

# Global warming argument assignment



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

Despite the broad international scientific consensus, allegations have been made that these researchers and institutions are part of a global scientific conspiracy. There have been allegations of malpractice, most notably the Climatic Research Unit email controversy. Eight committees investigated these allegations and published reports, each finding no evidence of fraud or scientific misconduct. The Mir Russell report stated, however, “ We do find that there has been a consistent pattern of failing to display the proper degree of openness, both on the part of CRU scientists and on the part of the ALGAE.

Lies are generally used for some kind of gain. In the corporate world, lies are told every day in order to gain either money or power. We have been told since the seventies that our environment is deteriorating. In 1973, politicians said that natural resources would be gone by the year 2000. This assumption was made because of the increase in the global temperature. The rapid growth of industry led many to believe that industry was not only going to pollute our air, but would deplete our stocks of iron ore, petroleum, and natural gases.

They also believed that by the year 2000 all of our water would be contaminated, and we would have to either discover a mass-filtering process, or die. Scientists claimed that our O<sub>3</sub> layer would deteriorate and we would soon have to cover our entire bodies before we walked into the sunlight, or the radiation would burn our skin (Adam 1997). These speculations were all made based on small amounts of evidence and scientific data according to the CRU and SEA scientists, the sun is no more

harmful than it was 30 years ago, and there is more fresh water available to drink than ever.

We believed what we were told, and continue to do so today. Global warming is a phenomenon that is on a level that is virtually unnoticeable. Global warming has not been a cause in any natural disasters. Two American scientists, Thomas Knutson and Robert Tuttle, published an academic paper forecasting an increase in the power of hurricanes (typhoons) because of global warming. Specifically, they used a computer model in which the sea surface temperature was warmed, and they found that nearly 60 percent of the changes in the computer's hurricanes could be attributed to that effect.

In reality, only 10 percent of the behavior of hurricanes in the Atlantic Ocean (where there are the best long-term records) is related to sea surface temperatures. When that is factored in, any changes in hurricanes related to global-warming become undetectable over the next century. Extremely high-tech instruments are the only method capable of measuring the minute changes that scientists claim to be occurring after extensive research from 2000 to 2002.

The Committee of Abrupt Climate Change concluded in their report to the National Research Council, “ abrupt climate change might occur sometime in the future, or it might not, triggered by mechanisms not yet understood, and that in the meantime more research is needed. There are organizations that make millions a year through fundraising, donations, endorsements and various other methods. Private and public alike, environmental organizations have been growing in number and size over the last decade.

<https://assignbuster.com/global-warming-argument-assignment-essay-samples/>

Salesman, a sociologist who studies the effects media and politics have on science, insists in his book that “ When politics merge with science, the outcome is always biased. If you tell a person to survey a group of people, and tell them that most will say ‘ yes,’ then that person will get more answers of yes than no, however, if you eve a second person survey the same group, but tell them that most will answer ‘ no,’ then the majority of the answers will be 180). An example of politics being biased for global warming was the Presidential elections in 2000 featuring AAA Gore and George W. Bush.

AAA Gore entire campaign was evolved around the up rise of global warming. His followers and his voters already were biased on his point Of view simply because that’s their leader. Not knowing the true facts that he has left out, and swept under the carpet. When an environmental organization does research to prove that global warming exists, their findings will be skewed. For example, if glaciers are known to be melting in Russia, but they are also known to be thickening in Canada and Antarctica, scientists may take measurements and other data from the glaciers in Russia and publish them while ignoring the others (Singer 2).

The disclosure of information by scientific groups is usually specific to a cause or motive that the organization is trying to encourage. If a lab is being paid to do research for an organization that claims that global warming exists, their results may be biased. If the results themselves are not biased, then what is published will be filtered by the organization. Benjamin Disraeli once claimed that, “ There are three kinds of lies: lies, damn lies, and

statistics. ” It is easy to fabricate statistics when presenting to an audience in order to solidify your approach.

By providing certain information to the public, people begin to believe what they are shown. If an environmental organization shows examples of five glacial areas in the world that are melting, one would come to the conclusion that all glaciers are melting. This, however is not so. Chilly, a Naval geologist, reported, “ While glaciers in some areas of the world such as Greenland have been following a melting trend over the last 30 years, larger ice shelves such as Antarctica and glaciers covering Canada have been following an opposite trend, and have become thicker”(Chilly 443).

Evidence is not clear as to whether trends are warming or if trends are staying the same. In some areas of the world the temperatures have been getting warmer, but in other areas they have actually gotten colder. Most areas, however, have remained the same. Global warming is not an issue that some scientists would like us to believe. In 1994 the federal courts established a set of deadlines that would determine what types of science would be allowed as admissible in court.

After lawsuits in the early nineties regarding global warming, the courts added a section to the guidelines that prevented any speculator testimony from being presented as scientific evidence (Reference 628). The courts basically ruled that evidence that supports global warming is not credible. A physicist argues, “ The failure of the scientific community to take decisive action over the flaws in standard statistical methods, and the resulting waste

of resources spent on futile attempts to replicate claims eased on them, constitute a major scientific scandal. ” (Matthews 34).

He argues that just because our statistics are flawed due to lack of scientific knowledge, scientists are not authorized to fill in the blanks with their own assumptions. To do so is poor scientific practice and should not be accepted by the scientific community. (Matthews 32). “ There is no science available that can allow any scientist, no matter how experienced, to predict any form of weather pattern, within reasonable accuracy”(Roberts 616). Roberts suggests that since the science is not available, the scientists will fill in the blanks in order to prove global warming.

They provide an expert opinion, but present it as silence. The fear is that by trying so drastically to prevent global warming, the consequences may be just as harmful. If environmental agencies were to accomplish their goals to basically cool the planet a few degrees, sea levels would recede due to thickening glaciers. Winters would be longer. Weather patterns would change. Storms would be more frequent during the change of season. There is no method, however, to predict what the world will be like 35 years from now. Nature has proven to be extremely durable on its own. It has sustained life for an uncountable amount of time.

Other species have survived not only with the help of humanity, but even more impressive is how well other species have survived in spite of humanity. Our resources are still flowing, more so now than 30 years ago. The predicted end of the earth, YAK has come and gone. People are no longer afraid to live near power lines, people have survived microwaves

<https://assignbuster.com/global-warming-argument-assignment-essay-samples/>

without getting brain cancer, and 35 years ago, some environmental activists claimed that by now, San Francisco would be under water due to rising sea levels caused by the melting glaciers. They predicted that tornadoes would become so frequent that the middle part of the U.

S. Would be virtually uninhabitable during spring and fall. The truth is that not only has the planet only warmed a measly one- half of a degree, but it seems to have been beneficial. " Heating costs due to the small temperature increases have gone down relative to inflation. " (Hotpot 5). It has lowered the number of deaths that occur during cold weather months, and no increases in severe weather have been recorded in the last thirty years. (Sunniest 59). Global warming is not a threat to the world. Not only is the increase in temperature so minuscule, but it follows no pattern or predictability.

A half of a degree is barely even noticeable on a thermometer. Many of the measurements taken in the past have been taken by instruments that can hardly be considered reliable. Global warming is not an issue, it is not a threat. Many theories provide insight as to why a phenomenon that does not exist would be so widely accepted and reported. Some blame politics, some blame activists, some blame corporations, whatever the claim, one thing needs to be taken into account: In regards to something as unpredictable and powerful as weather and mother-nature, we should not attempt to control it.