

12 Reasons Why the Climate Change Issue is Controversial

Back in 2006, one of my four brothers, 12 years my elder, had watched Al Gore's documentary, *An Inconvenient Truth* and then brought up of the subject of AGW with me (*anthropogenic (human caused) global warming*) — which is now generally referred to as climate change, yet somehow not "ACC". These days when one uses the term climate change it is assumed that human caused climate change is meant, as if other reasons for changes in the climate didn't exist. After the IPCC (the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) published their 2006 report my brother touted something to the effect that they were "all but certain" that the (at that time) ca. 0.5 degrees C increase in temperatures from a relatively low period in the later 70s through 2005 was directly and essentially 100% attributable to the increased concentration of CO₂ in the atmosphere, which was about 60 parts per million. (375-315 ppm)

At that time I knew as little about the subject as anyone else, but I was reasonably well educated and somehow had earned an A in a statistics class in college. My immediate response was to ask if he knew anything about statistical significance. Then I asked him how he reckoned scientists could be so sure that the temperature increase from the late 70s to the late 90s was caused exclusively(!) by the higher levels of CO₂. Think about it, I said. Literally hundreds of other poorly understood, variable and unpredictable factors also play a role in Earth's chaotic and extremely complex climate system, or something to that affect. I wondered, among all that noise and so many factors that are impossible to accurately or reliably quantify, how could they be sure to any degree whatsoever and apparently rule out the possibility of natural variation seemingly altogether? It seemed like common sense to me that such claims could not be based on unbiased science.

Indeed, such claims have seldomly come from unbiased scientists, rather from such reports from people like my brother who parrot snippets of hyped articles written about summaries of the carefully constructed report summary and how the media then spins that already filtered and compromised information into hype and beliefs which are simply parroted by a very misinformed segment of the population who somehow seem to want to believe that the sky is falling.

The Earth's climate and average temperature is essentially always fluctuating within ranges on short, medium and longer timescales. One data set of only 30 years which reflects an expected return towards the mean temperature, a fluctuation within a known and previously observed range in the not distant past (see Reason 3), surely cannot hold much weight when studying such an immensely complex system with no control whatsoever, which greatly enhances the need for strong statistical support. 30 years in this case was obviously not only not strong statistical support, it was essentially none whatsoever. So there seemed to be something amiss from the get-go, especially since the get-go had already gotten going the mid 1980s.

Something else I already knew when our debate began was that there was concern back in the chilly 1970s about potentially catastrophic climate change happening that would negatively affect our immediate future, but the concern was the ongoing cool trend from the mid 1940s through

1978, not warming. When I was 10 years old, Leonard Nimoy, who played Spock in the original Star Trek, had a documentary series called In Search Of which became one of my favorite shows to watch. I was already a young Trekkie thanks to another older brother of mine, so seeing Spock as a normal guy was immediately interesting for me and I actually do recall the 1978 episode on the possibility of a new ice age beginning. You can watch it on YouTube:https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RQRqr9_jw5I It's pretty cool. Even almost chilling at times.

Less than a decade later, in the late 1980s, a new buzz about climate change had already begun. But this time it was about the neither surprising nor unusual warming despite the fact that it was far better news than a continuation or worsening of the cool period of the previous 30 years would have been, not to mention the statistical significance of a 10 year trend being essentially zero. Guess who was already planning to publish his first book about being an environmentalist in the 21st century and begin preaching about the dangers of global warming before the new trend was even a decade old. Al Gore, of course. Suspicious, if you ask me. https://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/10/12/AR2007101200827_pf.html By 2006 that buzz had gotten considerably louder, especially after Gore released his second book and documentary by the same name, focused entirely this time on CO2 and temperature, and that despite the fact that temperatures had actually declined somewhat after the 1998 super El Nino until the time of its production and subsequent release (2006). I cover some literally shocking facts about that documentary below under Reason 6. You have to check that out and tell your friends about it. It's almost unbelievable. There should be a video on it on thesameboat.com under climate. Please have a look for it and share it on social media. That kind of fraud should not be going ignored and unnoticed.

Anyway, I pointed out to my brother that the temperature records from the 30 year period (1945-1975) which preceded the warming trend that began in the late 70s contradicted the hypothesis entirely. Why ignore the previous 30 years when temperatures had decreased from those of the warmer period that ended in the mid 1940s? After all, CO2 levels had already begun rising more rapidly in the 1940s due to the post WWII economic boom, so if the AGW hypothesis was valid, why was the temperature trend from 1945 – 1975 downward instead of upward? (OK, yes, naturally there are reasons but this is just a review of my rhetoric from back then, and it is a valid question in any case)

From two 30-year data sets, the AGW hypothesis was only supported by the empirical evidence in one. The other set exhibited a negative correlation between CO2 increases and temperature. I told him that anyone with any common sense and basic critical thinking skills should consider such declarations of relative certainty to be extremely dubious on the face of it. How was it not clearly unscientific to exclude the temperature data from 1945-1975 which would have significantly changed the magnitude and far more dramatically, the rate of change? Talk about cherry picking data! This is an extreme example and it's obviously there for all to see. From the beginning it hasn't been about objectivity, rather pushing a narrative. The evidence is essentially irrefutable. More on

this under Reason 5.

Over the years since then I have spent a good few hundred hours learning more on this subject, particularly recently (2022) as I write this chapter. That debate and others we had during the Trump presidency on subjects I also cover in this book have played a role in my inspiration and motivation to put in this effort to clarify things, not just between us, but for countless other Americans who doubtlessly have had similar debates which stressed a relationship in their lives and likely remained unresolved with little or no common ground ever having been established.

Clearly I am writing as a journalist. If you don't find my summary to be trustworthy, please, do your own research instead of simply believing me, or for that matter headlines and hype going forward. For those interested in getting a second opinion there are many books available by "realists" with PhD degrees in science and climate science who have been researching the issue for decades. In 2021 Steven Koonin published "Unsettled", which I found to be quite good. I recommend reading his introduction on the "look inside" feature on Amazon. You can also listen to his interview with Joe Rogan on Spotify. It's episode Nr. 1776. I can also recommend Robert Carter's "Climate, the Counter Consensus", "Lukewarmig" by Michaels and Knappenberger, "False Alarm" by Björn Lomborg, "Why Scientists Disagree About Global Warming", Idso, Singer and Carter, "The Real Inconvenient Truth" by Sangster and "Climate Change: The Facts", by Jennifer Marohasy, yet there are also many others. Many more resources and links are available at [thesameboat.com /climate](https://thesameboat.com/climate)

Between 2007-2010 alone at least 63 books were published on climate change from the skeptical, realist perspective*. Apparently between 10-20 new ones come out every year. That means there must be hundreds of books out there on the subject, most of which probably never sold more than a couple hundred copies, if that many. The authors of these books were certainly not in it for the money. They invested their time and effort to communicate what they know out of passion and a deep desire to help get the word out that not all is as it seems when it comes to media coverage on climate change. They each spent several hundred hours of their lives, some over a thousand or many more to formulate as best they could the message they wanted to share as a release and expression of their dismay. Sadly almost all of these authors have been unsuccessful in achieving much reach through their personal efforts.

*<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3787818/>

Skeptics are not fringe "science deniers" nor by any means whatsoever alone, and we certainly do not deserve to be compared to members of the Flat Earth Society as John Kerry had quipped in 2014. If that is perhaps akin to what you may already be thinking as you consider if you really want to read this chapter or not then in my humble opinion you may well stand the most to gain from reading it if you can maintain an open mind and resist the urge to simply dismiss the points addressed because they conflict with your current opinions and worldview. In this effort I believe a mantra could be helpful. If you notice you're shaking your head or find yourself thinking about writing a one star review for this book on Amazon then perhaps you may consider running these words through your mind with your eyes closed while breathing deeply; Follow the science, not the headlines. Follow the science, not the headlines...and carry on. Pace yourself. You don't have to

read it all at once.

The vast majority of Americans agree that we should respect Mother Nature, our paradise Earth and protect environments from unnecessary pollution and destruction. Despite this broad agreement Americans are nevertheless divided on the subject of (human caused) climate change which has become the signature issue for a new “environmental movement” that overshadows all other (environmental) problems. I feel that any “guide to heal the divide” must address this highly controversial subject because it plays a key role in the overall divide in the USA. This chapter will explain why and convince readers that it matters, regardless of which side of the argument they’re on.

Most of us have an opinion on whether or not human caused climate change is a serious problem as well as whether or not we should attempt to minimize our influence on the climate system by reducing CO2 emissions as much as possible, as fast as possible. Yet very few of us know much about the controversy at all. In order to have an informed opinion one must look at arguments and evidence from both sides, not just one. This is your opportunity to get up to date on the AGW debate, without the hype, from any extremist view on the issue, and it’ll only take you about an hour or two to peer inside the rabbit hole. If you consider yourself to be skeptical about “climate change” you will very likely find more reason to be in the following pages. If not, you will likely learn quite a lot and may be a skeptic as well by the time you're finished. Overall it should be an educational and eye-opening read for almost everyone who has spent far less time learning about this issue than I have.

First I will briefly cover some necessary and fundamental facts and information about climate science, some data and some terminology. Then I will introduce you to each of the 12 significant issues that raise important, eye-opening questions which are all being relentlessly ignored by the media, like a proverbial elephant in the room. A couple of them are so powerful and have been so ignored that they really are in and of themselves like an elephant in the room, which is why I had considered naming this chapter Climate Change Elephants, but while all the elephants are reasons, there are also reasons that don’t really qualify as elephants, so I changed the title. I believe that each of these reasons justify healthy skepticism. If this chapter’s content were common knowledge I believe that we would be at a point where we would have considerably less divisiveness in the political arena. I am quite sure you will find it highly educational and often very surprising, if not almost downright shocking.

Please remember that the intention of this chapter is to present and summarize the reasons why Americans are divided on this subject. I believe this contribution to the debate should be considered constructive. I think it would be a great thing if the points I make were addressed and the questions I ask receive answers. The best strategy for those who benefit from the alarmist narrative being perpetuated is to continue to ignore all these points because there are no strong answers which legitimately “debunk” them. The media will continue to avoid them entirely until we succeed in changing this critical factor of our overall problem — the politicized misinformation and constant lying-through-omission media.

Why the Climate Change Issue is Controversial - outline

Some key climate change facts in a nutshell...

AGW, El Niño / ENSO,

past CO2 levels vs. today,

climate sensitivity,

Logarithmic function of CO2, CO2 as Life-Giving Gas and growth rates of crops

30 year averages = climate (trend),

stats regarding storms, arctic ice data and Antarctic ice extent data,

how ice core research works,

regarding statistical significance and „cherry picking“ of data sets, Temp record long term... Temp

record last 6000 years, Temp record since 500 years, Temp record past 140 years,

never run away GHE,

Is it warmer? Warmer than when? The cold 1970s? Yes. How much? A bit under one degree C, or 1.8 degrees F.

Than the end of the Little Ice Age? Yes. Also by about 1 degree C.

Than the time when life indisputably thrived more than ever before? No. It was about 5-15 degrees warmer then and CO2 levels were between 5 and up to 20(!) times (throughout different periods) as much as the relatively modest level of 420 ppm we have today. ...So it matters what you're comparing something to before you can establish a perspective.

Three things of certainty to keep in mind:

1: A run-away GHE never happened. Why not?

2: Colder temperatures than today are undoubtedly NOT better for life on Earth

3: At 560 ppm of CO2 in the atmosphere, double the pre-industrial level of 280, crop yields increase on average by well over 50%.

12 Reasons Why the climate change „issue“ is controversial - List / Outline...

1 It's been entirely politicized and a LOT of money is involved

2 Undeniable Fact to never forget when it comes to considering the entire AGW Debate

For life on Earth, warmer temperatures and MORE CO2 are directly and indisputably coupled in a positive CAUSAL relationship. That is to say, warmer and more CO2 is indisputably directly correlated with the abundance of life on Earth. Warmer is better for life, along with more CO2. The same applies when one uses the average of the past 500 years as a baseline. Again, warmer is better than colder. The same goes for the past 150 years and the past 50 years as well.

3 The Actual Temperature Record. The next ice age will come, one way or another. If not, we can consider ourselves lucky. Pumping more CO2 into the atmosphere would be a more logical strategy as an insurance / buffer against cooling, reducing the real and far more serious threat regarding

climate change, namely cooling. Differences in climate and temperature NOT quantifiable! Plant growth optimized at much higher levels. No reason to believe the arbitrary choice to use 19th century CO2 levels as somehow “optimum”. Calling for MORE CO2 would make more logical sense.

4 Everything regarding the science and hype about future warming is based on inadequate (flawed) models...Koonen

Garbage in, garbage out. Shit track record.

5 The MSM aren't reporting objectively. Media has lied through omission and peddled lies regarding increasing disasters for which there is no evidence whatsoever. Morano

6 Indoctrination

7 We Have Real Environmental Problems to Deal With That Are being Ignored

8 The Origins of the 97% Consensus Myth and Obama's big lie over Twitter

9 The REAL Inconvenient Truth about Gore's Mock Doc

10 If 97% of scientists are on their side and the science is so clearly settled, why do all alarmists refuse to debate the issue publicly?

11 Atmospheric temperatures cannot force increases in ocean temperatures down to 2000 feet! Sooo... you got it. The El Niño events of 1998 and 2015-2016 raised the near surface ocean temperatures and THAT drove atmospheric temperatures up, NOT the other way around. And if ocean temps caused the increases in atmospheric temps, then the AGW hypothesis is DOA.

12 And on top of all of that, there's the elephant in the room regarding the potential for success with the reduction of CO 2 strategy based on performance thus far since the Paris Accord, goals that would need to be achieved by when and how feasible that is Would be. Reality check
Rudimentary Cost-Benefit Analysis missing

Conclusion