

## Climate Change: Revisiting *An Inconvenient Truth* by Al Gore

When Al Gore's documentary movie, *An Inconvenient Truth: The Crisis of Global Warming*, came out in 2006 and the book the following year, it was a bombshell. It presented a new, courageous thesis that the earth is at a crisis point of global warming that, if it is not slowed, will produce long-term catastrophe for all of us. Mr. Gore's main visual aid was the so-called "hockey stick"—a graph created by Michael Mann that he said showed the projected escalation of the temperature of the globe that will begin compounding upon itself with a precipitous rise that would unavoidably and irreversibly become catastrophic in 2020 (by the way, it didn't happen).

The main "villain" and cause of global warming was the increased output of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere from ever-increasing burning of hydrocarbons from the earth, primarily from coal and oil, during the industrial revolution over the last 200 years. This thesis has become basic popular orthodoxy today, claiming that "95% of scientists agree" with this "scientific consensus" and most people seem to believe that it is valid.

The subsequent political and social pressures to accept this new orthodoxy have been huge, and any skeptic's opinion is discounted as a "climate change denier" and "anti-science", relegating them to "flat-earther" status. In fact, to challenge the "Global Warming" orthodoxy today would be just as courageous, if not more so, than Al Gore's first presentation of "An Inconvenient Truth" claimed to be. Being involved in science all my life, I have read extensively about the "Global environmental crisis caused by man."

The term GLOBAL WARMING morphed into CLIMATE CHANGE in the mid-2000s, after the predicted warming didn't occur, and that CLIMATE CHANGE is now the scapegoat for every weather event considered unusual. Such conclusions (CLIMATE CHANGE) are just a blink of a geologic eye. It is too brief a period to evaluate the data adequately. This is the "non-expert" problem as to what to believe. People suspect something is amiss with the one-sided deluge of information about climate catastrophe, but aren't fully equipped to assess it and judge for themselves. Thus, comes the SCIENCE versus CONSENSUS controversy.

So, is **science** consensus; or, is **consensus** science? If so, how; or, if not, what is the difference? Consensus means "general agreement". So, is consensus **science**? What is the consensus based on.....Opinions or facts? **Science** is not a belief system. **Science** is a disciplined method of inquiry, by which the scientist applies pre-existing theory to observations and measurements to develop or to reject a theory. That way, the theory can unravel or be confirmed clearly as possible to show the distinction between what the Greek philosopher, Anaximander, called "that which is and that which is not".

What is **SCIENCE**? It is the collection of data that is collected over periods of time that could indicate tendencies. So, how much of "climate change" is **SCIENCE** and how much is **CONSENSUS**? Do we dare question the claim that most "climate change" is attributable to human activities? Is this claim scientifically supportable? To start looking at this critically, we should separate what we **KNOW** from what we **DON'T KNOW**.

The “consensus” opinion promoted by climate-apocalypse proponents seems to be consistently at odds with some established facts. It seems unfair to scientific truth to simply accept as expedient of a mere head-count among those who make their livings from government funded research topics.

**Science does not advance through consensus.** Consensus stops the pursuit of science and data collection. It’s a “show stopper”, ending the discussion and drawing the “line in the sand”. Then, the position seems to resort to accept and do not contest. If climate alarmists resort to a consensus opinion, rather than argue the merits of the science, have they already conceded that their argument may be weak when open to debate? Their efforts seem to defend their already questionable theory instead of digging and developing a more complete data base.

In a true scientific inquiry, real data should always trump models based on a simple few data points. If actual hard data are available, there is no need to forecast – unless there is an alternative objective. One problem that confounds us is that some **scientists**, just like anyone else, may say that they “believe” things (whether they believe them or not) for social convenience, political expediency or financial profit. So, who and what are we to believe?

INDUCTIVE REASONING is true science. Inductive reasoning is the collection a lot of data until it could show that a theory could be justified. Then, the data is used to prove it as being right or wrong. It uses **all** the data, not just the convenient data. Inductive reasoning is not consensus. The data must stand by itself.

The antithesis of INDUCTIVE REASONING is DEDUCTIVE REASONING. This is the use of a few data points that support an already predisposed theory. It is vulnerable to cross-examination and debate and can be overturned by more complete data. When DEDUCTIVE REASONING is used to develop models, then ultimately projections, the entire premise could collapse if the few data points used were inaccurate or inappropriate.

The one book that seems to me to have pulled much of the data and scientific position on the subject is by Gregory Wrightstone in his 2017 book, ***Inconvenient Facts: the Science that Al Gore Doesn’t Want You to Know.***

His 60 “inconvenient facts” come from government sources, peer-reviewed literature and scholarly works, but it is very understandable by the average “non-scientist.” He asserts that the planet is indeed warming slightly, but mainly from other than human-generated activity. In fact, he proposes that the planet is improving, not in spite of increasing CO<sub>2</sub> and rising temperature, but because of it. Fair warning: Wrightstone is very passionate about this presentation and at times sounds angry or “I told you so” in his style. But, if you read his book, try filtering it and consider his ideas on their face value. His book provides the extensive bibliography and data resources that support his comments.

I have listed some of Wrightstone’s points from his book and have inserted some thought provoking arguments below. I invite you to consider his ideas, read his book and scrutinize his documentation. I believe that his method is a good example of honest science. I caution you that if you try to talk to any “Global Warming” activists about these challenges, you may be criticized. But if you believe that the truth is more important than consensus, W. Somerset Maugham’s saying may be comforting: “If 50 million people say something foolish, it is still foolish.”

1. Gore's book is based on retrieving of **tidbits** of information and making broad generalities. From these generalities, he's proclaiming prognosticating MODELS of doom if we don't conform NOW. Several of those model's time frames of doom have already passed and guess what? They didn't occur! This approach is not SCIENCE, it promotes alarmism. In science we call this minimal approach DEDUCTIVE REASONING in which we proclaim gross generalities from a tidbit of information.

So, what if the whole idea started with the wrong premise? There were some methodological flaws in Gore's presentation: His famous "Hockey Stick" graph (that asserts that the global warming was caused by man) has shown to be vulnerable, because it used cherry-picked data and a biased algorithm, based on incomplete and limited data. In fact, historical records show that the "Medieval Warming period" of 1000 AD to 1350 AD was much warmer than even today—and that time was a time of economic thriving for Europe. Could the major causes of the fluctuations in climate temperatures been dependent upon other sources, such as, sunspot activity or the changes in the rotational axis of the earth and not the composition of the atmosphere?

2. His conclusions are based on "MODELS" from these generalities that have alarmist tendencies to scare people into submission. Gore's chief research author, Mann, used pieces of data that could support his "model" and seemed to ignore the overwhelming amount of data that would not support or even be contrary to his thesis.

It has been tremendously effective. Children are schooled today to be concerned that they may not be able to live on this earth when they get old. They are fearful because of what is taught to them by their parents and teachers. Is the psychological impact on these youngsters imposing unwarranted stress in their lives? The Pope says that climate change is the most important issue of this millennium. Power companies are investing billions in "green energy" due to political pressures.

3. THE QUESTION: "Is climate change driven primarily by human actions?" What scientific data demonstrates what percentage of the warming we've had since 1900 was directly caused by us? One suggestion instead of a world quickly diving into a man-made climate from which we cannot return, could be that the Earth, its ecosystems and we humans, are thriving. We are thriving BECAUSE of increasing CO<sub>2</sub> and rising temperatures, not in spite of it. The current changing climate has led to increasing food production, soil moisture, crop growth and a "greening" of the earth. Is this due to what is called the "greenhouse effect"?
4. **Yes**, there has been some warming. **Yes**, some of the warming is likely man-made. **Yes**, some further man-made warming is to be expected. On all these matters, few would disagree, for they are all demonstrable. But no, past and future anthropogenic warming does not mean that catastrophe will follow, or that measures to prevent global warming are scientifically and economically justified, or that capitalism or industrialized countries should be blamed for the supposed "crisis"...still less that it should be destroyed because of spurious science (consensus).

*"THE GREAT TRAGEDY OF SCIENCE: THE SLAYING OF A BEAUTIFUL THEORY BY AN UGLY FACT".*  
(Thomas Huxley)

5. GREENHOUSE GASSES (our security blanket):

- A. Most significant greenhouse gas of all is **water vapor** and is often completely ignored in discussing global warming. Contribution of greenhouse gases to global warming:  
**Excluding Water Vapor: 63 % Carbon dioxide**  
**Including Water Vapor: 6% Carbon dioxide**
- B. Contribution of water vapor to greenhouse effect: 60-95%  
 (Is there an effort to regulate water vapor as a pollutant? **Why not, if the “greenhouse” effect is harming us?**)
- C. Warming effect of CO<sub>2</sub> decreases significantly (logarithmically) as its concentration increases. In other words, the more carbon is in the environment the less the ability to create a warming effect.
- D. The concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> in the air has increased from about 280 parts per million (ppm) by volume in the mid-18<sup>th</sup> century, to a little above 400 ppm today. Plant life would not survive without at least 150 ppm.
- E. Reconstruction of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations is available for thousands of years due to the analysis of ice cores from Antarctica and Greenland. CO<sub>2</sub> levels average about 280 ppm at each interglacial period. Our current geological period (Quaternary) has the lowest average of CO<sub>2</sub> level in the history of the earth. We are in a period of CO<sub>2</sub> starvation.
- F. Increased CO<sub>2</sub> helps plants to resist drought, warmer weather, pollution and other environmental stresses.
- G. More CO<sub>2</sub> in the air means more moisture in the soil for the plants.

## 6. TEMPERATURE

- A. Our current warming trend began 200 years before any significant man-made contribution to the greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. The “little Ice Age” peaked in early 1800s and started a warming trend.
- B. 18 years of no warming yet CO<sub>2</sub> increased. Significant 33-year span of global cooling from 1944 to 1976 coincided with the increasing CO<sub>2</sub> levels.
- C. Melting glaciers and rising seas confirm warming predated increases of CO<sub>2</sub>. In sea levels and the retreat of the glaciers began long before any significant man-made CO<sub>2</sub>.
- D. Central England record began in 1659 and showed extreme cold from 1670 to 1715 which was known as the “Maunder Minimum”. It was noticed that this coincided with a period of sharp decline in solar activity. The “Maunder Minimum”, the coldest period in the Little Ice Age (1250-1850), brought famine, poor harvests, disease and widespread loss of life.
- E. Current warming trend began in the late 17<sup>th</sup> century. Glaciers could not retreat until the atmosphere had warmed sufficiently to allow summer ice loss to exceed winter accumulations. That glacial “tipping point” occurred around 1800.
- F. The current warming trend started 300 years ago. This data is from the Antarctica and Greenland ice cores.
- G. Interglacial periods last 10,000-15,000 years. Ours is about 11,000 years old.
- H. Each of the four previous inter-glacial warming periods was significantly warmer than our current temperature.

COMMENT: *The modern warming is neither unusual nor unprecedented. It appears to be very similar to the nine other warming trends of the last 10,000 years. Promoters of climate catastrophe cannot show that the warming trend is “unusual or unprecedented”. They have no cause for the alarm they are sowing.*

- I. Earth's orbit and tilt drive glacial – interglacial changes. The earth wobbles on a 26,000-year cycle that causes a phenomenon known as the “precession of the equinoxes”.
  - J. Only in the relatively recent past has there been any ice at the northern pole. We are living within the coldest period in the last 65 million years. The earth has not had a geologic period this cold in 250 million years.
  - K. In climate research and modelling, we should recognize that we are dealing with a coupled non-linear chaotic system, and therefore that the long-term prediction of future climate states is not possible. (IPSS, 2001, Chapter 14.2.2.2.)
  - L. “It is somewhat ironic that our contribution of greenhouse gases to the atmosphere may actually be helping to delay the next ice age from starting!” (US Geological Survey)
  - M. For human advancement, warmer is better than colder. The Dark Ages was a bleak time in human history during the peak of the ice age.
7. WATER, ICE, ACIDITY and DROUGHTS
- A. The dual effects of rising temperatures and increasing CO<sub>2</sub> are working together to increase the soil moisture around much of the world.
  - B. As the atmosphere warms, it is capable of carrying more water vapor. The additional water vapor tends to precipitate as rain. This increasing precipitation, owing to a warming world, is having its effect on once drought-stricken areas, such as the Sahel in the Western Sahara.
  - C. We are witnessing a significant decline in droughts, while both temperature and carbon dioxide increase.
  - D. The earth is becoming greener, not turning into desert.
  - E. More CO<sub>2</sub> and warmer weather mean more world food production.
  - F. Warmer weather means many fewer temperature-related deaths.
  - G. Warmer weather prevents millions of premature deaths each year. Maybe many of those who died did so because they could no longer afford to heat their homes.
  - H. More CO<sub>2</sub> and warmth mean shorter, less intense heat waves. The devastating European heat wave of 2003 found that decreased soil moisture in their region was the primary cause.
  - I. The number of tornadoes is decreasing. The number of tornadoes in 2016 was the lowest on record.
  - J. There has been no increase in frequency of hurricanes in recent data. Global tropical storm and hurricane frequency is falling. We have seen 250 years of declining hurricane frequency. The data to estimate increase in hurricane strength is too small to be significant.
  - K. It is difficult and dangerous to assess the population of polar bears accurately. Despite these challenges, the most recent population studies actually indicate that polar bear populations are rising fast and are at a 50-year high.
  - L. Extraordinarily inconvenient recent results of polar bear research do not support the narrative that decreasing sea ice is detrimental to the bears' health. (Rode 2014). “Simple ‘bear’ necessities” may not actually include ice. They prefer warmer to colder weather due to an increased source of food.
  - M. The oceans did not become acidic even with CO<sub>2</sub> at 15 times modern levels. Predictions of the end of the oceans and coral reefs as we know them from “acidification” are based entirely on “deductive” models that assume that oceans possess no organisms, rocks or dissolved solids that might moderate or buffer any increase in carbonic acid.
  - N. Media sensationalism is compounded by misrepresentations of available science and by unscientific reliance on computer projections (“garbage in – garbage out”) rather than on historical data.
  - O. The sea level actually fell during the cold of the Little Ice Age.

- P. The natural sea-level rise will continue whether or not we reduce our greenhouse gas emissions.
- Q. One of the most common climate myths is that the melting of the northern polar ice cap will not only lead to the extinction of polar bears, but cause significant sea-level rise. Actually, the entire north polar ice cap could melt and the change in the global sea level would be virtually zero. That is because the ice cap is frozen seawater, floating in the Arctic Ocean. As the ice melts, water displaces the void left by the formerly frozen H<sub>2</sub>O, most of which is submerged. And, as ice melts, it reduces its volume by approximately 8%.
- R. Antarctica today has nine-tenths of the world's land-based ice mass. Paradoxically, Antarctica is also the Earth's driest continent. Water vapor across the continent is often near zero, and very little snow actually falls. So, the world's driest continent has the greatest potential to drive sea-level rise. Most of Antarctica is cooling and gaining ice mass.
- S. Sea-level rise, which began long before widespread use of fossil fuels, will continue until the next ice age. Cold is a "killer", where heat, on the whole, is not.

## CONCLUSION

1. It is unfortunate for us that too many scientists have failed to uphold the integrity of the profession, whether because of willful self-promotion, desperate self-preservation, ignorance, greed, or fear of ridicule by their peers of climate orthodoxy. It may take science decades to overcome the damage wrought by the corruption of the scientific community substituting consensus for science.
2. My suggestion is that policy should, in the end, be based on objective truth and not on funded and elaborate international campaign falsehoods that are based the DEDUCTIVE reasoning models. The impact of the world of any atmospheric effect should be analyzed with objective scientists accumulating all the known data available and using INDUCTIVE reasoning based on the facts shape any projection model.
3. So, how do we as individuals handle this? Get involved, study scientific research, question the validity of "models" and make sure that the theory that you promote or believe is supported by fact and not conjecture or consensus.
4. An important decision that we have as world citizens is to try to understand the current policies and ask questions as to their rationale and impact upon our lives. This would include evaluating the research matter that supported the policy. Then, to address the asserted problem of man-made global warming by having the courage to continue the science. Finally, making a decision that affects us which could be to do nothing and NOT to impose the world citizens into making huge investments into ineffective solutions.

*"HAPPY IS THE ONE, WHO FINDS THE WHY OF THINGS". (Roman poet Virgil)*