

If you don't regularly receive my reports, request a free subscription at steve_bakke@comcast.net!
Follow me on Twitter at <https://twitter.com/BakkeSteve> and receive links to my posts and more!

WHY I AM A SKEPTIC! OR AM I A DENIER? THAT'S THE "97%" QUESTION!

Stephen L. Bakke  June 28, 2014



Hey SB! I don't know about you, faithful (perhaps) disciple, but I'm confused with what the real controversy is regarding climate change or disruption. The alarmists are trying to lay claim to many of the true skeptics as being part of the "97% consensus." We skeptics aren't part of that alarmist crowd! I'm one of those skeptics who feel climate change exists – it always has! We might even agree that human CO2 production could have some environmental impact. But how much of that is positive and how much is negative? There is no evidence to convince me that humans make a big difference or that dramatic reduction in U.S. fossil fuel usage will make an appreciable difference! CO2 is only .04% of the atmosphere and human generated CO2 is only .16% of greenhouse gases. There are also many other natural factors that cause some of the symptoms the alarmists are pointing to! – **Stefano Bachovich** – obscure curmudgeon and wise political pundit – a prolific purveyor of opinions on just about everything – my primary "go to guy."

Skeptic or denier?

The alarmists have been trying desperately to blur the line between "deniers" and "skeptics." Originally, as I recall, "denier" indicated anyone who didn't agree with the climate interpretations and suggested solutions of the alarmists – the Al Gore crowd. We were all referred to as "deniers" by the alarmists. Then, as satellite warming measurement increases slowed and even stopped for a while, their numbers shrunk, or at least "cooled" in their urgency and enthusiasm, slightly different definitions were assigned to the opposition.

Deniers are now often crowded into a very small corner with those few who deny any unusual or erratic climate developments. And the alarmists began claiming that the large number of "non-deniers" all fit into the claim that we have 97% consensus as to facts and solutions. It just ain't so!

Instead, the skeptics are those in the very large center who would never deny that humans create CO2, and believe that excessive CO2 probably has some influence on climate. BUT, skeptics see no proof in the research that humans are the main cause of CO2 variations, nor that the effects of CO2 are catastrophic. Skeptics can't join in the radical policy and regulatory changes being bantered about. There is no proof for them that this is even needed, and if it were, there is nothing even close to convincing that these changes would improve anything. Therefore "skeptics" can't support "betting the (economic) farm" on the conclusions and policy imperatives of the radical alarmists.

We skeptics are not deniers! And we refuse to be included in the "97% consensus statistic."

Why is the terminology changing?

We started with “global warming”; then came to “climate change”; and now we witness an attempt to change again to “climate disruption.” Why? It’s my opinion that no matter what the models predict, the observations have influenced the “terminology police” to move from the bold prediction of catastrophic warming to the milder “climate change.” Why? Because warming actually stalled for a few years. Then, as the concern seemed to change to the deteriorating predictability, the emphasis seems now to be on “climate disruption.” Changing impressions lead to changing terminology.

I’m a skeptic but why? (In 300 words or less.)

The alarmist opinions, projections, and suggested policies are just words and numbers. I’m a skeptic because of a lot of other reasons, too numerous to list here, but I’ve written about most of them at one time or another. Here’s a partial list:

- Alarmist projections and policies depend primarily on models – untested ones.
- The projections are based on only limited prior observations.
- Thus far in the evolution of the science of global warming, the models have been unsuccessful in making satisfactory projections. Actual observations usually disprove the assumptions.
- Some startling projections will occur far into the future: e.g. “worst case” in 200 years; perhaps as far out as 1000 years.
- Atmospheric CO₂ has gone up, but there has been about 15 years of stable global temperatures.
- Only about 4 decades climatologists were predicting a coming ice age.
- The British “email scandal” proved that scientists who are non-alarmist were generally denied access to professional publications and the peer review endorsement process.
- The purveyors of doom and gloom can’t predict the cost of the policies being proposed.
- These “purveyors” can’t predict the extent or timing of any resulting improvement.
- The alarmists claim a 97% scientific consensus, but the accuracy of that claim is dubious at best.
- A prominent claim is that severe damage is being done to polar bears – but they are thriving.
- Another of the biggest claims has been the melting ice sheets. Refer to my last report on this topic re: record levels of ice. Total Antarctic ice is at record levels.
- Witness the changing terminology – global warming/climate change/climate disruption.
- Almost 96% of CO₂ come from mother nature, not humans; less than .16% of greenhouse gases come from humans; CO₂ is only .04% of the atmosphere; the increase in CO₂ since 1750 represents only .01% of the atmosphere – given these statistics, isn’t some skepticism warranted as to whether eliminating human causes of CO₂ will make an appreciable difference?
- One interesting observation that demands skepticism comes from Steven Goddard of Real Science. It appears that he has shown how, in recent years, NOAA’s US Historical Climatology Network has been “adjusting” its record by replacing real temperatures with data “fabricated/created” by computer models. If actual recorded data is analyzed, it’s apparent that the globe has been cooling since the 1930s – that decade may be the warmest in recent record. On the other hand, using the NOAA (allegedly) tampered data, shows a false warming trend.
- Over the past 130 years, the decade of the 1930s still has the most U.S. state high temperature records. Roughly 70% of the current state record highs were set prior to 1940. In the last 50 years, there were more new state record lows than highs. (This item from a report by 15 prominent scientists and meteorologists including Dr. George Wolff who formerly chaired the Environmental Protection Agency’s Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee.)
- And on and on!

Who is the latest IPCC disciple to be thrown under the global warming bus?

I mentioned earlier the scandal several years ago that proved the ill-treatment critics and skeptics were receiving from people associated with the IPCC – i.e. denying peer reviews and publication. All I will present here are two quotes from/about an IPCC scientist who recently began to challenge certain IPCC reports findings. He carefully concluded **that there were many hypotheses and model errors that were leading to much exaggerated results**. He describes his fellow academics' tactics against him personally as “McCarthy-style.” He’s been ostracized!

The problem we now have in the climate community is that some scientists are mixing up their scientific role with that of a climate activist. – Lennart Bengtsson, research fellow at the University of Reading, one of authors of the IPCC report. Because of this and similar statements, he recently has had his research suppressed and is professionally isolated by many in the alarmist establishment of the IPCC.

(Bengtsson’s research is) less than helpful Actually it is harmful as it opens the door for oversimplified claims of ‘errors’ and worse from the climate skeptics media side. – Comments from a “peer reviewer” after Bengtsson challenged his associates that there were hypotheses and model errors in the IPCC research and that the effect of climate change is much slower and milder than the IPCC claims. They don’t want him “stirring the pot.” The reviewer suggested not publishing Bengtsson’s research – simply because it is “unhelpful.”

In the interest of full disclosure, a question is warranted: Has my opinion evolved?

My CO2/climate change opinion has remained directionally consistent, but it has changed a bit! I’m much more resolved in my opinion that the alarmists are way off base, but I’m not a radical denier and never have been. Since I first put my opinion on paper in 2008, I’ve grown much wiser and noticeably more conservative. In the interest of full disclosure, in 2007 I wrote:

Developing alternative energy sources, including nuclear, is an imperative ... Global warming is now occurring and humans contribute to climate change ... The many problems identified by Mr. Gore et al, include some representations that aren’t just “spin”, but appear to be exaggerations, errors, incomplete representations, or misrepresentations ... The solutions advanced by Gore et al, most about reducing CO2 emissions, will have nowhere close to the impact that is suggested, and their successful implementation is doubtful and expensive in more ways than just economically ... There are many forces at play other than human influence in climate change and, before making impetuous or potentially wrong and damaging policy decisions, the debate needs to be continued - and in fact it is heating up ... There is CLEARLY no consensus!



Hey SB! Like I said There’s more than enough reason to be skeptical! I’m not sayin’..... I’m just sayin’! – **Stefano Bachovich** – obscure curmudgeon and wise political pundit – a prolific purveyor of opinions on just about everything – my primary “go to guy.”