

Global Warming: The Scientific View

As a scientist I have been asked to elaborate a bit on my position regarding the **Global Warming Theory** (GWT), and how it relates to wind energy. This is a very legitimate — and important — question.

Although I am not a climatologist, as a scientist **I know how to do objective research**. As such I have read some hundred reports and studies on the climate issue. (BTW, true scientists also have a healthy degree of skepticism.)

After digesting these studies and reports is very clear to me that GWT is still *a scientifically unresolved matter*.

An important point is that Climate Change is **not** the same as the GWT. There IS universal scientific consensus that we have experienced some recent Climate Change, so that is not the issue.

The crux of the matter is: what is the primary *cause* of these Climate Changes?

The “Global Warming Theory” is one possible explanation. The basic premise behind this hypothesis is that Climate Change is man-made (anthropogenic), primarily due to us introducing an increase in CO₂, etc. into the atmosphere through activities like burning fossil fuels. To be sure, there are good, credible people with sound scientific evidence to support this theory.

But the fact is that there are three BIG problems with this hypothesis:

1 - There is *considerable* scientific evidence that *contradicts* the assumptions and conclusions of this theory. Unfortunately, the main proponents of the GWT have not been able to provide credible scientific explanations for these contradictions. This seriously undermines the validity of their position.

Worse, when contradicting scientific evidence is put forward, the presenters are often characterized as “non-believers,” “deniers,” or worse — and are then excluded from the process (e.g. Kyoto). Allow me to repeat: sound science is based on **skepticism**, so all differing views should be *welcomed*. The nature of the GWT proponents response to other scientists’ differing conclusions gives their theory a bad name — and makes it sound more like a religion.

2 - The GWT is **entirely** built upon computer modeling projections. This is based on an underlying **assumption** that *complex scenarios* (future climate, wind power performance, financial derivatives) *can be accurately reduced to a collection of ones and zero*. Why do we believe this unproven and highly speculative assumption? *Because we’d like to be able to predict the future!*

The fact is that there is ample evidence that says that accurate modeling of such complex matters is **impossible** — yet we forge on, ignoring this reality.

3 - There are *other* theories that have been put forth by very qualified scientists, and these alternative explanations are also supported by significant scientific data. These other theories also have their weak points, but the fact is that they do explain some facets of the Climate Change situation better than the GWT does.

So to me, *this is not yet a scientifically resolved matter*. The jury is still out. We all need to keep an open mind about this issue, and try to work together to work it out in a civilized, expeditious, objective scientific manner.

How does this relate to wind power? Well, let's look at the two extremes:

1 - If you were a strong advocate of the GWT, you would also accept the dire immanent consequences postulated by its lead proponents (e.g. Hansen, Gore, Romm). As such you would be very committed to taking measures that were **sure** to result in a **large** reduction of CO₂, in **short order**. But all independent scientific evidence to date says that wind power only makes a trivial reduction of CO₂ — and well into the future at that. *As such you would be **against wind energy** as an inefficient use of time and money!*

2 - If, on the other hand, you believe that the Global Warming Theory is total bunk, then you would not be a believer in the concept that man-made CO₂ is causing us problems. Since the main reason for wind power's existence is its promise to meaningfully reduce CO₂, that would be of little value to you. *As such you would be **against wind energy** as a waste of time and money!*

So it seems to me that no matter which side of the Global Warming debate you fall on, **wind energy is not the answer**.

Then there are those who say something like: "but we need to be cautious here, and prepare for the worst" On the surface that seems to have some merit, but exactly what does being cautious mean — *and* what are its costs?

Let's look at an example that might put it into perspective. In the US there are some 42,000 people killed each year in motor vehicle accidents. It is an indisputable fact that slower speeds significantly reduce such fatalities — so lowering **all** highway speed limits to 30 MPH would save many THOUSANDS of lives annually? *So why isn't Greenpeace & UCS clamoring for this?*

Clearly there would be MANY other SIGNIFICANT negative consequences for this "cautious" response. So, similarly, before we make an equally radical change to our electrical grid system just to be "cautious," we ought to be fully aware of ALL of the consequences — **almost all of which appear to be bad**.

Lastly, there are those who insist we must do something — *anything!* Indeed we should not continue on with business as usual, as we have serious energy and environmental issues. But these people confuse activity with accomplishment. We need to take measures that have conservatively calculated good cost-benefits!

— DISPELLING SOME GLOBAL WARMING MYTHS —

(Note: since we have all been inundated by media supporting the GWT, I am listing the links below to give this some balance.)

Considering that there are literally thousands of article on this topic, it may be a fool's errand to try to summarize them into anything meaningful. In any case, that is my goal: to provide a layman's overview. Here goes...

1 - Some people have the idea that the IPCC is an independent science-based organization.

FACT: the IPCC is much more of a political organization.

An excellent summary of just some (50) of the articles written about the IPCC's flawed process <<<http://mclean.ch/climate/IPCC.htm>>>.

For a superb historical overview of how we got here, please read this summary by Climate Expert John Coleman <<<http://tinyurl.com/aea6m6>>>.

"Hysteria is the Real Threat" puts this situation (and some of the hidden agendas) into a good perspective <<<http://tinyurl.com/nuulur>>>.

— — — — —

2 - The public has repeatedly been told that the majority of scientists agree with the IPCC's position.

FACT: No such evidence exists, as no such poll has ever been taken.

See petition signed by 31,000+ scientists, stating that they do **not** believe that the GWT is a scientifically resolved matter: <<<http://www.petitionproject.org/>>>

A peer reviewed scientific assessment <<<http://tinyurl.com/3x7fc4>>>.

The conclusions of some 700 scientists: <<<http://tinyurl.com/nhv4py>>>.

A survey of 51,000 scientists <<<http://tinyurl.com/yvm3r3>>>.

Here is a list of scores of scientific studies disputing various aspect of the Global Warming theory <<<http://tinyurl.com/nccsm4>>>.

This scientist discusses how "settled" this matter is <<<http://tinyurl.com/ctpxqn>>>.

And there is this fascinating interview with a climate expert <<<http://tinyurl.com/leu7n2>>>.

Another interview of a Climate expert concludes that he doesn't agree with the Global Warming theory at all <<<http://tinyurl.com/rc5y9q>>>.

“Separating Scientific Fact from Personal Opinion,” a detailed critique of James Hansen’s 2007 US Congressional testimony (he is a principle Global Warming advocate): <<<http://tinyurl.com/d3gdzw>>>.

3 - Some people have the idea that science is based on what is the consensus view among scientists.

FACT: Science has NOTHING to do with “consensus.”

Michael Chrichton said it best:

“I regard consensus science as an extremely pernicious development that ought to be stopped cold in its tracks. Historically, the claim of *consensus* has been the first refuge of scoundrels; it is a way to avoid debate by claiming that the matter is already settled. Whenever you hear *the consensus of scientists agrees on...* something or other, reach for your wallet, because you’re being had.

Let’s be clear: the work of science has **nothing** whatever to do with *consensus*. **Consensus is the business of politics.** Science, on the contrary, requires only one investigator who happens to be right, which means that he or she has results that are verifiable by reference to the real world. In science, *consensus* is irrelevant. What is relevant is reproducible results. The greatest scientists in history are great precisely because they broke with the consensus.

This overviews the GWT consensus situation: <<<http://tinyurl.com/llhbfg>>>.

A scientist’s 2009 testimony before Congress <<<http://tinyurl.com/by7a2t>>>.

4 - The majority of people have the idea that computer models can accurately model essentially anything.

FACT: Computer models do NOT have the ability to accurately model complex scenarios. In other words, extremely complex scenarios (like future climate) can not be reduced to 1s and 0s.

An excellent discussion about the limitations and accuracy of computer models <<<http://reformedmusings.wordpress.com/2008/12/30/anthropological-global-warming-rip/>>>.

As a long time computer programmer, read my explanation as to why this is so: <<http://www.northnet.org/brvmug/WindPower/Models_of_Illusion.pdf>>.

This is an EXTREMELY important article (and relates to what I wrote about computer models [before this came out]): “Global warming: Our best guess is likely wrong” by three independent science experts: <<<http://tinyurl.com/l7w72w>>>.

5 - Many people believe that the IPCC's computer model conclusions are based on accurate hard data.

FACT: Garbage in garbage out. In addition to the inherent limitations of the computer model concept, there are profound inaccuracies with the data submitted to the climate computer models. Of course these inaccuracies lead to false results.

A study of surface stations in the US (which are an important part of global warming data) is found here <<<http://www.surfacestations.org/>>>, and elaborated on here <<<http://masterresource.org/?p=2632>>>.

Here is a report about the quality of land temperature data taken in the US (which is a key part of the basis used to support Global Warming predictions): <<<http://tinyurl.com/ngo4zg>>>.

This discusses some errors in tree-ring analyses, which is another key element in making conclusions about past climate <<<http://tinyurl.com/kmqzye>>>.

6 - Most people are not aware that essentially ALL of the IPCC's position is based on computer models. Make sure that you understand that clearly: ALL of the IPCC's position is based on computer models.

FACT: Translated, this means that the IPCC's conclusions are HIGHLY speculative.

IPCC Models' Fatal Errors <<<http://www.rocketscientistsjournal.com/>>>.

IPCC Model uncertainties <<<http://tinyurl.com/mpnhrj>>>.

"How Do Climate Models Work" by Dr. Roy Spencer, climatologist <<<http://www.drroyspencer.com/2009/07/how-do-climate-models-work/>>>.

7 - Most people are of the opinion that the IPCC objectively considers all options before coming to any conclusions, and encourages inputs from scientists to make their position more accurate.

FACT: the IPCC has a political agenda, and has discouraged all inputs from those who have other information or perspectives.

This comes from scientists who were personally involved with the IPCC. Read what they have to say about whether the process was political or scientific. Remember that any **Science-based** theory WELCOMES skeptical criticism, as it gives them an opportunity to consider other perspectives and to provide objective proof. **Political-based** theories REJECT skeptical criticism, as they do not want the fallacies of their agenda to be exposed. Which is going on here?

The Triumph of Doublespeak <<<http://tinyurl.com/mal8go>>>. This site also has over a hundred other papers on various aspects of global warming.

An MIT PhD finds the science seriously deficient <<<http://arxiv.org/pdf/0809.3762v3>>>.

An expert is barred by GWT advocates <<<http://tinyurl.com/mv8rbj>>>.

Scientists contest IPCC's claims <<<http://tinyurl.com/nl76dv>>>.

Read "Climate Change Reconsidered: The 2009 Report of the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change " <<<http://tinyurl.com/logkxo>>>.

"Forecasts by Scientists vs Scientific Forecasts" <<<http://tinyurl.com/n4qpw7>>>.

"The Bullies of Global Warming" <<<http://tinyurl.com/munesx>>>.

Another MIT PhD's views are stifled by the EPA, as being "against policy": <<<http://tinyurl.com/obxv8c>>>.

8 - Most people are of the opinion that man-made CO2 emissions is the only plausible explanation for Global Warming.

FACT: Not only is there a scientific dispute whether or not man-made CO2 emissions cause Global Warming, there are several other possible explanations for climate cycles, for example:

- a) Geo nuclear <<<http://climateréalists.com/index.php?id=3427>>>
- b) Other natural forces <<<http://tinyurl.com/nsphy7>>>
- c) Southern Oscillation Index <<<http://tinyurl.com/m5qr7e>>>
- d) Soot <<<http://tinyurl.com/luzzqo>>>
- e) Sulfates <<<http://tinyurl.com/nflwaw>>>
- f) Solar <<<http://tinyurl.com/qshbsu>>>; <<<http://tinyurl.com/mvvp6j>>>
- g) Cosmic Rays <<<http://tinyurl.com/mk9maz>>>.

9 - Now that you are thinking for yourself, here are some sample websites that have hundreds of articles about the science of global warming:

- a) Watts Up <<<http://wattsupwiththat.com/>>>
 - b) Climate Sanity <<<http://climatesanity.wordpress.com/>>>
 - c) International Climate Science Coalition <<<http://tinyurl.com/9wxgbs>>>
 - d) Climate Depot <<<http://www.climatedepot.com/>>>
 - e) Climate Science: Dr. Roger Pielke, sr <<<http://climatesci.org/>>>
 - f) Climate Audit <<<http://www.climateaudit.org/>>>
 - g) CO2 Science <<<http://www.co2science.org/>>>
 - h) Friends of Science <<<http://www.friendsofscience.org/>>>
- ... There are *MANY* more. Ask and I'll provide additional links.

10-If you'd like to go into even more detail, then:

Lindzen on Global Warming <<<http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2009/07/resisting-climate-hysteria>>>.

A timeline and a bibliography of the science and politics of climate science <<<http://tinyurl.com/nrw6fu>>> and <<<http://tinyurl.com/nxybgz>>>.

“Fallacies About Global Warming” (and MANY other related good articles at this site): <<<http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/originals/fallacies.html>>>.

An excellent summary about Global Warming Facts: <<http://environment.ncpa.org/files/GlobalWarmingPrimer_low.pdf>>.

“The Real Inconvenient Truth” is a lengthy, technical overview <<<http://www.junkscience.com/Greenhouse/>>>.

An informative Open Letter to McCain on Global Warming and its impact on the US energy policies: <<<http://tinyurl.com/5g4to7>>>.

Global Temperature Trends From 2500 BC To 2008 AD: Harris-Mann Climatology: <<<http://tinyurl.com/2s722m>>>.

Climate Realists beat Alarmists in debate <<<http://tinyurl.com/467q86>>>.

Movie: “The Great Global Warming Swindle” <<<http://tinyurl.com/yohrzy>>>.

Video: <<<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KLxicwiBQ7Q&fmt=18>>>.

There are numerous books, e.g. —

“Climate Change - A Natural Hazard” <<<http://tinyurl.com/ld86ot>>>.

”The Climate Caper” <<<http://tinyurl.com/m7hocj>>>.

“Global Warming: False Alarm” <<<http://tinyurl.com/lctmb6>>>.

So, the one thing that can NOT be said is that "*Global Warming is resolved.*" ANY independent assessment of this situation would conclude that the matter of "man-made global warming" is nowhere near being understood or resolved in any way or fashion.

One insightful observer commented that the whole Global Warming Theory was never about climate anyway — but rather it is ultimately about **control** (of population, lifestyle, energy use, etc.).

This material was prepared on the assumption that some readers were genuinely concerned about our environment (as I am), **and** were open-minded about what the science really does say. If you want more info, let me know.

John Droz, jr.

aaprjohn@northnet.org

physicist & environmental advocate

12/17/10