

# Global warming assignment assignment



Many people can argue different opinions on this subject, such as, they can find it is a serious threat and that it will impact all parts of our society and that action needs to be taken immediately to abate the effects. Others may believe that global warming isn't true, and all actions taken toward it will only cause harmful effects to the economy. In my standpoint, I believe that global warming isn't a problem. I stand in the position that it's not a big deal, and people and scientists are exaggerating the facts. Many scientists say it is CO causing the global warming.

For example the saying "reducing your carbon footprint" Yet simply in the article "No Need to Panic About Global Warming" It states that CO is not causing as much damage as other scientists might say. Rather they are only basing their theories upon a computer where they amplify and exaggerate the effects of CO. As they state in the article "the warming is only missing if one believes computer models where so-called feedbacks involving water vapor and clouds greatly amplify the small effect of CO." so the computers don't exactly know what will happen in the future they only can predict upon what has happened.

So therefore what the computers hypothesize, is most likely not correct because of the changes in precipitation, water vapor, and clouds. Another reason is, "that computer models have greatly exaggerated how much warming additional CO can cause" they are only basing what they get off of the computer and not realizing that CO isn't as bad as they believe. Simply these scientists that believe the global warming isn't a big deal are stating that the world is heating up mostly by itself, because CO isn't a pollutant, it's a colorless, odorless gas, that is a key element in the biosphere's life cycle.

They state that CO<sub>2</sub> helps aid growth in plants, and have better varieties. In the studies of global warming, they saw a small rise in temperature during the second half of the 20th century. The one part in this is the natural CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, and that humans only have a third of the role of the increase of it. So the benefits of moderate warming are likely to outweigh the effects. Scientists say that CO<sub>2</sub> causes a small amount in moisture, that would cause further warming, but others have found no evidence as such.

So without this added information there is no crisis, because even if the earth's temperature continued to rise, it would only increase 0.123 degrees C per decade. Some scientists even have evidence of a cooling trend. Which contradicts the major role of CO<sub>2</sub>. Many people state that global warming increases the amount of catastrophic consequences, but there isn't a sufficient amount of evidence the trend to be true. It should have shown an increase in the 20th century, but it didn't. As mentioned above, the rise of CO<sub>2</sub> would help fertilize and increase the growth of the plants and amount, and also more rain.

So you would be gaining a lot in produce and farming. As mentioned in the treatise "How Will Global Warming Change Earth". Other than that the rising of seas are discussed to, but the rising in the waters more than seven inches are proven by data that it is unlikely. It would have little effect on wildlife, but it even has a positive effects such as, hurricanes would decrease in the frequency and severity. Although many scientists and people agree upon global warming being a rises, it is matter a fact not.

The increase of CO would greatly benefit us in many ways. Global warming just doesn't have enough liable evidence that it is a crisis, information is exaggerated and is only a theory from a computer. Even several pieces Of evidence state that our earth is in a cooling trend. So even though many people are arguing that it is a problem, it would only be a problem if carbon increased by humans significantly. So, with the evidence as is, there is more proof that its not as big as a problem as we might think.