

MY THOUGHTS ON GLOBAL WARMING

Stephen L. Bakke, December 2007

Contents	Page
Background	1
My Conclusions	2
Questions Raised By My Research	3
<i>Credible Debate Continues</i>	3
<i>Competing Information Creates Questions</i>	8
<i>What Should We Do?</i>	14
Breaking News!	17
Why Liberal vs. Conservative?	18
Kum Ba Yah	21
Sources of Information	21
<i>Books</i>	21
<i>Writers, Columnists, and Reporters Whose Material Was Used</i>	22
<i>Papers, Pamphlets, and Court Records</i>	23
<i>Websites and Newsletters Monitored Regularly</i>	23
Far-Fetched or Humorous	24

Background

The issue of climate change, and man's contribution to it, has always been a vague concept that didn't really grab my attention. I left it to others to deal with. The debate left an impression only in the back of my consciousness, and my knowledge was limited to sound bites and simplistic comments repeatedly issued by both sides of the issue.

Gradually, in 2005, I paid more attention. I was attracted by several things. I saw the polarizing (no pun intended) opinions forming along political lines – liberal/conservative, or democratic/republican – why? I observed Al Gore becoming uncharacteristically zealous about the issue – why? I observed him attempting to cut off the debate – why? I noted Al Gore's refusal to testify in Congress about the global warming issue. It was reported that he did this because he was advised there would be conflicting opinions presented in his presence – why react like that? I recalled his adamant statement as Vice-President, regarding his opposition to the Kyoto Protocol – using words like “no way, no how” – obviously an about-face – why? I heard demagoguery on both sides of this issue – why the change? I observed spokespersons on both sides of the issue treating the issue very simplistically when it isn't simple – why? I heard statements that there is no longer any disagreement, and that the debate is over – but I heard other obviously reputable experts disagreeing, saying the debate was most certainly not over – why the disagreement? And so on....

I became aware that most of the solutions suggested by Al Gore and others were extreme and would have huge, some said devastating, economic impact. Those solutions would be fine and good if the predictions are correct and if the solutions work. It was important

for me to understand the facts and arguments because I am cautious about making or supporting huge decisions if there is any question as to their necessity or effectiveness. Also, I tend to be curious and skeptical about any “sky is falling” declaration.

Or perhaps all of that is just intellectual justification, and not the real reason. Maybe I simply didn’t understand something that I found very intriguing and important.

My Conclusions

My conclusions are not very complicated:

- Cleaning and preserving the environment, including reducing CO2 emissions, is inherently good and self redeeming on its own merits – without regard to any related impact on global warming.
- Reducing our consumption of petroleum products is the right thing to do. And reducing our reliance on foreign energy sources is important for many reasons.
- Drilling in Alaska and the Gulf of Mexico is right to do in the short term.
- 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, in my opinion, aren’t just “spin”, but appear to be exaggerations, errors, incomplete representations, or misrepresentations.
- The solutions advanced by Mr. 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 are few easy or ideal solutions to the world’s problems. Let’s pay attention as science develops and the debate continues.
- There is **CLEARLY** no consensus! The debate is **CLEARLY** not over. After reading this I hope you understand why I reached that conclusion, even if you don’t agree with all of my opinions.

Why do I reach these conclusions? I honestly would not have compiled the same list prior to this project. While the information which I gathered from both sides of the

debate often can be described as “spinning” and misleading, my research assures me that the absolute certainty displayed by Al Gore and others is incorrect, misleading, and potentially very risky. I do not pretend to be a scientific expert, nor could I effectively debate this issue with many of those who disagree with me. I just know that informed logic doesn’t compel the actions suggested by climate change zealots. I will present observations and questions prompted by apparent exaggerations, apparent misstatements, inconsistencies, incomplete representations, and apparent research errors.

I think it is unfortunate that Al Gore and others have presumed Mr. Gore into the de-facto leadership position on this issue. There are so many more who, for me, would be more influential in that role. Nevertheless there he is – he’s the one the public listens to. As a result many of my comments refer to him, his group, et al, or a similar reference. His presence, in the context of his book and movie, seem to make my job easier and place an exclamation mark on my arguments. If you notice some bias in how I frame my comments or conclusions – to that I plead guilty. The bias exists because I am writing this after almost 1 ½ years of considerable research and thought, and to eliminate my bias from this writing would take more energy than I want to expend – and I’m not sure I would prefer the result.

Certainly, many points made by the zealots are “right on”. For example, I believe humans do contribute to climate change – and some opposition to their theories and opinions are “knee-jerk” and simplistic. Even more certainly, some of the questions I raise could be incorrect, or eventually proven to be incorrect. And I am quite sure I have made some errors in interpretation. But taken as a whole, I believe these points probably will remain relevant and should be sustained as part of the debate. Of course, my opinions are always subject to adjustment as new information is available.

Questions Raised By My Research

The work I have done has discovered some very good points to be made in favor of concern about climate change. My goal here is not to enumerate those with which I agree. Rather, I want to present why I feel the debate has only just begun. I will do this by listing some of the observations and questions that prevent me from “jumping aboard” Mr. Gore’s runaway train. Some of what I present gives examples of credible evidence that the debate does go on, whether we like it or not, and it must continue in order to better assure the right outcome. I will also try to present important questions raised in my mind and others, and the competing opinions and their basis.

Credible Debate Continues

“Only an insignificant fraction of scientists deny the global warming crisis. The time for debate is over. The science is settled.” So said Al Gore way back in 1992. Even then it was shown to be obviously incorrect. A Gallup pole at the time reported that 53% of scientists actively involved in global climate research did not believe global warming had

occurred; 30% weren't sure; and only 17% believed global warming had begun. AI has bad habits that are hard to break. Here are some examples of how the debate continues:

- In March 2007, there was an Oxford-style debate in New York sponsored by Intelligence Squared, a debating society. Brenda Ekwurzel of the Union of Concerned Scientists, Gavin Schmidt of NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies and Richard Somerville of the Scripps Institution for Oceanography argued that global warming is a crisis. Michael Crichton, Dr. Richard Lindzen of MIT, and Dr. Philip Stott of the University of London argued that it was not. The audience was polled both before and after the debate with 57% believing in the crisis before the debate, with only 42% after hearing the arguments. The more facts people learn, the less they tend to agree with the alarmists.
- At a recent (2007) debate over global warming sponsored by National Public Radio, the audience was polled beforehand and was solidly on the side of the more alarmist predictions. Afterwards, they switched to a slight majority against those predictions. I don't find where Al Gore has ever debated his positions directly (with the possible exception of a debate with Rush Limbaugh about 15 years ago – that could have been like the “extreme” debating the “ridiculous”).
- NASA's top administrator Michael Griffin feels the need to debate. He recently stated that while warming is occurring, he is not yet sure - “it is fair to say that it is a problem we must wrestle with”. He is by no means a technical expert, but he is a high level official who is close to many who are, and he feels the need to be cautious in making judgments. He has received much criticism for this.
- There seems to have been a shift in momentum in climate science. Many former believers in the catastrophic theory have recently reversed themselves and are now skeptics. Here is just a sampling of those who have recently spoken out to oppose the “consensus” theory. I understand that a soon to be released Senate report will include a much more comprehensive list (I can't find the list if it already has been released – my source for this information is a Senate related website)..... **Dr. Claude Allegre**, a top geophysicist and French Socialist – he was an early proponent of the warnings and now says the causes of global warming are “unknown” and refers to his former colleagues as “prophets of doom”.....Geologist **Bruno Wiskel** of the University of Alberta recently reversed his view – this resulted from a closer review of the science behind the attempts being made in favor of adopting the Kyoto Protocol..... Astrophysicist **Dr. Nir Shaviv**, a young Israeli award winning scientist – his further review of the evidence behind the CO2 theory led him to state that “things are far more complicated than the story sold to us by many climate scientists” – he believes some of the causes come from solar activity..... Mathematician and engineer **Dr. David Evans**, who did carbon accounting for the Australian Government stated “When I started that job in 1999, the evidence that carbon emissions caused global warming seemed pretty conclusive, but since then new evidence has weakened the case that carbon emissions are the main cause”..... Botanist **Dr.**

David Bellamy, famed UK environmentalist recently converted after reviewing the science relating to natural phenomenon contributing significantly to global warming..... **Dr. Chris de Freitas** of The University of Auckland, N.Z. wrote in 2006, “with the results of research...it is unlikely that the man-made changes are drivers of significant climate variation”.....Meteorologist **Dr. Reid Bryson**, founding chairman of the Department of Meteorology at the University of Wisconsin (now The Department of Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences).....Global warming author and economist **Hans H.J. Labohm**.....Paleoclimatologist **Tim Patterson**, of Carlton University in Ottawa..... Physicist **Dr. Zbigniew Jaworowski**, chairman of the Central Laboratory for the U.N. Scientific Committee on the Effects of Radiological Protection in Warsaw.....Paleoclimatologist **Dr. Ian D. Clark**, professor of the Department of Earth Sciences at University of Ottawa.....Environmental geochemist **Dr. Jan Veizer**, professor emeritus of University of Ottawa.....This is just the tip of the iceberg – you can expect to hear of more and more defections.

- Climate researcher **Dr. Tad Murty**, former Senior Research Scientist for Fisheries and Oceans in Canada co-authored a 2006 letter to the Canadian Prime Minister which stated in part, “If, back in the mid-1990s, we knew what we know today about climate, Kyoto would almost certainly not exist.” He was one of 60 who sent the letter urging the PM to undertake “a proper assessment of recent developments in climate science”. It also disputed the contention that “a climate catastrophe is looming and humanity is the cause”. The letter cautioned that “observational evidence does not support today’s computer climate models” and warned that since the study of climate change is relatively new, “it may be many years yet before we properly understand the earth’s climate system”.
- Referring to the letter from the prior item, also signing the letter were **Fred Singer**, former director of the U.S. Weather Satellite Service; **Ian Clark**, hydrogeology and paleoclimatology specialist at the University of Ottawa; **Hendrik Tennekes**, former director of research at the Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute; physicist **Freeman Dyson** of the Princeton Institute for Advanced Studies; the University of Alabama’s **Roy Spencer**, formerly senior scientist in climate studies at NASA’s Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville, Alabama. There were 55 more qualified individuals, but I will stop there.
- In 2006, the director of the International Arctic Research Center in Fairbanks, Alaska testified to Congress that highly publicized climate models showing a disappearing Arctic were nothing more than “science fiction” (he was taking exception to the models, not stating that nothing is changing in the Arctic).
- While everyone was castigating the U.S. for not jumping onto the Kyoto bandwagon, we were the only country at the meeting in Bali (December 2007) with CO2 emissions declining in 2006. This is from the Energy Information Administration. U.S. CO2 emissions also fell most recently in 2001 and 1990.

- According to the 2007 IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change – Al Gore’s co-winner of the Nobel Peace Prize) report, ground based warming ceased in 1998 – this despite an increase in CO₂ by 4% over the last 8 years. And satellite data also shows little, if any, warming since 1979, although atmospheric CO₂ has increased by 17%. This certainly supports continuing the debate.
- I find the IPCC reports helpful, worthy, and much more balanced than Al Gore’s work. However, even some contributors to IPCC have problems with being associated with portions of the report they were not involved in and with which they disagree. The claim that “2500 top scientists” support the theory of man made global warming is reported to be misleading. This number includes many politicians, other non-scientists, and even some who now are counted among the dissenters. Some believe there is unauthorized selective editing of what they personally have written and submitted. One example is Paul Reiter of the Pasteur Institute who felt his views were not considered but he was listed as one of the contributors. He had to sue to have his name removed.
- In 2003, environmental scientists Dennis Bray and Hans von Storch surveyed 530 of their peers in 27 countries on topics related to global warming. One question asked, “To what extent do you agree or disagree that climate change is mostly the result of anthropogenic (human) causes?” On a scale of 1 (strongly agree) to 7 (strongly disagree), the average score was 3.62, reflecting no clear consensus.
- Referring to the same survey as in the last item, asked whether abrupt climate changes will wreak devastation in some areas of the world, the percentage of scientists strongly agreeing (9.1%) was nearly identical to the percentage strongly disagreeing (9.0%). Another question asked to what degree might global warming prove beneficial for some societies? A striking 34% of the scientists answered 1 or 2 (a great degree of benefit); just 8.3% answered 6 or 7 (very little or no benefit). Plainly, the science isn’t settled. It changes all the time.
- The 2007 report of the IPCC foresees the possible (according to some models) rise in sea levels of about 17 inches over the next century. This is less than half the maximum projection in the prior (2001) report. Why the revision? The IPCC states in their fine print that it was “mainly because of improved information”. And, appropriately, they still admit their research involves guesswork. Science is getting better but far from settled – the debate goes on.
- In October 2007, in the British High Court of Justice, Mr. Justice Burton ruled that Mr. Gore’s film could not be shown in British schools unless opposing opinions and information was also communicated (i.e. separate appropriate guidance has to be provided). His ruling referred to nine specifically identified errors, exaggerations, and misrepresentations in the film. Some of the glaring flaws in research and presentation are becoming clear to more than just a few.

- Referring to the prior point, the nine errors (the word “error” was used by Judge Burton, not introduced by me) highlighted by this judge are (very abbreviated): (1) Sea level rise of up to 20 feet will be caused by melting of either West Antarctica or Greenland in the near future....(2) Low lying inhabited Pacific atolls are being inundated because of anthropogenic global warming.....(3) Shutting down of the “Ocean Conveyor”.....(4) Direct coincidence between rise in CO2 in the atmosphere and in temperature (referring to two graphs).....(5) The snows of Kilimanjaro melting.....(6) Drying up of Lake Chad.....(7) Hurricane Katrina caused by global warming.....(8) Death of polar bears.....(9) Bleaching of coral reefs...I will deal with several of these in more detail later in this report.
- In 2004 a panel of 8 world-renowned economists (including three Nobel laureates) met to discuss and prioritize proposals that address ten of the world’s greatest challenges. This group is referred to as the “Copenhagen Consensus”. The challenges and solutions, presented as alternatives to be prioritized, were those identified by the United Nations. The climate related challenge (global warming) and the suggested solution (e.g. Kyoto) were rated at the absolute bottom of the list of priorities. Diseases and malnutrition were ranked one and two. For comparison, a group of scientists also gathered, and the results were very similar. And here is something surprising – a sampling of U.N. ambassadors also were given this challenge and results were again similar. They all had to choose between alternatives, while being limited by resources, and having been given information on projected results of various actions or inactions. In other words, we should deal with facts, not submit to panic and emotions.
- In August 2007, NASA acknowledged it had accidentally inflated its official record of surface temperatures in the U.S. beginning with the year 2000. A Canadian statistician discovered the error. Al Gore had emphasized these statistics when he reported that nine of the ten hottest years in history have been in the last decade, with 1998 the warmest on record – he made a “big deal” about this. The revised data show 1998 falling to second place behind 1934 as the warmest year, followed by 1921, 2006, 1931, 1999, and 1953, 1990, 1938, and 1939. Note that only one year in the last five is on this list, and only three (rather than nine as Al Gore had stated) in the top ten are from the past decade. The 1930s now had 4 in the top ten. Mr. Gore has avoided dealing with this disclosure.
- Expanding on the last point, new data are also emerging that the temperature record should be adjusted even further downward. There is preliminary evidence that land use changes over the years may be contaminating temperature records. Some recording stations that were originally isolated are now located in alleys (new construction), near air conditioning units (in the flow of heat from the condensers), in parking lots (concrete), and other heat generating environments.
- The IPCC uses models to predict the future. The results are varying enough from subsequent actual measurements that some scientists state with confidence that it

points to lessening evidence of human impact and increases the apparent impact of natural climate variability. The theoretical and the observed already conflict.

- In 2001, NASA released information that there had been discovered a phenomenon that mitigates virtually all of the warming effects of CO₂ (in some experts' opinion). They also stated that their models did not consider the effect of this in their projections. There was very little or no media attention given to this significant event. The discovery is called a "heat vent". It is very technical, but here goes: The cooling/venting efficiency of rainfall over the oceans increases when sea temperatures rise above 28 degrees C. This has a cooling affect, and mitigates the tendency for warming to create water vapor. It acts sort of like a "governor"... (Ole just told me to stop while I'm ahead).
- An example of "spin", or misrepresentation, comes from a news report stating that "The EPA says sea levels **may** rise as much as 3.5 feet, in line with the warnings of the IPCC". The EPA really said that in the next 100 years, there is a 1% (or nil – Ed.) chance of rising 3.5 feet. Finding this type of bias should fuel the debate.
- The U.N. can be scary when you consider how it is involved in any multi-national movement to address climate change (IPCC or Kyoto). I found a quote by Maurice Strong, founder of the U.N. Eco-Summit and an Undersecretary General, as follows: "Isn't the only hope for the planet that the industrial civilizations collapse? Isn't it our responsibility to bring about?" This isn't much different than a quote by environmental activist Paul Ehrlich: "Economic growth in rich countries like ours is the disease, not the cure." Or, Matt Lauer who stated: "Us homo sapiens are turning out to be as destructive a force as any asteroid....consume too much...." What's the motive? Take it for what it's worth.

At this point in my presentation it's time to remind you of my purpose. When you have completed reading this report, considering everything I will by then have presented, and whether or not you agree with me or others referred to herein, I ask you to re-evaluate Al Gore's very specific representation that "zero" percent of scientific writing is in disagreement with his basic assertions about global warming. The debate was always there and never went away.

Competing Information Creates Questions

Here I present two sides of the debate. First I state either an assertion by many alarmists or a common impression held by many in the general public – this followed by the argument from dissenters, or information which seems to contradict the assertion.

- *Assertion or Common Impression:* CO₂ is a significant portion of total greenhouse gases. *Competing Information:* CO₂ comprises 3.6% of total greenhouse gases (the largest by far is water vapor).

- *Assertion or Common Impression:* Humans contribute a large portion of the greenhouse effect. *Competing Information:* Humanity is responsible for about one-quarter of one percent of the greenhouse effect. The effect of ocean biologic activity, volcanoes, decaying plants, animal activity, etc. account for almost 17 times more than humanity. The balance, approximately 95% of the total, is the result of water vapor.
- *Assertion or Common Impression:* CO₂ causes warming which increases water vapor in the upper atmosphere, thus amplifying warming. *Competing Information:* Probably not true because there is no available evidence that upper atmosphere water vapor is increasing.
- *Assertion or Common Impression:* Human's are emitting significant percentages of total CO₂ production. *Competing Information:* Humans contribute approximately 3.4% of annual CO₂ levels compared to 96.6% by nature. Several of the above items emphasize the insignificance of the human "share" or contribution. While humans do contribute to climate change, given the proportions we have seen here, how can humans make the compelling difference being attributed to them by the alarmists?
- *Assertion or Common Impression:* CO₂ is at or approaching historically high levels. *Competing Information:* During the Cambrian Period (550 million years ago) there was an explosion of life forms when CO₂ was 18 times higher than today, and during the Jurassic Periods (dinosaurs were prominent – less than 200 million years ago) CO₂ levels were up to 9 times higher than today.
- *Assertion or Common Impression:* The earth's present average temperature is at relatively high historical levels. *Competing Information:* At present, the average global temperatures are at very low levels if all historically available information is considered – back many centuries, millennia and far beyond.
- *Assertion or Common Impression:* There is absolute certainty that temperature and CO₂ levels are closely related. *Competing Information:* Over very long periods of time, covering even millions of years of available data, there is no close relationship between CO₂ levels and temperature. However, over the much shorter term (looking at the last 400,000 years), it is clear that the two have moved together, i.e. positively correlated, but with temperature fluctuations occurring **in advance of** CO₂ fluctuations (so, what is causing what?).
- *Assertion or Common Impression:* We are at the start of a warming period. *Competing Information:* Historical data suggests that we are currently at the tail end of a warm period.
- *Assertion or Common Impression:* If we look at the much more recent term, we are at a relatively high point for surface temperatures. *Competing Information:* During Roman and medieval times, the Earth was as warm or warmer than it is

today. If we look at the last 3 millennia, we are at a very low point in surface temperatures. And if we look at the past century, the Earth's average temperature has risen a little less than 1 degree Celsius, with almost half of this warming occurring before 1940. But note that greenhouse gas emissions began to rise substantially only after 1950. There's some contradiction here.

- *Assertion or Common Impression:* The industrial age has caused an increase in CO2 levels with the increases accelerating greatly in recent decades. *Competing Information:* Partly in agreement – the CO2 increases since the beginning of the industrial revolution (approximately 1750) have been significant, about 35%. But 80% of that increase occurred prior to 1950.
- *Assertion or Common Impression:* The U.S. is taking less action to control CO2 emissions than Europe, wherein reside many of our biggest critics. *Competing Information:* The U.S. has slowed the growth of its emissions far more than the European Union – despite larger population growth and higher economic growth. And in 2006, it was recently announced that the U.S. emissions of CO2 showed an absolute decrease.
- *Assertion or Common Impression:* The debate is over and the science is decided. An insignificant percentage of scientists disagree with the seriousness of the situation presented by Al Gore regarding human contribution to climate change. *Competing Information:* According to a recent survey, approximately 56 percent of climate scientists worldwide believe humans are the cause of global warming.
- *Assertion or Common Impression:* Climate change models predict a high level of global temperature increase in the next century. *Competing Information:* The IPCC presents ranges of information with 6 degrees Celsius at the extreme for the increase in the next century. These models are subject to error and are coming under increased scrutiny. Models already need adjustment as shown in other sections of this report. Both James Hansen of NASA, the father of the greenhouse theory, and Richard Lindzen of MIT, considered by many the most renowned climatologist in the world, agree that even if nothing is done to restrict greenhouse gases, the world will only see a global temperature increase of about 1 degree C in the next 50 to 100 years. Hansen and his colleagues “predict additional warming in the next 50 years of 0.5 plus or minus 0.2 degree C...” Note that the total increase in average global temperatures over the past century was 0.6 degree C.
- *Assertion or Common Impression:* Sea levels are rising at record levels. *Competing Information:* Sea levels have been rising since the Earth began to come out of the last ice age. However, the rate of sea level rise since 1961 (less than 1/8 inch) is far lower than the historical average.
- *Assertion or Common Impression:* Melting of the Arctic ice cap is contributing to the rising sea levels. *Competing Information:* The Arctic ice cap is floating and

any floating ice that melts adds no volume to the water in which it was floating (remember that floating ice displaces an equal mass of water).

- *Assertion or Common Impression:* The polar bear population is decreasing. *Competing Information:* There are approximately 20 different polar bear “populations” (or geographical groups) in the world. Only two of these are decreasing, and recreational hunting can account for the reduction in at least one of these two groups. Curiously, the two populations which are decreasing are in habitats which show measured cooling in recent years. Overall, polar bear numbers increased dramatically from around 5,000 in the 1950s to as many as 25,000 today. This is higher than at any time in the 20th century.
- *Assertion or Common Impression:* Hurricanes are becoming more powerful and prominent in recent years. *Competing Information:* Neither the number, nor the strength of hurricanes has increased outside the normal range since approximately 1945. Data indicates that for the time around 1950 and 1965, more hurricanes occurred than in recent years.
- *Assertion or Common Impression:* Global warming is increasing weather related deaths. *Competing Information:* Worldwide weather related deaths have declined dramatically over the past eight decades due to the fact that while small numbers of heat related deaths can be attributed to global warming as it advances, a far greater number of cold related deaths are avoided. Al Gore used an example of a European country that suffered several dozen more deaths in a recent heat wave. What was omitted was that the same year, which was warmer than normal, exhibited far fewer cold related deaths than normal – the net result was a significant reduction of “temperature” related deaths overall for the year in question. A good example of partial truths being told.
- *Assertion or Common Impression:* Malaria deaths are increasing due to global warming. *Competing Information:* Rather than warming being the problem, DDT is the problem – not the use of it but the lack of use of it. Many millions of people have died needlessly from malaria since the use of DDT was eliminated several decades ago. It is now generally accepted that using DDT in the right volumes is very safe and effective – even indoors! In the case of malaria, the amount necessary to kill the offending mosquitoes is very small. Its acceptance is slowly coming back but must overcome an unfair stigma. As a footnote to this point, the elimination of DDT came almost directly as a result of Rachel Carson’s 1962 book “Silent Spring” in which she made largely unfair and unsubstantiated attacks on DDT and other “Killer Chemicals”. Incidentally, Al Gore has pledged his loyalty to Ms. Carson – his environmental mentor.
- *Assertion or Common Impression:* Droughts are occurring more frequently due to global warming. *Competing Information:* Natural variability has produced more frequent and longer droughts in the past than we experience today.

- *Assertion or Common Impression:* There are no advantages to CO₂ increases. *Competing Information:* Historical records, and laboratory results, show that plants grow bigger and faster with increased levels of CO₂. It is like a plant food and most plants evolved at times when CO₂ levels were much higher than today.
- *Assertion or Common Impression:* The Kyoto Protocol is essential to stopping global warming. *Competing Information:* This is an international treaty designed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from industrial countries an average of 5% below their 1990 levels by 2012. Even if all of the countries complied, the Earth would be only marginally cooler by 2100 (less than .2 degree Celsius).
- *Assertion or Common Impression:* Developed countries alone can prevent global warming. *Competing Information:* Developing countries currently don't have to comply with the treaty. Greenhouse gas concentrations will continue to increase despite CO₂ cuts in developed countries because the fast growing developing countries (China, India, South Korea, Brazil, and Indonesia) will account for as much as 85% of the projected increase over the next two decades.
- *Assertion or Common Impression:* Al Gore's presentation addresses the concept of thermohaline circulation in the oceans. He uses the term "ocean conveyor" and says global warming will "shut down" this circulation, thereby plunging Europe into an ice age. *Competing Information:* Disruption perhaps, "shut down" no – it is universally accepted that the thermohaline circulation cannot be and will not be shut down by global warming. Mr. Gore's co-winner of the Nobel, the IPCC also takes exception to his assertion.
- *Assertion or Common Impression:* Mr. Gore says that in each of the last four interglacial warm periods it was changes in carbon dioxide concentration that caused changes in temperature. *Competing Information:* It was the other way around. Changes in temperature preceded changes in CO₂ concentration by between 800 and 2800 years. One of Mr. Gore's scientific sources also points out this error. The scientific literature is almost unanimous on this as pointed out by the judge in the British lawsuit referred to on page 6.
- *Assertion or Common Impression:* Mr. Gore says global warming has been melting the snows of Mount Kilimanjaro in Africa. *Competing Information:* The melt of this glacier began 125 years ago. More of the glacier had disappeared before Hemingway wrote "The Snows of Kilimanjaro" in 1936 than afterward. Temperature at this glacier has never risen above freezing. The likely cause is climate shifts exacerbated by imprudent regional deforestation – thus the area can't melt but has been drying. The "melting" is most likely just evaporation.
- *Assertion or Common Impression:* Hurricane Katrina was man-made according to Al Gore – global warming was the cause. *Competing Information:* Refer to a prior comment on the data related to hurricanes and global warming on page 11.

It was not a record setting storm for intensity. The damage and suffering was exceptional due to the failed levee and other failed infrastructure.

- *Assertion or Common Impression:* Arctic temperature increase has caused the massive melting of the icecap. *Competing Information:* In November 2007, a team of NASA and university scientists detected an ongoing reversal in Arctic Ocean circulation triggered by atmospheric circulation changes that vary on decade-long time scales. And in December 2007 it was determined that fewer clouds resulted in more sunshine, thereby warming arctic waters more than normal. This is attributed to normal weather pattern variability. These phenomena contributed to Arctic melting previously attributed exclusively to temperature increase. This, in part, helps me accept the difficult concept that overall, the Arctic has in fact been cooling over the past 60 years, and is now 1 degree Celsius cooler than it was in the 1940s. There were many reports that the so-called “Northwest Passage” was free of ice in 2007 and that this was the first time since records began – but these records go back only to the 1970s. In fact, the Northwest Passage had also been open for shipping in 1945. In 1903 the great Norwegian explorer Roald Amundsen passed through it in a sailing ship. This is not the thing upon which myths are made – it apparently was very real, very recently.
- *Assertion or Common Impression:* Again referring to Mr. Gore addressing glacial melt, he states that 40% of the world’s population gets their water supply from Himalayan glacial melt waters and that these are failing because of global warming. *Competing Information:* They don’t, and they are not. The water comes almost entirely from snow melt and not from ice melt. And over the past 40 years there has been no decline in the amount of snow melt in Eurasia.
- *Assertion or Common Impression:* Al Gore represents that glaciers worldwide are disappearing. *Competing Information:* The glacial melt began in the 1820s, long before humans could have had any effect, and has continued at a uniform rate since. It has shown no acceleration since humans began increasing the quantity of CO₂ in the atmosphere. In fact, total ice volumes in three of the last four Ice Ages were lower than they are today. Man-made global warming certainly had nothing to do with that.
- *Assertion or Common Impression:* Greenland ice is breaking up and in serious decline endangering many things including the sea levels, ocean currents, and European climate. *Competing Information:* There are areas in Greenland where the ice has been reducing. But only Greenland’s southern glaciers are melting. A 2006 study in the Journal of Geophysical Research demonstrated that Greenland is in a prolonged cold spell unequaled since the 1910s. The December 2005 issue of Journal of Glaciology reports that the Greenland ice sheet is, overall, growing and thickening rather than shrinking. This was from a study conducted by Norwegian, Russian, and American scientists. And in December 2007, a scientific study was released indicating that “hot spots” under Greenland caused

some of the apparent melting. Magma is warming the ice where the earth's crust is thinnest. The cause of these "hot spots" is not known.

- *Assertion or Common Impression:* Continuing the question of Greenland's ice sheet, as presented on a 2006 CBS News "60 Minutes" segment, correspondent Scott Pelly claimed that the ice in Greenland was melting so fast that he barely got off an iceberg before it collapsed. *Competing Information:* The impression left is clear and vivid – and incorrect. "60 Minutes" failed to inform its viewers that a 2005 study by a scientist named Ola Johannessen and his colleagues showed that the interior of Greenland is gaining ice mass and that, according to scientists, the Arctic was warmer in the 1930s than today. Again partial truths seem too common in this debate.
- *Assertion or Common Impression:* The Antarctic ice sheet is melting due to global warming. *Competing Information:* Mean Antarctic temperature has actually fallen throughout the past half-century. Total Antarctic sea ice spread to a 30 year record in 2007. In fact, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration reports that Antarctic sea ice is currently at its greatest extent in recorded history, showing that sea ice retreat is local rather than global. For example, Mr. Gore specifically dealt with a reduction of a specific ice shelf which is located on the Antarctic Peninsula. This is the northernmost section of Antarctica and it is wrong and very misleading to imply that this small area should represent the entire continent. Unfortunately, there's no question of the message conveyed.
- *Assertion or Common Impression:* Al Gore refers to carbon dioxide as "global warming pollution". *Competing Information:* It is not. It is food for plants and trees. Even at levels many times greater than today's concentrations (which I am not suggesting would be OK!), even the most delicate plants flourish. CO₂ is essential and, in geological timescale, currently has a very low concentration.
- *Assertion or Common Impression:* Al Gore says that the prediction that atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide will rise to more than 600 parts per million by volume as soon as 2050, is "not controversial in any way or in dispute by anybody". *Competing Information:* Not one of the half-dozen official projections of growth in CO₂ concentration made by the IPCC (Gore's co-winner of the recent Nobel Peace Prize) shows as much as 600 parts per million by 2050.

While more could be presented, that is enough to illustrate the continuing debate.

What Should We Do?

While constructing this section I was influenced by several sources, including the IPCC. But I must point out that my biggest influence for this section came from articles by Bjorn Lomborg and his book entitled "Cool It". He was a uniquely credible source because he asserts global warming as being man made, and at the same time he is

reasonable and extremely analytical in his evaluation of global warming's likely impact. He develops meaningful and practical solutions. He considers both science and economics, and usually ends up, in my opinion, with a very logical result. So here goes.

First, let's just calm down. We need to seriously study what we can really do about the problem and then decide among alternatives, including the likelihood or practicality of "old fashioned" adaptation. But while we are starting this process we need to keep studying climate change in general and let the science develop – let the debate continue. I am confident in this approach because I agree with Mr. Lomborg that the alarmists are way out of line in their predictions of the extent and impact of global warming. He also extensively analyzes, technically and economically, the impact of remedies such as Kyoto. He asserts that whatever the cause, we need to decide wisely what to do to devise simple, smart, and efficient solutions. We must reject most of the existing excessive and ineffective, albeit well meaning, alarmists' programs.

We need to get our perspective back and remember there are many other issues which we may find are equal or more important than global warming. For example, refer to the discussion of the Copenhagen Consensus referred to on page 7. The approach I am suggesting should make sense to those who agree with my opinion as to causes and effects of global warming, and the futility of programs such as Kyoto.

- Set aside any further consideration of the Kyoto Protocol. Remember, there is ample evidence that even if the world were to comply 100% with the provisions, the benefit would be miniscule even after a century – arguably only 3 degrees F lower temperature. This data is not terribly controversial, even according to the IPCC modelers. And the Washington Post refers to Kyoto as "mostly symbolic". But isn't it better than nothing? But at what cost?! If the Kyoto Protocol is complied with we will see very little benefit, and the economic costs would be staggering. Reasonable persons have said it could result in the end of society and civilization as we know it. **It's not as if Kyoto would work, while being too expensive. It wouldn't work AND the costs would be devastating.**
- We can safely dispense with the concern with any increase of heat related deaths. It can be effectively demonstrated that heat related deaths are far less than the reduction in cold related deaths. The death rate will actually decrease overall. And we should use our wealth to develop technologies to eliminate the very small increase in heat related deaths. This can be done.
- For the developing world, which will be most harshly affected by negative effects of warming, we don't serve them well by expending funds on hopeless measures such as Kyoto. Rather, we should use those savings to make a meaningful difference such as fighting HIV/AIDS through research and new medications.
- And how about other "third world" concerns like malaria, typhus, and other serious insect born diseases. We should wisely use the money saved from avoiding Kyoto by fighting these and other diseases in very effective ways. For

example, the use of DDT (now determined not to be harmful if used correctly) will relatively easily and cheaply wipe out many of these diseases. DDT would improve the lifestyle in wealthy countries as well.

- Rising sea level is another concern for the next 100 years. If it is to happen, the best estimate is approximately a one foot increase – about the same as the last 150 years. Knowing this in advance will give us the opportunity to implement adaptive measures along our coasts as we have done with success in past decades and centuries. Society will make changes if they have the resources.
- Those supporting Kyoto are concerned with hurricanes increasing in frequency and intensity. However, evidence indicates that if there is an increase in hurricane damage it will most likely will be due to societal forces (e.g. more people living closer to coasts) and not more frequent or stronger storms. If we have saved money by avoiding the predictably worthless Kyoto efforts, we can deal with structural and infrastructure improvements.
- Starvation, water shortages, etc. etc. Again, if we make the right choices for economic resource allocation, we can make the right social policy changes. Kyoto wouldn't have worked and we wouldn't have had the funds to make these choices and changes. There is no indication that overall crop production will do anything but improve, and our water resources will remain. The problem may well have more to do with allocation and distribution, so that everyone has access to what is predictably an adequate supply.
- If we don't spend money foolishly (e.g. Kyoto), we will have more available to spend on R&D for renewable and non-carbon energy sources, including nuclear.
- And so on. I believe this is the best approach given what we know today.

So, really the answer is to pick the choices that DO GOOD (e.g. adaptation, research, infrastructure, social policies) not just ones that FEEL GOOD (e.g. Kyoto). Given the most likely results of global warming we need to combine adaptive strategies (e.g. infrastructure) while doing other things to reduce or eliminate damage (e.g. R&D for energy) and applying known remedies like DDT for disease. **This is all possible because science truly is not telling us to act in an alarmist and foolish way.**

Refer to the information presented earlier about the Copenhagen Consensus on page 7. We should find a good lesson in that exercise. We can all react better, as wealthy nations with resources “dealing with and adapting”, than we could with very few resources and weak economies. The latter would be the likely result of pursuing the wasteful strategies of the Kyoto Protocol. And as we continue to listen to science and continue the debate, it won't be long until we will discover even better short and long term strategies.

Breaking News!

As I complete this report (December 2007), Al Gore and others (190 countries including the U.S.) are participating in the Bali conference on global warming. One of the stated goals is to renegotiate the Kyoto Protocol to extend beyond its 2012 expiration (preliminarily referred to as the Kyoto Mandate). As this conference opened, the U.S. was being “hung out to dry” by the U.N. representatives as the only industrialized nation to refuse signing the original treaty (Australia recently signed, immediately after their elections and a change in the governing administration).

Let’s review the facts of the situation: Al Gore, as vice president, was the one who held a press conference when the U.S. refused to ratify the treaty because of its questionable potential, its focus on the U.S. carrying the burden of compliance, but at significant damage to our economy.....One of our concerns was that the developing countries were not to be held to compliance, and that negates much or all of the possible, albeit improbable, impact of compliance by a few industrialized countries.....Not much has changed, except that there is even more scientific evidence than ever that Kyoto is not going to work as hoped. It won’t provide any significant environmental impact. It could bankrupt the U.S. and a few others....Kyoto is primarily a European-born agreement, and remember that those countries have not complied with the treaty they signed years ago. But the “uncooperative” U.S. is leading the European Union in reducing the increases in CO2 emissions over the past several years. And the U.S. is the only country at Bali that actually had a DECREASE in CO2 emissions in 2006....It’s not widely disputed that without compliance by the developing countries (China et al), Kyoto can’t even make the insignificant progress in CO2 emissions that may otherwise be possible.

What could be the motive to want to drag down the U.S. or other industrialized countries? Refer to page 8 and the quotes by the U.N. official and others about the industrialized countries and human consumption. This is perhaps a hint. Some want to “level the playing field” by severely damaging the U.S. economy through compliance with Kyoto, while turning a blind eye to the “sins” of developing countries. There are reports of some elements represented in Bali admitting to using climate change as a tool for achieving “global equity”. If my opinions are anywhere near being correct as to the absolute futility of the Kyoto Protocol, why would an average U.S. citizen want it?

As should be expected, China is objecting to having any curtailment on their development which would come from compliance with either the current or future Kyoto agreements. They take the position that the job of curtailing greenhouse gases belongs to the wealthy. It’s important to note that many experts believe China now is the world’s leading emitter of CO2. Do you see the “rock and a hard place” dilemma for all those pushing hard for Kyoto to succeed?

And all this has led to reports of discussions which appear at least encouraging. The U.S. will not be signing the treaty and all participants know that. However, apparently sidestepping China’s intransigence, a U.N. official issued an interesting statement. Apparently recognizing the progress that the U.S., and I understand **only** the U.S., has

made in CO2 containment, a U.N. official announced, in effect, that success would occur if U.S. cities and states were to commit to reducing CO2 in various ways – a “national commitment” of sorts – even if the new global agreement is not signed by the “uncooperative current Bush administration”. Our way is working better than the others, and I think the official realizes that and must save face.

And there’s more. A group of scientists at the conference announced that the use of seaweed and algae as a means of reducing CO2 has great promise, but hasn’t been adequately researched and exploited. This apparently has great promise because of these plants’ prolific and widespread growth. Of course there are problems, but it’s a good start. And it could be profitable for someone to develop! There couldn’t be a better example of an opportunity for human intelligence and resources to find a solution.

This is what I hoped would happen – recognition that the U.S., through its imperfect but still reasonably effective economic system will see a way through to improve the situation when no one else can. And when forced to be creative, Bali scientists are doing so. We humans will find a way. It’s called ADAPTING – applying wealth and ingenuity to our problems.

And there’s more! Not everything can be good news. A group of dissenting scientists has been denied credentials at the conference so their updated scientific research can’t be presented. And after signing the existing Kyoto treaty, the Australian trade minister came out strongly against China’s insistence on not being required to comply. And there is an accusation, by an IPCC contributor in attendance at the conference, of political tampering with the 2007 IPCC report. Lots of infighting going on. That’s not all bad. On balance, I am encouraged by these developments.

Finally, the agreement to come out of Bali is non-specific in terms of preset requirements. This seems fairly consistent with the original U.S. goal. And there’s something for everybody – while the U.S. gets all that it could hope for, many critics get to say the U.S. backed down. And I get something too – they are referring to “adapting” and “using technology” to address problems created by global warming – that’s my theme exactly! This is the starting point for several years of international negotiations. I think we will see a far more desirable result by 2012 than most would predict today – and many of the issues may change dramatically as science talks to us. This may happen quietly and peacefully, with nobody even noticing. Right will “win out”.

Why Liberal vs. Conservative?

The politics of climate change lines up like this: those advocating certain catastrophe requiring dramatic action now are predominantly liberal – while those for more caution in predictions and reactions are predominantly conservative.

While the apparent political polarization of this issue is important, I have struggled mightily to find a satisfactory explanation. I have gleaned information from politicians,

columnists, scientists, and friends. Some of my comments are legitimate, others perhaps are “a bit of a reach”. I found a very few sources to guide me, and I must give credit to the careful observations of columnist Dennis Prager as being most influential. Some of my comments may therefore be curiously similar to his, and given my previously stated conclusions, I know I can’t completely mask my bias.

One of the most prominent participants in the climate change debate is the IPCC – i.e. “**Intergovernmental** Panel on Climate Change”. It has politics at its core. And the U.N. is obviously political – it couldn’t be anything else. Subtle underlying political/economic agendas certainly are part of the debate. Consider again the disturbing quote I presented earlier: Maurice Strong, founder of the U.N. Eco-Summit and an Undersecretary General, was quoted as follows: “Isn’t the only hope for the planet that the industrial civilizations collapse? Isn’t it our responsibility to bring about?”

Complicating the political question is the fact that neither president – Bill Clinton nor George W. Bush – has sent the Kyoto treaty to the Senate for ratification. And a bi-partisan Senate resolution disapproved the notion of joining the treaty by 93-0 late in Clinton’s presidency. I recently viewed a video of the announcement, made by Al Gore, stating we would not be ratifying it as it stood. Mr. Gore said something approximately like “no way, no how” to describe the U.S. official position. The reason for the overwhelming opposition then was the incredibly high cost to our economy, and the fact that it was not uniformly enforced – developing countries weren’t to be held to a level of compliance. Nothing has changed in that regard – we just have more information confirming the negative impact on our economy, and the repeated refusal of developing countries like China to be subject to compliance. And, in the opinion of many, more information is available suggesting science is telling us there is more to learn. Many more experts are concluding that the predicted impact of global warming has been incorrect. We must proceed with caution because the right decisions are not yet obvious.

Here are some factors relevant to the political polarization:

- Kyoto and early support for dramatic ecological changes were born in liberal circles in Europe. There is very little debate that their bias is anti-industrialization, and since CO₂ had long been discussed for its greenhouse effect, industrialized countries provide a logical target. The intense and quite sincere criticism of many of the leading industrialized economies was predictable. Al Gore was adopted as one of the spokespersons, and it developed from there.
- I believe the basis for this polarity also has its origin in the first Bush victory over Al Gore. The characters were in place for the drama – Bush vs. Gore. The intense resentment over the Bush victory led to intense liberal dislike of him and everything he stood for. President Bush seemed opposed to aggressively addressing global warming, and because the more politically conservative tended to trust him more than the others, they tended to support the cautious approach. Those who by then intensely disliked Bush (predominantly liberals) rallied ever more strongly toward the developing theories of Al Gore and other alarmists.

Soon the alarmists were hard to stop because of their ever increasing emotional investment in the cause – complex as it was. I believe some of the recent increases in news reports of conflicting scientific opinion have been ignored or are unnoticed by this emotionally committed group.

- The liberal leaning alarmists (I keep using this term for lack of a better one) had plenty of encouragement from the media. This shouldn't be surprising since the media tends to be liberal, in my opinion, and alarmist reports accelerated with relatively little presentation of competing information. This wasn't very surprising since the alarmist agenda was supported by climate models which are comparatively easy to explain and comprehend. Much of the competing information tended to be very complex historical measurements and climate theories without very eloquent spokespersons – until recently anyway. We are now receiving reports which more effectively compete with the alarmists.
- Another reason for political polarity is the basic difference in philosophy of the two political camps. Both groups are socially conscious, but their programs contrast dramatically. The Right tends to be more aggressive in fighting certain human evils such as communism and Islamic totalitarianism. The Left avoids directly and aggressively confronting those human evils. Rather, the Left would want to concentrate its attention instead on socioeconomic inequality, environmental problems, and the wrong deeds of traditional capitalism. To the Left, global warming meets all three of these criteria of evil.
- Both groups have an appreciation for nature, but the Left tends to have a way of revering it – sometimes almost worshiping it. Once convinced your conservative adversaries are not doing what you are convinced is best for nature, it is a natural extension to become a devoted follower of Al Gore and his minions.
- I believe those on the Left tend to view their ideological adversaries as basically bad people, i.e. people with bad intentions (e.g. corporate profit), while those on the Right tend to view their adversaries as wrong, perhaps even dangerous, but not usually as bad. Consider the statements by Ellen Goodman comparing global warming “deniers” with Holocaust “deniers”. And Al Gore recently compared those supporting a cautious approach with WWII Britons who were isolationists and doubtful of the true Nazi threat. To make these statements is to ascribe equally nefarious motives to competing theories of global warming, its consequences, and the best solutions. I believe Ms. Goodman has sadly trivialized Holocaust denial. I believe these opinions represent a dangerous vilification of decent people – those who dare to even try to debate the predictions of the alarmists.

That's as close as I have come to an explanation of this polarity.

Kum Ba Yah

I wrote this for me. I wanted to personally review all that I had gathered and organize my thoughts as I finalized my current opinions. If others want to read it, fine. I have copies of most of the sources and information available if questions arise. And the balance of the information I reviewed is available by reference to the websites listed herein.

This project was, I believe, broad, fair, and honest. It should show a non-scientist trying to make a credible attempt at reaching a conclusion about a very important and complex issue. I sincerely believe I have covered all the bases I originally intended to, and stayed on course.

In the interest of clarity of purpose I will repeat myself from earlier in the report. I am sure I am wrong in some of my comments and opinions. I am also quite sure that some of the “competing information” I present may be incorrect, or may not stand the test of time. I am also quite sure the alarmists have some very good points to make and we should continue to listen to them. However, incorrect, misleading, and incomplete information is still very prominent and could lead to incorrect decisions with potentially disastrous results. We need to be more certain – and I don’t mean to imply I want unreasonable or infinite certainty. My primary goal is to extend the debate and I believe I have shown that it certainly IS NOT AND SHOULD NOT be over!

Sources of Information

This is not intended to be a bibliography or list of notes and references which would be necessary for publication or other wide use of this report. I have given few quotes and statistics specific attribution. Therefore, this report is in a state of “technical plagiarism”. These lists are merely intended to relay the nature, extent, and seriousness of my effort to become personally more knowledgeable. I hope to lend some level of credibility to the project and my conclusions. The items below are listed in no particular order.

Books

An Inconvenient Truth by Al Gore (book and movie versions)
Myths, Lies, and Downright Stupidity by John Stossel
Under a Green Sky by Peter Douglas Ward (excerpts)
Taken by Storm: The Troubled Science, Policy and Politics of Global Warming
by Christopher Essex and Ross McKittrick (summary and review)
The Weather Makers: How Man Is Changing the Climate
and what It Means for Life on Earth by Tim Flannery (summary and review)
Field Notes from a Catastrophe: Man, Nature and Climate Change
by Elizabeth Kolbert (summary and review)
The No-Nonsense Guide to Climate Change by Dinyar Godrej (excerpts)

The Complete Idiot's Guide to Global Warming by Michael Tennesen, (excerpts)
 Cool It by Bjorn Lomborg
 Unstoppable Global Warming, Every 1500 Years by S. Fred Singer and Dennis T. Avery
 Eco-Freaks by John Berlau
 The Politically Incorrect Guide to Global Warming by Christopher C. Horner

*Writers, Columnists, Educators, Scientists and Reporters Whose Material Was Used
 (often multiple items for each, most relatively brief - some are experts and others
 reporters, commentators, and even a very few politicians)*

Bob Burnett	George M. Rivas	Ellen Goodman
Marc Morano	Dr. David Evans	Dr. Vincent Gray
Bob Tyrrell	Thomas Sowell	Eric Jaffe
Victor David Hanson	John Roach	Deb Riechmann
Thomas L. Friedman	Mark Steyn	Cal Thomas
Jeff Jacoby	James Keaten	Seth Borenstein
Ed Koch	Dr. Walter Williams	Iain Murray
Daniela Pegna	Michael Fumento	Roy Spencer
Stephanie Stein	Arthur Max	Jonah Goldberg
John H. Fund	Larry Elder	David Strom
Dennis Prager	Michael Barone	Fiona Harvey
Tom Swiss	Charlie McDonald-Gibson	Richard A. Lovett
Stephen Fidler	James Hansen	Peter Douglas Ward
Mona Charen	Charles J. Hanley	Joseph L. Blast
Jack Kelly	Paul Greenberg	Steven Amstrup
Laura Helmuth	Debra J. Saunders	John Stossel
Corinne Purtill	Professor Robert Balling	Paula Easley
Lawrence Solomon	Professor Bjorn Lomborg	Thomas McClanahan
Professor John Christy	Anya Kamenetz	Kathleen Parker
Martin Durkin	Wesley Pruden	James Taylor
Sarah Reding	Dr. Michael A. Glueck	Dr. Robert J. Cihak
Michael Casey	Joseph Coleman	Christopher Alleva
Dr. John Brignell	Rohan Sullivan	Rich Lowry
Naomi Kim	David Laskin	John Coleman
Joe D'Aleo	John Roskam	William Gray
Clayton Sandell	Bill Blakemore	Ann Coulter
Newt Gingrich	David Limbaugh	Tony Blankley
Glen Beck	Phil Valentine	Brian Lambert
Professor Kam-biu Liu	Mike Baron	Sandy Bauers
Christopher Monckton	Patrick J. Michaels	Jack Spencer
John McLean	H. Sterling Burnett	Dr. Margaret Chan
Terry Francl	Peter Brown	Bill Steigerwald
Timothy Ball	Clive Crook	Hans von Storch
Nico Stehr	Robert Roy Brett	Andrea Thompson
Richard Walker	Gde Anugrah Arka	Jean-Louis Santini

Thomas H. Maugh
Conservapedia

Alan Zarembo
Editorials and Compilations

Wikipedia

Papers, Pamphlets, and Court Records

A Global Warming Primer – National Center for Policy Analysis
Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)
– Summaries for Policymakers – (2007)
IPCC Report – Summary for Policymakers – (2001)
The Myth of Dangerous Human-Caused Climate Change
by Professor R. M. Carter (Australia)
Climate Momentum Shifting: Prominent Scientists Reverse Belief in Man-made Global
Warming – Now Skeptics, by Marc Morano
Approved Judgment, October 2007 by Mr. Justice Burton re: British Public
Schools Use of “Inconvenient Truth” Without Presentation of Alternate Theory
Climate Change Impacts on the United States, the Potential Consequences of Climate
Variability and Change, by the National Assessment Synthesis Team (2000)
35 Inconvenient Truths – The Errors in Al Gore’s Movie
by Christopher Monckton of Brenchley, Science & Public Policy Institute (SPPI)
Climate Change Science: An Analysis of Some Key Questions
– Executive Summary (2001), National Academy of Sciences
Skeptics Guide to Debunking Global Warming Alarmism
Global Warming: The Origin and Nature of the Alleged Scientific Consensus
by Professor S. Lindzen
Uncertainty in Climate Model Projections of Arctic Sea Ice Decline:
An Evaluation Relevant to Polar Bears, by Eric DeWeaver/USGS

Websites and Online Newsletters Monitored Regularly

Roll Call Newspaper	The American Spectator
Energy and Capital – Liberal Commentary	Little Green Footballs
The New Republic	Liberal Voices
American Prospect	The Nation
The Smithsonian Magazine	Liberal Oasis
National Review	The Progressive Magazine
The Heritage Foundation	American Enterprise Institute
Cato Institute	Institute of Economic Affairs (UK)
Jewish World Review	The Weekly Standard
Glen Beck	Drudge Report
Science & Public Policy Institute (British)	National Science Foundation
National Geographic News	World Health Organization
Global Warming – Cooler Heads Coalition	U.S. Geological Survey
Global Warming Facts – The Heartland Institute	National Center for Policy Analysis
Junk Science	ICECAP

Far-Fetched or Humorous

A few unusual or unexpected things have been tied to global warming (No vetting), e.g.:

Divorce – “If more people knew the environmental consequences of divorce, more of them might choose to stay together”... “Even those people who care dearly about the environment are not aware of the environmental impacts of divorce.” (I didn’t make it up.)

Birth Control or Whatever – One group is suggesting that in addition to other measures, a global warming solution will require a worldwide population reduction by 75%. (I understand they’re looking for volunteers – you go first.)

Glacial Growth AND Glacial Retreat – Can we have it both ways?

Accelerating Evolution – Isn’t that called “adapting”?

Collapse of Gingerbread Houses – Emeril to the rescue.

Extinction of Woodlice – I thought I noticed a difference.

Beer is Better – Beer is always good.

Decline in Circumcision – They really know how to mess with a guy’s feelings.

Erosion of Footpaths – I find that kind of hard to “follow”.

Mammoth Dung Melt – Watch your step.

Megacryometeors – I thought so.

Seals Mating More – They gotta’ like that.

Tropopause Raised – I could have sworn it had lowered.