas) that help to warm up (cool down) the Earth, respectively. Ozone depletion, the steady decline in the total amount of ozone in Earth’s stratosphere, is sometimes cited in relation to global warming. Although there are a few areas of linkage the relationship between the two is not strong. Reason 4: Let’s look at another obvious, natural factor in global warming, this time in the form of volcanoes. the earth has seen many global temperature variations historically. (Keeling and Whorf, 1997) The irrefutable truth is that just a single volcano can release more gases in a single day then mankind has in its species existence. Secondly, such eruptions are not isolated occurrences, but rather volcanic activities which happen numerous times every year and have happened for eons of the earth’s istory. As an example, USGS scientists studying the gases of Mount St.

Helens have determined that about 2 million tons of sulfur dioxide were emitted between 1980 and 1988. In addition, global temperature trends have shown to hold great variation; proof of this lies within the ice ages and tropical periods. Reason 5: Also, global warming is not the fault of humans and in fact, it isn’t bad. Dr. Hugh Ellsaesser believes that we are due for around a 1. 8 F. increase because of the global cooling during the past four hundred years (Carlise, 1998). He claims that all this will do is generate slightly warmer winter and nighttime temperatures, which will result in fewer frosts and longer growing seasons.

Additionally, the only time that agriculture was failing was during the cooler temperatures. This upcoming warming, in fact, could be beneficial to many countries and their agricultural success (Carlise, 1998). Present theories about global warming are based on very small amounts of data collected in only the last hundred or so years; hardly enough upon which to base a judgment. Moreover, all statistics based upon sea levels rising are based on false and inaccurate data. NASA scientists studying the “ rise” in sea levels have discovered an error in the software aboard OPEX/POSEIDON, the U. S.

-French satellite that is supposed to be measuring sea-level change. The error has produced a severe exaggeration in NASA’s estimates of sea-level change. (Milloy, 1996)Anthropogenic Global warming has yet to even be scientifically proven and continues to pose no immediate threat. Lastly, with regard to human activities, while a high correlation between global warming and said activities can be pointed out, no proof has been shown with absolute certainty. The point at which there can be no clear or scientifically proven link between human activities being at the root cause of increased global temperatures, I would conclude that human activities are not the cause of global warming and that it is not a threat.

There are simply too many other factors involved to properly conclude that any global warming trend could be a result of human related activities. Historically, there have been global temperature variations, some even far greater than the one we’ve experienced in recent times. Many of these temperature variations have been caused by natural factors, such as volcanic activity. In fact, it can be concluded that all temperature variations pre-human beings were due entirely to environmental factors. And were global warming an actual temperature trend, it would not be a terrible catastrophe as many make its effects out to be. It would allow for a longer growing season which, in some countries, could be quite beneficial.

Yet, obviously, data from the past hundred years is far from sufficient to make a conclusion from in support of a warming trend. It is merely an uninformative extrapolation of data in respect to the amount of time behind it. Global warming is not an issue to be taken lightly; however, it will have no direct effect on humans and, were there a risk of it having an effect, there really isn’t a whole lot we could do about it. Literature Cited 1. Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.
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