

Anthropogenic global warming: dispelling myths assignment



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Dispelling the Myths Global warming; climate change; rising sea levels; receding glaciers; hurricanes; drowning polar bears; floods; pestilence; famine; plague; disease; The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse; Repent ye Sinners! For the end of the world is at hand; do all of these proclamations sound eerily similar? Unfortunately, the answer to the question is yes. To those who subscribe to the statements made by the advocates of global warming or climate change theory, the destruction of the planet is imminent.

The objective of this paper will be to look rationally at the debate over “global arming” (now euphemistically switched to climate change because the Earth has actually been in a cooling trend since 1998 (Spencer) and global warming no longer fits its proponents’ talking points) and shed the ever present light of truth on the arguments on behalf of Anthropogenic global warming. It is the intention of this paper to dispute the claims that Anthropogenic global warming is occurring.

This paper will examine the specific arguments regarding global warming or climate change, dispel the myths surrounding this volatile topic, and illustrate that global arming is a natural cyclic event that humans have no significant control over. The first argument this paper will discuss regarding global warming is the alleged consensus of scientists that Anthropogenic global warming is indeed occurring.

Second, to explore the methods of the scientific data collected thus far and illustrate the flaws in the collected data and prediction models based on that data. Third, to review the arguments of greed put forth by AY Gore; et. Al. And understand the motives behind these individuals who strongly advocate

Anthropogenic global warming. In the words of "Deep Throat" in the Movie All the Presidents Men regarding the Watergate scandal, "Follow the Money!" In other words, who stands to gain by advancing the global warming agenda? It should be noted that the argument of greed is launched by proponents of both sides toward each other. The profit motives of corporations are obvious and they do not purport to be above reproach. However, those who claim to have no ulterior motive other than the salvation of the human race and the planet deserve to have the same scrutiny placed on them.) Fourth, this paper will review the proposed remedies to avert global warming and illustrate how these remedies would cripple the global and United States economy.

Finally, to bring all of these together to show that there is simply not enough data to make any knowledgeable conclusion regarding the true cause of global warming. However, the data seems to begin to suggest that as life is cyclical, all things are cyclical, including the warming and cooling of the Earth. As such, while conservation is a positive and honorable endeavor, to take drastic measures to remedy a problem not fully understood is irresponsible and premature. By the end of this paper, the facts will be clear.

An interesting side note, mentioned earlier, is the sudden change in language that occurred in late 2008, where the proponents of the global warming movement suddenly switched to using "climate change" as the preferred warming and the convenient change in nomenclature, Todd Wynn, Climate Change and Energy Policy Analyst at the Cascade Policy Institute writes: Global warming used to be the defining term to represent the increase in the average temperature of the earth during the past 100 years. <https://assignbuster.com/anthropogenic-global-warming-dispelling-myths-assignment/>

Recently, the more politically popular term, climate change, has replaced global warming.

Why? One main reason is because the earth is currently cooling. Global warming obviously entails global average temperature increase, whereas “climate change” is about much more than just temperature. “climate change” can represent just about anything, which is handy when the earth doesn’t happen to cooperate with climate models predicting future climate catastrophe. If the earth gets too cold, if it gets too hot, if there happens to be a slight increase or decrease in storm/drought/precipitation frequency or intensity, all of these events can be blamed on “climate change. (Wynn) A few stipulations just be made at the outset in order to have a rational and intelligent debate regarding the topic of “global warming. ” First, stipulation is made that the conservation of resources and responsible living, as it pertains to our environment, are good things. This author does not advocate dumping toxic chemicals in lakes, rivers, and streams. Nor does the author advocate wasting water, clubbing baby seals, starving polar bears, overfeeding the oceans, strip mining, burning rain forests or repeating the Exxon Valued and Union Carbide disasters.

With these stipulations in place, a rational analysis can now move forward. As it pertains to the first argument for Anthropogenic global warming, there have been statements made by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and Al Gore that a consensus of scientists agree that global warming is a human caused condition. Gore, in his various speeches and in the movie An Inconvenient Truth, asserts that “... A survey of 928 random abstracts published in scientific journals that use the word “<https://assignbuster.com/anthropogenic-global-warming-dispelling-myths-assignment/>

climate change” showed that 75% of them agreed with the consensus and that none of them disagreed. Gore)” Mr.. Gore went on to say that “ not believing n global warming is as ridiculous as believing that the Earth is flat. (Gore)” However, it has been shown that the study was flawed, and that the majority of abstracts did not mention manmade effects on climate at all. To add to this, the Epic’s assessment reports are widely seen as authoritative evidence that global warming is occurring. Instead of providing logical evidence to support the idea of global warming, some may say that they believe in the theory because the EPIC or AY Gore says it is true.

This is a reasonable position with a topic as complex as global warming due to the fact that the EPIC and Mr.. Gore have become self proclaimed authorities regarding the topic. As such, the majority of individuals do not have the time or interest to actually research the topic but accept the assertions based on the authority of the EPIC and Mr.. Gore. However, in the context of a logical discussion, to say global warming is true simply because the EPIC or Gore says so is a fallacy known as an “ appeal to authority. ” To illustrate this fallacy, the following are actual facts.

In its Second Assessment Report in 1995, the EPIC made headlines when it announced for the first time that “ the balance of evidence suggests a discernible human influence on global climate. (EPIC)” This was a groundbreaking change from its position in its first assessment report, and it had heavy political significance. Shortly adoption off realistic but binding target” for emissions. (Edwards, Schneider) It was also on the basis of this report that the Kyoto Protocol was entered into by most of the countries of the world two years later.

<https://assignbuster.com/anthropogenic-global-warming-dispelling-myths-assignment/>

Accusations followed from Frederick Suite, a scientist with formidable credentials. Suite was a recipient of the National Medal of Science and a past president of both the National Academy of Sciences and the American Physical Society. The accusations had to do with revisions that had been made to Chapter 8 of the report, the most controversial of the sections. Here is how the chapter was written, based on an account of two scientists who were involved with the revisions. (ibid) First, a working group of six dozen climate scientists met and debated over each portion of the chapter.

Based on this discussion the chapter was written, submitted to the EPIC, and accepted. Then, government representatives from various countries had the opportunity under EPIC rules to respond to the report. Benjamin Canter, the lead author of Chapter 8, was required under EPIC rules to revise the chapter in response to these government comments. He made the revisions without consulting with the other scientists of the working group. Suite claimed that this revision amounted to deliberate fraud and “ corruption of the peer-review process. (ibid) Specifically, the following statement was deleted, “ None of the studies cited above has shown clear evidence that we can attribute the observed changes to the specific cause of increases in greenhouse gases, (EPIC)” and the following statement was added, “ The balance of evidence suggests a discernible human influence on global warming. Gray)” This was a fundamental change. With this evidence brought forth, is there truly a consensus of scientists that subscribe to the belief that the current warming trend is caused by human influence on the planet as the EPIC and AY Gore assert?

The answer may be surprising, especially since the proponents and media have stated a consensus exists for so long. Initially, when the scientific community began to study the problem, the theory was posited that the warming trend was a direct effect of human population and carbon emissions on the environment. At the outset, it was clearly only a hypothesis ND studies were still being conducted. Unfortunately, the theory seemed to gain traction in the political and environmental protection circles and began to take on a life of its own.

Assertions were made on behalf of scientists, when the majority of the scientists were still figuring out how to even study the temperature anomaly, let alone begin to extrapolate well supported explanations of the data. Thus, a new political / scientific movement was born where the ends justified the means. What is meant by this is that huge amounts of money suddenly became available to scientists to study the cause of the current warming trend.

As any research scientist worth his or her degree knows, to keep the money flowing from the benefactors, the data and findings had better support the popular hypothesis or the money dries up. This is in no way meant to disparage scientists or claim that they falsify data to fit specific objectives. Unfortunately, this has happened as evidenced by the EPIC revisions. As it pertains to the consensus of scientists, it has become increasingly evident that a consensus does not now, nor did it ever, exist.

To the contrary, it appears that a growing number of scientists are in complete disagreement with the assertion that the current temperature

conditions are human caused. To illustrate the lack of EPIC and Mr.. Gore. First is the petition, signed by over 17, 000 scientists worldwide, that was circulated by the Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine stating in part, “ there is no convincing scientific evidence that the human release of carbon dioxide, methane, or other greenhouse gases is causing or will, in the foreseeable future, cause catastrophic heating of the Earth’s atmosphere and disruption of the Earth’s climate.

ISM)” Second, there exists another petition of 31, 478 United States scientists who have signed a mail-in petition rejecting global warming as part of the Global Warming Petition Project. (GAWP) This petition includes 9, 029 scientists with PhD. Additionally, a minority report from the United States Senate Environment and Public Works Committee has released a list of over 700 scientists rejecting global warming. GIUSEPPE) This list is perhaps more significant because it includes biographies from the scientists as well as specific quotes. The list includes many current and former EPIC members as well as several Nobel Prize winners. The final example is Just one of many defections by scientists in the global warming camp. Claude Allegro, renowned French Geophysicist and at one point a staunch proponent of anthropogenic global warming, in his paper on “ The Snows of Met. Kilimanjaro’ writes that the “ cause of climate change remains unknown. Allegro, 1)” Allegro also pointed out that studies show that Antarctic snowfall rate has been stable over the past 30 years and the continent is actually gaining ice (Allegro, 1). Clearly the assertions that the EPIC and Mr.. Gore advance regarding a scientific consensus are rosily overstated, if not outright lies, meant to further their own political and financial agendas. Next, in the

effort to fully understand the assertions and claims being made in support of anthropogenic global warming, the methods of study and data collection need to be examined.

Multiple studies have been submitted claiming to show that the earth is indeed in an unprecedented warming trend. This paper does not refute that those studies exist nor does it dispute that the specific studies show a warming trend. However, is this really an accurate representation of the current global climate conditions? Satellite readings of the lower troposphere (an area most scientists predict would immediately reflect any global warming) show no sustained global temperature increase since the readings began 23 years ago.

These readings are accurate to within 0.01 degrees Celsius and are consistent with readings from weather balloons. Furthermore the readings, based on thirty years worth of data from eight NASA weather satellites that have gathered more than 300,000 daily global temperature measurements, show clearly that in the past four years, a period of reduced solar activity, all of the rise in global temperatures since 1979 have separated (Spencer).

This is supported by John Christy of the Department of Atmospheric Science and Earth System Science Center, University of Alabama in Huntsville and David Douglass of the Department of Physics and Astronomy at the University of Rochester, in their paper that was accepted by the Energy & Environment scientific Journal, where they conclude: The global atmospheric temperature anomalies of Earth reached a maximum in 1998 which has not

been exceeded during the subsequent 10 years. The global and the extraterritorial latitude bands.

El Niño/La Niña effects in the tropical band are hard to explain the 1998 maximum while variations in the background of the global anomalies largely come from climate effects in the northern hemisphere. These effects do not have the signature associated with CO₂ climate forcing. (Christy, Douglass 3) The readings that do indeed show a temperature increase in support of global warming are primarily land-based stations. The fault with these stations (and the associated data from them) is that they do not cover the entire globe, can be contaminated by heat generated by nearby urban development, and are subject to human error.

American Policy Roundtable) In addition, all predictions of global warming are based on computer models, not historical data. The flaw with the approach with this method of modeling is again the ends justifying the means. In other words, the modeler must make initial assumptions regarding current and future conditions to produce the climate model. How confident are meteorologists that the weather forecast for a week from now is accurate? Forecasting the weather more than about two weeks ahead is fairly unreliable.

If this is the case, how can one expect computer models to predict the climate in 2050? Comparing local weather and global climate is not an equal comparison; they are really two different things. They are similar, however, from the perspective that they each have an incredible number of variables involved. A computer climate model is only as good as the person who

programs it, and there is still a lot we don't know about climate. A computer model is also subject to the preconceived ideas of the person who programs it, like the idea that CO is warming the Earth.

James Hansen, head of the NASA Institute for Space Studies, gatekeeper of the satellite temperature data used by the EPIC, outspoken supporter of global warming and friend of AY Gore, once said to the US Senate, " The forcing that drive long-term climate change are not known with an accuracy sufficient to define future climate change. " (Hornier, 320) The 2007 EPIC Fourth Assessment Report states that of the nine variables that affect climate change, they have a " low" to " med" level of scientific understanding for seven, and only a " high" level for two. EPIC, 4) It is with this data that they program their 16 computer models. The Epic's current stated level of confidence in their conclusions would not be enough to warrant scientific publication on other subjects. Mueller) However, since no historical data exists to illustrate the hypothesized CO levels and its potential effects on the climate, the meddlers start with the assumed end result and work backwards. (Linden) Climate meddlers frequently use " flux adjustments" to get the models to produce the predictions close to the designer's expectations.

These " flux adjustments" can be 25 times larger than doubling the concentration of carbon dioxide currently in the atmosphere. (Emmanuel, 1) This equates to an increase of 2500 times the amount of carbon dioxide at present levels. No scientist on the planet, living or dead, believes his could occur, especially as a result of human related carbon emissions. Richard Kerr, writer for Science magazine writes, " climate meddlers have been "
<https://assignbuster.com/anthropogenic-global-warming-dispelling-myths-assignment/>

cheating” for on hypothesis, observation, and repeatable results, it is fair to say that the collected data is far from a convincing trend toward human caused global warming.

In fact, it could be said that the data is increasingly trending away from human causes at all and more towards the belief that the changes are cyclical and part of the natural course of the earth and solar system. The next step is to address the myth of the purely altruistic intentions of the global warming advocates. Many an argument has been made that the skeptics of human caused global warming are in the pockets of “ Big Oil” or “ corporate lackeys”. Certainly the argument holds that to refute global warming is in the best interest of industry as will be discussed later in the paper.

But this amounts to an Ad Hominid attack on those who question the science and the interpretation of that science. Basically, the proponents of human caused global warming infer that to disagree with their beliefs, an individual is wrong simply because one is incapable of thinking in his or her own and must be in the employ of someone who stands to gain financially from blocking the proposed remedies to global warming. Whereas, by inference, these same advocates are doing it simply for the love of the planet and the salvation of the human race and as such their intentions and motives should be beyond reproach.

Unfortunately for those proponents, the same argument can be used in reverse. In other words, the advocates of global warming stand to gain financially from the proposed remedies, as much, if not more, than the

skeptics stand to gain by doing nothing. Several individuals who are the loudest in pushing for weeping changes stand to gain immensely from the implementation of the proposed remedies. AY Gore, the individual behind the current “ Cap and Trade” legislation pending in the United States Congress and the world’s foremost “ Warm- Monger” is at the forefront of potential financial benefit.

Deborah Corey Barnes’ report on Mr.. Gore’s investments is quite revealing. AY Gore is chairman and founder of a private equity firm called Generation Investment Management (MM). According to Gore, the London-based firm invests money from institutions and wealthy investors in companies that are going green. GIMP appears to have considerable influence over the major carbon-credit trading firms that currently exist: the Chicago climate Exchange (ICC) in the U. S. And the Carbon Neutral Company (CNN) in Great Britain. ICC is the only firm in the U. S. That claims to trade carbon credits.

Clearly, GIMP is poised to cash in on carbon trading. The membership of ICC is currently voluntary. But if the day ever comes when federal government regulations require greenhouse-gas emitters and that’s almost everyone to participate in cap-and-trade, then those who have created a market for the exchange of carbon reedits are in a position to control the outcomes. And that moves AY Gore front and center. As a politician, Gore is all for transparency. But as GIMP chairman, Gore has not been forthcoming, according to Forbes magazine. Little is known about his firm’s Mr..

Gore is obviously the most visible of the global warming advocates but not the only one who stands to gain. Another individual who came to the

forefront in the 2008 United States elections was T. Boone Pickers. Mr. Pickers sponsored “ The Pickers Plan” and took out numerous advertisements to further the agenda of moving to a cleaner, greener, and more energy independent model. However, what Mr. Pickers failed to disclose was that he owned significant positions with major solar, wind and natural gas companies who would stand to benefit substantially by the enforcement of the proposed “ Cap and Trade” legislation.

Michelle Milkman, noted political watchdog, provides insight into another relationship that is cause for concern. The current Speaker of the House of Representatives, Nancy Polloi, has some interesting financial holdings. Speaker Polloi and her husband hold substantial shares in Clean Energy Fuels Corporation, a major manufacturer of wind turbines and wind farms. (Milkman) Interestingly enough, Clean Energy Fuels Corp. Was founded by none other than T. Boone Pickers. The most alarming issue with Speaker Polloi's holdings is that she is responsible for drafting the “ Cap and Trade” legislation.

As evidenced above by the EPIC modifications that occurred in chapter 8 of the report, the interpretation and conclusions of the scientists can be altered to fit an individuals or governments objectives. Those who stand to gain from advancing a specific agenda should rescue themselves from being actively involved in interpreting the data and crafting legislation or reforms as it pertains to global warming. It is not the intent of this paper to cast dispersions upon the proponents of global warming simply due to financial holdings but it does raise the question regarding intentions and motives.

As stated, it would be best if those individuals charged with arriving at a comprehensive analysis of the collected data and proposing a course of action were completely impartial. Perhaps it is naivet?? and true impartiality is impossible. However, the arguments on behalf of human caused global warming would hold significantly more weight if those individuals advancing those arguments were completely divested of any potential financial gain by its implementation. Regardless, the “ greed” arguments by the proponents of global warming against the skeptics are porous when the light is shined in the reverse direction.

To be fair, it should be noted that the opponents of global warming would benefit greatly by blocking the legislation as it would allow them to do business as usual. Either way, both sides stand to gain from advancing their agendas. The next point in examining the topic of human caused global warming and the surrounding myths is to look at the remedies put forth to rectify the problem. Specifically, the two major pieces of legislation are the Kyoto Protocol of 1997 and the current “ Cap and Trade” legislation before the United States Congress for debate.

First, The Kyoto Protocol is an international agreement linked to the United Nations Framework Convention on climate change. The major feature of the Kyoto Protocol is that it sets binding targets for 37 industrialized countries and the European community for reducing greenhouse gas (GOGH) emissions. (EPIC) The major flaw with the Kyoto protocol is that it is based on the aforementioned EPIC report on climate conclusion, how could the Kyoto Protocol be valid? A second flaw is that the major contributors, according to the United Nations, of greenhouse gases are China and the United States.
<https://assignbuster.com/anthropogenic-global-warming-dispelling-myths-assignment/>

However, neither China nor the United States are participants in the Kyoto Protocol. So what effect would a protocol have in alleviating CO emissions if the major players aren't playing? The reason that China will not adopt the Kyoto Protocol is that it will cripple its economy because of the changes mandated by the protocol in reducing carbon emissions. According to Charlie Icon, attorney and policy analyst, states: This is the same reason that President George W. Bush refused to sign the Kyoto Protocol, committing the United States to its mandates.

President Bush stated that " given the current energy crisis as well as the incomplete state of scientific knowledge of the causes of, and solutions to, global climate change and the lack of commercially available technologies for removing and storing carbon dioxide," the President said he could not sign an agreement that would " harm our economy and hurt our workers. " He also objected to the fact that the Protocol, which has been ratified by only one of the countries necessary before it could go into effect-still exempts 80 percent of the world... From compliance. (Icon) The other flaws with the Kyoto Protocol according to Icon are that it exempts developing nations and that it has severe economic consequences. Essentially, since the science behind the Kyoto protocol is flawed, the protocol itself is flawed and so it makes no sense to adopt sweeping changes until a complete, thorough, and comprehensive analysis has been performed. As it pertains to the " Cap and Trade" legislation, the same arguments hold true. Since the legislation is based upon the EPIC report, it is by its very nature a flawed piece of legislation.

Two lawyers at the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) with more than forty years of collective experience wrote an article in the Washington Post criticizing the pending climate and energy legislation and enumerating the flaws of the cap and trade system both the House and Senate versions of the bill espouse. According to attorneys Laurie Williams and Allan Cable: Cap-and-trade means a declining “ cap” on total emissions, while allowing trading of pollution permits.

Confidence in the certainty of declining caps is based on the mistaken assumption that cap-and trade was proven in the Pea’s acid rain program. In fact, addressing acid rain required relatively minor modifications to coal-fired power plants. Reductions were accomplished primarily by a fuel switch to readily available, affordable, low-sulfur coal, along with some additional scrubbing. In contrast, the issues presented by climate change cannot be solved by tweaks to facilities; it requires an energy revolution through investments in building clean- energy facilities.

The biggest obstacle to this revolution is that uncontrolled fossil fuel energy confidence that clean energy will become profitable within a known time frame and o will not ignite the huge shift in investment needed to begin the clean-energy revolution. In recent interviews, even the economists who thought up cap-and-trade have said they don’t believe it’s an appropriate tool for climate change. (Williams, Cable) Although the EPA lawyers do not address their beliefs on the existence of climate change, even the these lawyers from the EPA, the major government agency on global warming state that the proposed legislation is flawed.

It must be stated again that this paper supports conservation and responsible living as common sense approaches to helping the environment. However, the proposed solutions are not the answer when the foundations of those solutions are flawed at the outset. Finally, we can actually discuss the main merits of the case against global warming. The obvious place to start is temperature. The EPIC states that humans have been affecting climate since about 1957 by adding CO to the atmosphere, and that since that time the Earth has warmed about 10 F (0.60 C). EPIC) According to Michael Coercion, medical doctor and author, "... Lately, however, it hasn't been warming. From 1998 until 2009 the Earth has cooled about .250 C despite the fact that CO levels have continued to climb. Another significant time period is between about 1942 and about 1976. During this time temperatures also fell despite increasing levels of CO. Scientists worldwide were afraid that we were entering into another ice age. (Coercion)" Some people will argue that a 10 or 15 year time period is not long enough to gauge a climate trend, and they would be right.

It is all a matter of what time period one wants to look at and how the data is presented. Over a 3000 year period, the Earth has been cooling. Over a 1500 year period, it has been warming. Over a 1000 year period, it has been cooling. Over a 400 year period, it has been warming. Actually, it has pretty much been steadily warming for 400 years as we have come out of a time period known as the " little ice age. " (Coercion) It cooled last night, and it has been warming since the sun came up this morning. The climate constantly changes all on its own.

And it hasn't just been warming for 50 years; it's been warming for 400 years. The glacier on Mt. Kilimanjaro that Al Gore highlighted in his movie *An Inconvenient Truth* has been melting for 125 years, (Uncommon, 8) much longer than the time (since about 1957) the IPCC says humans have been affecting limited. In fact, glaciers in general have been melting and sea levels have been rising for 180 years. (Robinson) CO and temperature are clearly linked. But any scientist (which Gore is not) can tell you that "correlation does not equal causation. In other words, it doesn't prove what is causing what. CO could be driving temperature, temperature could be driving CO, or some third factor could be driving both of them. As it turns out, for the last 420,000 years, changes in temperature have occurred first. The ice core readings show that changes in temperature lead changes in CO by 1300 years \pm 1000 years. (Mudslides, 583-589) The data gathered from the ice cores do not show what Gore implies. This is not to say that CO is not a GHG or that it doesn't play a role in our climate.

However, multiple scientific studies have shown changes. (Postmaster, 246) What this data record shows is that CO is not the main driver in our climate. The temperature changes prompted the oceans to interact with the air and either release or absorb CO. The CO did not prompt the changes in temperature. When temperatures began to cool, they cooled despite higher levels of CO for several hundred years. When temperatures began to rise, they rose despite lower levels of CO for several hundred years.

Energy from the sun is obviously the source of all the energy for our climate system, and this energy is not constant. It's always changing. It goes through periods of greater and lesser activity on a not-so regular basis. (Bilabials)
<https://assignbuster.com/anthropogenic-global-warming-dispelling-myths-assignment/>

The EPIC states that solar variation is not the cause of the warming we have seen in the last 50 years. They base this position primarily on computer climate models. In its 2007 Fourth Assessment Report, the EPIC describes its level of scientific understanding of solar radiance as “ low. EPIC, 4) However, the best evidence of how the climate is working is not computer models but data of how the climate has acted throughout history. Historic data shows that changes in solar energy correspond with changes in temperature both in the long term and the short term. As AY Gore might say, even a fourth grader can see there is a correlation. And in this case, there is no way that we can say that the Earth’s temperature is affecting the amount of energy from the sun. A correlation in this case can only mean that changes in solar radiation are affecting changes in Earth’s temperature.

In summation, given the false accusations that have been made and the clear subterfuge that has occurred on behalf of anthropogenic global warming, it is fair to say that the actual data does not support the assertions of the proponents of global warming. There is not a consensus of scientists that support global warming. To the contrary, there appears to be a growing consensus that anthropogenic global warming is not occurring. The data instead appears, at this point, to support a natural cyclic event that occurs within our planetary atmosphere in relation to the sun and our solar system.

The data, at this point, when accurately and truthfully reported and analyzed does not show a direct causation of increased CO and temperature. All that being stated, the results are still out and no scientist can say for certain what is actually occurring. Thus, prudence would suggest that given the collected data, the human race has very little effect on the overall temperature of the <https://assignbuster.com/anthropogenic-global-warming-dispelling-myths-assignment/>

earth. Whether an individual subscribes to creationism or evolution, it would be fair to say that the human race has an amazing capacity to assert its own self importance in the grand scheme of things.

George Carline, comedian and noted liberal, puts it best: We're so self-important. Everybody's going to save something now. Save the trees, save the bees, save the whales, save those snails. And the greatest arrogance of all: save the planet... There is nothing wrong with the planet. The planet is fine... Compared to the people, the planet is doing great. Been here for four and a half billion years. Did you ever think about the arithmetic? The planet has been here four and a half billion years. We've been here, what, a hundred thousand? Maybe two hundred thousand? And we've only been engaged in heavy industry for a little over