

# THE DEBATE IS OVER

“The debate is over.” global warming opponents tell any who doubt humans are causing climate change. Wrong. Here is a list of 400 scientists from around the world who dispute the ‘consensus’.

Summary:

[http://epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Minority.Blogs&ContentRecord\\_id=f80a6386-802a-23ad-40c8-3c63dc2d02cb&Region\\_id=&Issue\\_id=88388d58-7e9c-9af9-7d66-62e366f3f189](http://epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Minority.Blogs&ContentRecord_id=f80a6386-802a-23ad-40c8-3c63dc2d02cb&Region_id=&Issue_id=88388d58-7e9c-9af9-7d66-62e366f3f189)

Full Report: *(The full report of 400 scientists from around the world that disagree with the IPCC consensus is also on this disc in .pdf format.)*

<http://epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Minority.SenateReport>

More skeptics:

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\\_of\\_scientists\\_opposing\\_global\\_warming\\_consensus](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_scientists_opposing_global_warming_consensus)

Dr. S. Fred Singer

<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/warming/debate/singer.html>

Dr. Roy Spencer

<http://www.capmag.com/article.asp?ID=4405>

---

“But this is only 400 versus thousands upon thousands of scientists who have all agreed to the consensus.” Climate change believers will say. Wrong again. During the Bali Climate Change Conference in December 2007, only 215 scientists signed on to the IPCC recommendation (*Read ‘Summary’ above*) and only 52 scientists participated in the IPCC summary. Several of these IPCC scientists are also on the list of 400 dissenting scientists. Yes, you read that correctly. Many of the scientists listed among the consensus had actually written disagreements with the consensus. The politicians in charge of the final draft conveniently omitted the disagreements of scientists while adding them to the consensus. *(If you read the ‘Full Report’ above there are personal descriptions of the experience these scientists have had with the politics of Global Warming.)*

I become very suspicious when Intellectuals who pride themselves upon open mindedness claim there can be no more debate about global warming. Scientists who persist with conflicting data are insulted, belittled, and fired from positions of authority in the world of science. The typically open-minded have suddenly become vastly intolerant of dissent, and my natural curiosity causes me to wonder why.

Threats:

[http://epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Minority.Blogs&ContentRecord\\_id=04373015-802a-23ad-4bf9-c3f02278f4cf&Issue\\_id=](http://epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Minority.Blogs&ContentRecord_id=04373015-802a-23ad-4bf9-c3f02278f4cf&Issue_id=)

---

Why don't we start with the basics; the definition of science. Most definitions include three general steps:

- (1) Observation of natural events
- (2) Accumulate data, facts

### (3) Formulate laws and principles, provable by prediction or experiments

When asked for proof, climate change proponents will always site the stacks of data accumulated through steps 1 and 2. But when was Step 3 performed? Computer models? Even scientists who have created such models admit they are flawed. The fastest super-computers available can only replicate less than 1 percent of the variables involved. Predictions? Name one accurate prediction about global warming made by scientists? 10 years ago we were told that Earth's temperatures would not only continue rising, but the increase would accelerate. Instead, temperatures have remained stagnant over the last decade, and even dropped on some continents. Global warming alarmists have been warning of increased hurricanes, tornadoes, flooding and droughts. The media has done all it can to give credence to these predictions. Every time a natural disaster hits, the press quickly seeks out the opinions of the climate change alarmists. But scare mongering is not science. Storms, which have been happening throughout Earth's history, are proof of nothing.

Some think that photos of receding glaciers and polar bears standing on melting ice chunks are proof. But the polar bear population has exploded since mid-century and a glacier, by definition, must either be receding or extending, otherwise it would not be a glacier. Video clips of Glaciers breaking into the sea are great propaganda. There is no question that glaciers have receded in many areas of the world. But there is never mention of areas where glaciers are actually growing in mass. Global warming has moved away from science, and into political propaganda. Every true scientific study shows that the frequency and/or severity of hurricanes, tornadoes, heat waves, cold snaps, and droughts are not historic in any matter. In fact real numbers suggest that human activity has had absolutely no effect on such natural disasters. The only thing that has increased is our awareness of tragedy around the world. Global warming advocates have used the information super-highway to push their agenda. But I am not falling for it. Show me the proof!

---

To combat the lack of proof human caused global warming advocates throw around the term 'scientific consensus'. But science is about proof. Consensus is a word used in politics. After all, in 1420 there was scientific consensus that the world is flat. In 1520 there was scientific consensus that the Earth is the center of the universe. In 1720 there was scientific consensus that Witch's were the cause of droughts and famine. In 1920 there was scientific consensus that electric shock treatment could rehabilitate the mentally disabled. In every case, the consensus was not a product of real science, but instead, a result of accumulating anecdotal evidence and arriving at a political solution. What better exhibit of anecdotal evidence than the IPCC report? Show me the proof!

---

**“Religion is a culture of faith; science is a culture of doubt.”** *Richard Feynman (Nobel Prize winning physicist)*

---

The debate is over? Not even Al Gore is willing to debate a scientist who does not agree with the political consensus of global climate change:  
<http://www.opinionjournal.com/editorial/feature.html?id=110009552>

Belief in human caused climate change patterns religion in many ways. Just like most theology, the faithful are intolerant of dissent.

[http://www.dailymail.co.uk/pages/live/articles/technology/technology.html?in\\_article\\_id=440869&in\\_page\\_id=1965](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/pages/live/articles/technology/technology.html?in_article_id=440869&in_page_id=1965)

And the polar bear picture that was used to make children cry – here is the original photo in proper context, before being used as propaganda.

<http://www.who.edu/beaufortgyre/dispatch2004/dispatch02.html>

Do scientists ever consider other explanations for the apparent warming of Earth's climate over the late 20<sup>th</sup> century? Yes. There are many other potential explanations. The global warming alarmists have routinely squelched opposing theories.

Could it be the sun?

<http://www.canada.com/nationalpost/story.html?id=edae9952-3c3e-47ba-913f-7359a5c7f723&k=0>

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2004/08/040803093903.htm>

What motivation would the U.N. have to lie in its IPCC report? Why would the U.N. exaggerate scientific consensus? Well, lets look at the U.N.'s history of exaggerating data for the purpose of increasing funding:

[http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/11/19/AR2007111900978\\_pf.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/11/19/AR2007111900978_pf.html)

The combination of ambitious politicians looking for a cause, Hollywood multi-millionaires with a guilty conscience, media outlets who love a doomsday scenario, and institutions of higher education hitching on to the money train, has caused a level of irresponsible propaganda rivaling that of Nazi Germany. An endless trail of government/non-profit moneys has poured into universities for studying everything from coral reefs to animal flatulence. The only requirement for the river of money to continue is that studies consistently conclude humans are destroying the planet, all in the name of global warming.

This list of 600+ articles attributing problems to global warming demonstrates how desperate the scientists have become to create a crisis:

[http://www.americanthinker.com/blog/2007/11/everything\\_is\\_caused\\_by\\_global.html](http://www.americanthinker.com/blog/2007/11/everything_is_caused_by_global.html)

---

Now, I am not saying that achieving a better understanding of our Earth's climate is bad. But do you think the funding would continue if the studies released concluded no immediate threat to mankind? In reality, scientists on campus have just as much financial motivation to achieve particular results as those working for Exxon laboratories. Take away the emotion, and look only at the existing facts. Open-minded people will conclude as I have. 'Global Warming' may be the greatest worldwide hoax in the history of mankind.

Darrin Barker

*Feb 24, 2008*