

Climate Change Hysteria and Al Gore's "Chicken Little" Scare Tactics

Contributed by George Landrith
Friday, 14 September 2007

Al Gore and the climate alarmists have been hysterically warning of dire warming and cataclysmic climate change for about 20 years. These hyperbolic warnings as well as Al Gore's documentary movie, *An Inconvenient Truth*, are emblematic of Gore's political career — which is to say they are simply a stunning string of exaggerations, prevarications and half-truths.

The New York Times praised Gore's movie, but unwittingly revealed the problem with *An Inconvenient Truth*, "Gore avoids making direct causal links that most scientists say are impossible to substantiate." Instead, "Gore uses imagery and implication" to make his case. You've got to hand it to the Times — that is an astonishingly flattering way to say that Gore's movie lacks scientific support and is based primarily on innuendo, symbolism and smoke and mirrors.

Introduction

Al Gore and the climate alarmists have been hysterically warning of dire warming and cataclysmic climate change for about 20 years. These hyperbolic warnings as well as Al Gore's documentary movie, *An Inconvenient Truth*, are emblematic of Gore's political career — which is to say they are simply a stunning string of exaggerations, prevarications and half-truths.

The New York Times praised Gore's movie, but unwittingly revealed the problem with *An Inconvenient Truth*, "Gore avoids making direct causal links that most scientists say are impossible to substantiate." Instead, "Gore uses imagery and implication" to make his case. You've got to hand it to the Times — that is an astonishingly flattering way to say that Gore's movie lacks scientific support and is based primarily on innuendo, symbolism and smoke and mirrors.

Al Gore has been known throughout his public career for exaggerating, distorting, and dissembling. His practice of exaggerating was illustrated when Gore claimed to have taken "the initiative in creating the Internet." His penchant for distorting facts was shown when he claimed during the presidential debates that he visited storm-torn Texas with the FEMA director — when, in fact, he did not. Gore was attending a fundraiser. His habit of dissembling was exhibited by his multiple and differing explanations for his involvement in the illegal fundraiser at a Buddhist Temple.

Al Gore's *An Inconvenient Truth* is actually a convenient myth — a myth that is convenient to his political and policy aspirations, but a myth nonetheless. Most myths are harmless. The mythical tooth fairy harms no one. If Al Gore's myths were similarly harmless, I would simply let the matter pass without a word. But Gore's myths are anything but harmless.

Gore's myths will cost trillions of dollars and divert us from doing things that will actually improve life on the earth — defeating global terrorism, providing clean drinking water in the developing world, controlling flooding and providing irrigation water for stable farming in underdeveloped nations, improving levy systems in areas prone to flooding, etc. Every dollar spent pursuing Al Gore's command and control regulatory regime is a dollar that cannot be spent on other important priorities. Additionally, his myths will kill millions of jobs and hamper economic growth — meaning that if Al Gore's myths become widely accepted, you and your family will have less income, fewer opportunities and less freedom.

For the record, the burden of proof is on Al Gore to establish that his claims are true and that his policy demands are needed. If I were to claim that the moon will crash into the Earth and kill millions and cost trillions and if I were to claim that immediate government action is required to avert this disaster, I would bear the burden to prove my claims — with observable and verifiable scientific data — not based on projections or estimates or guesstimates or imagery or implication — but real facts. And so it is with Al Gore — the burden of proof is on him. Gore and the climate

hysteria crowd fail to meet that burden.

The "Chicken Little" Crowd

The main point of *An Inconvenient Truth* is to scare you and me with dire predictions about future cataclysmic events so that we will gladly agree to support Gore's big-government command and control political and policy goals. Gore calls it a "planetary emergency." Simply put, the movie attempts to convince viewers that we, or our children, will die or be unimaginably and irreparably harmed if we don't elect Al Gore or those who agree with his politics. But these "chicken little" purveyors of doomsday predictions that the sky is falling have been, and are, consistently wrong.

In the 1960s, this crowd warned that population growth would cause unrest and riots in America and mass starvation around the globe. They were wrong. Violent crime rates have been falling in the U.S. for years and malnutrition across the globe is at all time lows. They predicted that we would exhaust the world's mineral resources. Wrong again. Today, minerals are generally more plentiful and cheaper than before. They predicted we would exhaust the world's petroleum supply before the year 2000. Wrong yet again. We will have oil well into the next century — if we still need it. In the 1970s, they warned of global cooling and a coming ice age. Again, they were wrong. Now, they tell us that mankind is causing global warming and that we can stop it if we give big government more money and more control over our lives.

Why should we pay any attention to these people? If for the last 40 years, I predicted that the Chicago Cubs would win the World Series and each year my prediction proved wrong, how serious would the public take my predictions? Who's the bigger fool? The person who runs around spewing silly doomsday predictions? Or the people who listen to them and adopt their oppressive regulatory regimes and tax policies?

Al Gore's Credibility

Let's look specifically at Al Gore's credibility — after all *An Inconvenient Truth* is his movie. Al Gore has exaggerated and prevaricated his way through his political career. There are many, many examples. His claim that "during [his] service in the United States Congress, [he] took the initiative in creating the Internet" is just one amusing example. Another humorous case in point was when Gore was campaigning for president in 2000 and told a union group that his parents sung him to sleep with lullabies like "Look for the Union Label" — a jingle that was written for a union advertisement in 1975, when Al Gore was 27 years old.

But perhaps the most illustrative example of Al Gore's problem with truth is when he stood before the entire nation during the 1996 televised Democratic National Convention and emotionally told of how in 1984 he held his sister's hand as she died of lung cancer due to smoking. With a lump in his throat and a hoarse voice, Al Gore explained that this emotional moment caused him to "pour [his] heart and soul into the [anti-tobacco] cause." It was a moving moment and he won accolades for his speech.

Only one problem, the story was not true. For the next four years after his sister's death, Al Gore and his family continued to grow tobacco on the family farm. For the next six years, Gore maintained political relationships with the tobacco industry and accepted their large political contributions. In 1988 (four years after his sister's death), when Gore hoped to win the Democratic nomination for President, he campaigned in the South as a pro-tobacco candidate, saying, "Throughout most of my life, I've raised tobacco. I want you to know that with my own hands, all of

my life, I put it in the plant beds and transferred it. I've hoed it. I've chopped it. I've shredded it, spiked it, put it in the barn and stripped it and sold it."

It is clear that Al Gore doesn't have a track record for candor or truthfulness.

When experts have questioned the basis for Al Gore's dire climate predictions and scary stories and asked whether it is ethical to make such claims without sound evidence, Gore says that exaggerated claims are justified because this issue is so important. To *Grist Magazine*, Al Gore said, "I believe it is appropriate to have an over-representation of factual presentations on how dangerous it is, as a predicate for opening up the audience." To "over-represent" is to exaggerate or embellish or misstate. To "open up the audience" is to scare them with misrepresented scenarios. That sums up the problem that Al Gore has — he is so emotionally committed to his pet theories, he believes he is justified to do just about anything to get you to accept his views — even misrepresent the facts.

One of Gore's primary global warming allies, Dr. Steven Schneider, a climate researcher, shares Gore's belief that it is okay to exaggerate some things and ignore inconvenient facts — an interesting theory for a scientist. Schneider said, "[Scientists] need to get broad-based support, to capture the public's imagination. That, of course, entails getting loads of media coverage. So we have to offer up scary scenarios, make simplified, dramatic statements, and make little mention of any doubts we might have.... Each of us has to decide the right balance between being effective and being honest." Al Gore and his friends have chosen to be effective at the expense of honesty.

Incidentally, Dr. Schneider was once an advocate of the global cooling scare. In 1978, he warned of a coming Ice Age. In fact, the National Academy of Sciences adopted this view, "There is a finite possibility that a serious worldwide cooling could befall the Earth within the next 100 years." My how times have changed. The bottom line is that global warming isn't the first time we've been warned of a coming climate apocalypse, but it certainly is the most loudly proclaimed.

Al Gore's ally at the U.S. Conservation Foundation, Richard Benedict, went so far as to say, "A global climate treaty must be implemented even if there is no scientific evidence to back the [enhanced] greenhouse effect."

Yet, Gore tells us the science is certain, the debate is over, and all serious, reputable scientists agree with him. But Gore is not telling the truth. He didn't create the Internet. He didn't devote his life to defeating big tobacco in 1984. The science isn't certain. The debate is far from over. And many serious and acclaimed scientists do not agree with Gore.

Gore dismisses those who don't agree with him as "pawns of big oil." This is both an unfair and inaccurate characterization. Many acclaimed scientists cast serious doubt on Gore's theories and they have solid evidence on their side. What Gore doesn't admit is that the scientists he relies upon have their own financial motivations to trump up scary "facts." As Professor Petr Chylek explains, grant funding is a big motivator. Chylek, a professor of atmospheric science at Dalhousie University, says, "Scientists who want to attract attention to themselves, who want to attract great funding to themselves, have to [find a] way to scare the public ... and this you can achieve only by making things bigger and more dangerous than they really are."

It is particularly disingenuous for Gore to pretend that climate scientists who agree with him have no financial incentives because the Clinton/Gore administration worked diligently to cut government funding to scientists who questioned Gore's theories. I know of climate scientists who lost funding as the result of Gore's efforts. I know of other scientists who kept a "low profile" because they feared Gore would cut their funding.

Yet, Gore says he is concerned that scientists who support his theories "were persecuted, ridiculed, deprived of income." The exact opposite is what occurred — scientists who questioned Gore's theories have been defamed and de-funded. Gore has been a major player in this smear campaign.

How can a man be trusted to tell the truth and fairly present the facts when he has admitted he believes he is justified in fabricating and exaggerating the facts?

Al Gore has no reservoir of trust to draw upon to tell us that we should simply trust him. Gore has proven over and over that he is more inclined to exaggerate and distort than tell the truth. The first thing to keep in mind when listening to Al Gore go on and on about global warming is that the truth doesn't matter to him.

Is the Science Certain? Is the Debate Over?

"The debate's over. The evidence is overwhelming and undeniable," says Gore. Gore and his allies pretend all serious-minded scientists agree with them and that only simpletons or charlatans disagree. But this is simply false. The debate is far from over and there are mounds of reliable scientific evidence that do not support Gore's wild doomsday predictions.

Al Gore and other global warming enthusiasts are fond of reciting that 2,611 scientists have signed a letter stating that global warming poses a serious and real threat. Yet, only about one in ten of the so-called 2611 scientists had scientific expertise. And only 5 out of the 2,611 so-called scientists had training in climate, weather or other atmospheric sciences. That is less than 1/2 of one percent. Excuse me, for being underwhelmed.

Perhaps more revealing is that Gore's list of "scientists" included landscape architects, psychologists, lawyers, a philosopher, a dermatologist, a gynecologist, and a diplomat. On this flimsy basis, as only Al Gore can, he tells us that the "debate is over" and that there is complete agreement.

The truth is that more than 17,000 scientists (not landscape architects, dermatologists or diplomats) have signed a petition stating, in part, that "there is no convincing scientific evidence that human release of carbon dioxide, methane, or other greenhouse gases is causing or will, in the foreseeable future, cause catastrophic heating of the Earth's atmosphere and disruption of the Earth's climate." This petition was circulated by the Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine, an independent research foundation that is not funded by industry. This petition was signed by more than 2,100 physicists, geophysicists, climatologists, meteorologists, and environmental scientists and by more than another 4,400 scientists with expertise on carbon dioxide's effects on plant and animal life.

Al Gore won't admit this, but a survey of state climatologists found that by an almost 3 to 1 margin these climate experts believe that global warming is largely a natural phenomenon. The survey further found that 9 out of 10 state climatologists agreed that "current science is unable to isolate and measure variations in global temperatures caused only by man-made factors." The vast majority of climatologists also said that the historical data do not indicate "that fluctuations in global temperatures are attributable to human influences such as burning fossil fuels." For Gore, this truly is an inconvenient truth — inconvenient because it proves that the debate is not over and that the science is not certain and that his hysterical warnings are not founded in established fact.

Professor Bob Carter of the Marine Geophysical Laboratory at James Cook University, in Queensland, Australia disputes that science or scientists are on Gore's side, "Gore's circumstantial arguments are so weak that they are pathetic. It is simply incredible that they, and his film, are commanding public attention." Professor Carter, also says that global warming theory is neither environmental or scientific, but rather, "a self-created political fiasco." Carter explains, "Climate changes occur naturally all the time, partly in predictable cycles and partly in unpredictable cycles."

Professor Carter is right. Actual climate records show that temperatures naturally vary. About sixteen thousand years ago, there was a major ice age. Today is warmer. That happened naturally. Man did not cause the change, nor did SUVs. Thus, because the actual climate data does not support their pet theories, global warming enthusiasts often rely upon computer models to predict future temperatures and argue that we will experience dramatic warming in coming decades. However, former University of Winnipeg climatology professor Dr. Tim Ball explains the problem with using computer models, "These models have been consistently wrong in all their scenarios." The truth is the models have been used for decades and none of the things that they predicted have happened. They have been consistently wrong. Why should we believe them now?

George Taylor, State Climatologist at the Oregon Climate Service and a past president of the American Association of State Climatologists said "I can tell you that there is a great deal of global warming skepticism among my colleagues [at the American Association of State Climatologists].... Far from being a 'done deal,' the global warming scenarios are looking shakier and shakier.... It's interesting to me that the tactics of the 'advocates' seems to be to (i) call the other side names ('pseudo-scientists'); and (ii) declare the debate over ('the vast majority of credible scientists believe...')."

Carleton University paleoclimatologist Professor Tim Patterson testified before Canada's Commons Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development, "There is no meaningful correlation between CO2 levels and Earth's temperature over this [geologic] time frame. In fact, when CO2 levels were over ten times higher than they are now, about 450 million years ago, the planet was in the depths of the absolute coldest period in the last half billion years." This fact alone blows apart the theory that current CO2 levels will cause dramatic warming. If CO2 levels were ten times higher during the ice age, it can't be that CO2 causes catastrophic warming. To drive home the point, Patterson asked the committee, "On the basis of this evidence, how could anyone still believe that the recent relatively small increase in CO2 levels would be the major cause of the past century's modest warming?" That is a very good question — but for Mr. Gore, it is an inconvenient question, thus he chooses not to address it.

Patterson also explained that his personal research and hundreds of other studies reveal that the Earth's temperature rises and falls as the intensity of the Sun increases and decreases. Many non-scientists think of the Sun as a steady and unchanging source of heat and light. Yet, scientific evidence shows that the Sun's intensity naturally varies. And for the record, mankind has no impact on the Sun's intensity. These natural variations in the Sun's intensity create warmer and cooler periods on earth. Perhaps Al Gore should consider the possibility that the Earth's climate is impacted more by the Sun's intensity than by yuppies driving SUVs.

In any event, Gore is not being honest or accurate when he says the debate is over and the scientific data clearly and unambiguously support his "chicken little" doomsday claims.

Is Global Warming Real?

More than 60 leading international climate change experts recently wrote a letter to urge Canada's new Prime

Minster to carefully review global warming policies, warning that "Climate change is real" is a meaningless phrase used repeatedly by activists to convince the public that a climate catastrophe is looming and humanity is the cause.

The Earth's climate has cooled during known and verifiable ice ages and warmed during similarly known and verifiable warmer periods. Even during periods of relative warming and cooling, the world's climate has varied from year to year and from decade to decade. The truth is climate naturally changes all the time — and mankind is not the cause. Some of those changes are in predictable cycles. And some are in unpredictable cycles. Some of those changes are gradual and some are rapid shifts. We know these changes occurred and much of the evidence points to the Sun and its varying intensity.

But many of the causes remain unknown. This is part of the problem with Gore's analysis. He observes changes and then blames man and industrialization. The problem with this approach is that there have been many other even more dramatic changes in the Earth's climate hundreds, thousands, and even millions of years ago and neither man nor industrialization were the cause. So if similar and even more dramatic changes have occurred naturally in the past, why is this change all of a sudden caused by man's activities? Isn't it more likely that it is just another natural variation?

Scientific data proves that on numerous occasions in the past, the Earth's climate was warmer than today — in some cases almost 10 degrees Fahrenheit hotter than today's climate. These warmer periods were not short-term aberrations, but in many cases lasted hundreds of years and even thousands of years.

Additionally, history shows that natural climate change can happen very rapidly. For example, scientists now know that "the main warming events that ended the last ice age took place within less than a decade. In Greenland, air temperatures warmed by about fifteen degrees centigrade within the time it takes to complete a college degree."

Thus, a change of half a degree centigrade over 100 years simply isn't that much to worry about it.

Additionally, the modest warming that has occurred since the end of the Little Ice Age has a remarkably benign distribution. Typically, when people hear about a 1-degree increase in global temperatures, they think the Earth will be warmer by 1 degree virtually everywhere. However, temperatures during the night and during the winter have increased the most and temperatures during the day and the summer have increased the least. This helps agricultural growing seasons without substantially changing the summer daytime high temperature.

Interestingly, a disproportionate amount of the modest warming since the end of the Little Ice Age has occurred in places like Siberia during the night in the winter. So that rather than being 90 degrees Fahrenheit below zero, it is 88 degrees below zero. That is not the kind of warming that will cause anyone to lose sleep. The world's coldest recorded temperature is 129 degrees Fahrenheit below zero recorded in Siberia in 1983. If places like Siberia warm a degree or two, who would ever notice? Or care? Conversely, the warmest area of the earth (those nearest the equator) experienced virtually no warming.

From the 11th Century to the 13th Century there was a warm period known as the Medieval Warm Period. The Earth's climate during the Medieval Warm Period when the Vikings settled Greenland was 1 degree Fahrenheit warmer than today's temperatures. In fact, for more than 7,500 of the last 10,000 years, temperatures have been higher than today's temperature. After the Medieval Warm Period there was a cooling period known as the Little Ice Age from 16th and into the 19th Century.

Since the end of the Little Ice Age in roughly 1850, there has been a mild warming trend of about 1 degree Fahrenheit. This modest increase is often cited as evidence of man-made warming. However, it most likely represents a return to "normal" temperatures following an almost 400-year period of comparatively colder weather.

Even the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), a primary supporter of the Kyoto Protocol global warming treaty, concluded that: "The Little Ice Age came to an end only in the nineteenth century. Thus, some of the global warming since 1850 could be a recovery from the Little Ice Age rather than a direct result of human activities." Al Gore fails to mention this "inconvenient" fact in his movie.

However, even during the modest warming since 1850, there were substantial variations in the Earth's climate. For example, from 1945 to 1975, temperatures fell by about 1/2°F. These falling temperatures led to concerns of global cooling and a coming ice age. In fact, in 1975 Newsweek reported, "The central fact is that after three-quarters of a century of extraordinarily mild conditions, the Earth's climate seems to be cooling down." Newsweek warned of "profound climatic change" with "catastrophic famines" and reported that meteorologists were "almost unanimous" that the cooling trend would reduce agricultural productivity.

In eerily similar language to Gore's warnings, Newsweek concluded, "The longer the planners delay, the more difficult will they find it to cope with climatic change once the results become grim reality." Also in 1975, the National Wildlife Federation's journal, *International Wildlife*, warned "the threat of a new ice age must now stand alongside nuclear war as a likely source of wholesale death and misery for mankind." Aren't you glad the government didn't spend billions of our tax dollars trying to save the world from the next ice age?

From the late 1970s to the late 1990s, there was again a brief period of modest warming which fueled Gore's enthusiasm for global warming politics. It is interesting that the official temperature records of the Climate Research Unit at the University of East Anglia, for the years 1998-2005 show that the Earth's average temperature did not increase. In fact, there was a very slight decrease.

In the film, Gore says that 200 cities in Western America set all time high temperature records. However, Dr. Roy Spencer, Principal Research Scientist at The University of Alabama in Huntsville says this is misleading. "It is not unusual for some locations, out of the thousands of cities and towns in the U.S., to set all-time records," Spencer says. "The actual data shows that overall, recent temperatures in the U.S. were not unusual."

When Gore says that global warming is real, he is not arguing that the Earth's climate naturally fluctuates and that a colder period ended and we have now entered a mildly warmer period. Gore's argument is that the current warming is unprecedented, catastrophic and caused by man's activity. That is what he means when he says "global warming is real." The bottom line is that Gore's version of catastrophic global warming caused by mankind's activities is not supported by the scientific climate data.

Are Computer Models Reliable?

Al Gore and other global warming activists rely heavily on computer climate models to support their claims of dramatic or catastrophic warming. The actual temperature records do not support claims of catastrophic warming. So global warming advocates turn to computer models for the data they need to back up their theories. The problem with computer models is that they are not evidence. They are merely predictions and they can produce whatever results are desired by making modest changes to assumptions and calculations. Models have their appropriate uses, but they are not evidence.

Are these models accurate and reliable? In a word, no. Even if you feed past data into these models, they cannot accurately "predict" the past. Simply stated, if you input the known data from the last century into these computer models, they cannot replicate what we already know happened in the climate. If these models cannot even replicate the past (i.e. what we already know happened), how can we rely upon them to predict the future?

There is a very good reason why computer models are inaccurate. It is practically impossible to account for the thousands of factors that impact weather and climate. Scientists don't even understand precisely how many of the weather factors impact climate — so accounting for them in a model is simply impossible.

Clouds are a good example. Currently, scientists have an understanding of the conditions under which clouds form and dissipate and what basic impact they have on atmospheric temperatures. But the details — cloud brightness, density, and size — are a much bigger problem. Little is known about most of these factors. Yet, clouds are a major factor in determining the Earth's climate by reflecting sunlight back into space, producing precipitation, and retaining heat at the Earth's surface. But because we don't understand these factors and relationships, we can't account for them in the climate models.

Predicting the weather next month is extraordinarily difficult. But accurately predicting weather into the next century is nearly impossible. Thus, computer models cannot be relied upon as evidence of global warming first because they are not evidence and secondly because they are not accurate.

Is Warming Making Hurricanes Worse?

An Inconvenient Truth opens with dramatic footage of Hurricane Katrina slamming into the Gulf Coast with Gore explaining unequivocally and confidently that because of global warming, hurricanes are getting more violent and more destructive. But again, the truth is very inconvenient for Mr. Gore and his pet theories.

Climate scientist, William M. Gray, who pioneered the science of forecasting hurricane activity and is often referred to as the "World's Most Famous Hurricane Expert," rejects the theory that climate change has caused an increase in the number of hurricanes or their intensity. He points out that in 1915 — well before the advent of SUVs — two major hurricanes, which approximated the ferocity of 2005's hurricane Katrina and hurricane Rita, hit the Gulf Coast only six weeks apart. The strongest hurricane ever to strike the United States occurred in 1935 — again, long before global warming was a vogue issue.

Gray explains that 2005's hurricane season was not unprecedented and is simply part of a natural cycle. Gray also argues that if global warming were causing more hurricanes in the Atlantic, why doesn't it cause more typhoons in the Pacific and Indian Oceans — where there has been a modest decrease in storm activity? Gray points out that for the last 30 years of the 20th Century, the United States had an unusually low number of intense storms.

No one should be surprised that after an unusually light storm period, we are witnessing an increase in storm activity — which is only a return to normal storm activity. Gray explains that current storm activity is simply part of a natural cycle and concludes that the notion that global warming is caused by human activity and that it is increasing hurricane activity is "one of the greatest hoaxes ever."

Chris Landsea of the National Hurricane Center casts serious doubt on the idea that hurricane intensity has significantly increased over the past thirty years. He points out that we could not accurately measure hurricane wind speeds before 1984 and that we do not know whether there is an actual increase in Category 4 and Category 5 hurricanes or whether there is only the illusion of an increase based on our improved ability to measure hurricanes.

Phil Klotzbach, a hurricane scientist and forecaster at Colorado State University, observes that recent increased hurricane activity in the Atlantic has been offset by a decrease in the number of tropical storms in the Pacific. "When these two regions are summed together, there has been virtually no increase in Category 4-5 hurricanes."

Given all the wild claims that have circulated about hurricanes and global warming in the last two years, a group of the world's leading hurricane experts conducted a careful scientific review of historical hurricane data and trends.

Their study concluded, "Claims of linkages between global warming and hurricanes are premature.... [because] no connection has been established between greenhouse gas emissions and the observed behavior of hurricanes." They concluded, "[T]he state of knowledge today is such that there are good reasons to expect that any conclusive connection between global warming and hurricanes or their impacts will not be made in the near term."

While some recent reports have suggested that hurricanes are getting worse, these reports only study hurricanes beginning in 1970 — a period when hurricane activity was well below average. However, when the analysis is expanded to include hurricanes beginning in the mid-1940s when hurricane hunter aircraft were first used, you have a more representative sampling and obtain very different results. The longer-term perspective reveals that just the opposite of the shorter-term studies — the number of strong hurricanes has declined. The truth is when the data is reviewed over a longer term from 1900 through the present, it becomes clear that there are natural periods of greater storm activity and periods of lesser storm activity, but no temporal trend building over time.

Some global warming activists have even disingenuously used the dollar estimates of damage and loss from hurricanes in an attempt to prove that storms are more severe and frequent.

They have argued, for example, that in inflation adjusted dollars, hurricanes in 1920 only did \$1 million of property damage, but in 2005, they did \$50 billion of property damage. However, this is a cheap statistical stunt devoid of meaning. Of course property damage is increasing — more people live in more expensive homes close to the coast in areas susceptible to hurricanes.

In 1900, Florida had barely one-half million inhabitants and was one of the smallest states east of the Mississippi. By 2000, Florida had grown 32 times its 1900 population and ranked as the fourth largest state in the United States. Thus if a Category 5 hurricane struck southern Florida in 1900, it would have done very limited property damage as there were comparatively few homes and businesses to damage or destroy. In contrast, in 2005, even a relatively mild Category 1 or 2 storm would do substantially more damage in terms of dollars to homes and businesses in the now populated areas of southern Florida.

Kerry Emanuel of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology is a prominent hurricane and global warming researcher who is frequently cited by global warming activists. Yet, he rejects the idea that global warming is causing more hurricanes. Recently, when he was asked if global warming is causing more hurricanes, Emanuel responded, "No," and added, "there is no indication whatsoever of a long-term trend in [the data]." When asked whether one could attribute hurricane Katrina to global warming, Emanuel responded, "[I]t would be absurd." Yet, this is precisely what Gore does.

Are the Ice Caps Melting? Are the Glaciers Retreating?

Gore shows dramatic video of Antarctic glaciers collapsing into the sea. We are told this is evidence of global warming. However, it is not. Dr. Boris Winterhalter, former marine researcher at the Geological Survey of Finland and professor in marine geology at the University of Helsinki, explains, "The breaking glacier wall is a normally occurring phenomenon which is due to the normal advance of a glacier."

In the movie, Gore states, "Starting in 1970, there was a precipitous drop-off in the amount and extent and thickness of the Arctic ice cap." He tells us this is evidence of global warming. However, Former University of Winnipeg climatology professor Dr. Tim Ball, explains that Gore's data is misleading, "The survey that Gore cites was a single transect across one part of the Arctic basin in the month of October during the 1960s when we were in the middle of the cooling period. The 1990 runs were done in the warmer month of September, using a wholly different technology."

Arctic ice thickness varies over time — expanding and contracting. Dr. Dick Morgan, former advisor to the World Meteorological Organization and climatology researcher at University of Exeter in the United Kingdom explains, "There has been some decrease in ice thickness in the Canadian Arctic over the past 30 years but no meltdown. The Canadian Ice Service records show that from 1971-1981 there was average, to above average, ice thickness. From 1981-1982 there was a sharp decrease of 15%, but there was a quick recovery to average, to slightly above average, values from 1983-1995. A sharp drop of 30% occurred again in 1996-1998 and since then there has been a steady increase to reach near normal conditions since 2001."

Data suggests that over the last several decades temperatures over much of the Arctic have increased to levels last seen in the 1930s. In contrast, data suggests that temperatures over much of Antarctica have decreased and that snow and ice accumulation is increasing. What do we draw from these facts? First, temperatures vary and current temperatures at the North Pole are similar to temperatures in the 1930s. Second, we see that overall, there is no polar warming trend as the South Pole is colder and has more snow and ice accumulation.

Typically, news stories about warming focus on the Arctic, and do not report cooler temperatures in Antarctica or the growing snow accumulation. If they do mention Antarctica, they tend to talk only about a small part of Antarctica — the Antarctic Peninsula, which is less than 2% of Antarctica — where temperatures have risen slightly. As a result, greater plant life and animal life are beginning to colonize there. However, the vast majority of the continent of Antarctica (more than 98% of it) is cooling, yet Gore and the media simply don't report it.

While there is some melting of Greenland's ice sheets, there are areas in Greenland where the interior ice sheets are growing. From 1992 to 2003, the area of "growing" ice far out weighs the melting areas, according to a study by a Norwegian-led team of scientists. Thus, the Greenland Ice Sheet is not melting away, but is actually growing at respectable rates. These increasing or "growing" ice sheets, like the one in Antarctica, are actually removing water from the oceans.

Of the 160,000 glaciers in the world only a small fraction have been studied or catalogued over time. For example, only 42 glaciers have been inventoried for a period of ten years or longer. Thus, it is difficult to make sweeping statements about glaciers with any scientific certainty. But we do know that during the 15th through 19th Centuries, glaciers advanced around the world during the cooler period known as the Little Ice Age. After the Little Ice Age ended, it should surprise no one that glaciers receded. The rate of glacial retreat over the last 70 years does not appear to have increased.

Often dramatic pictures of Glacier National Park in Montana and Herbert Glacier in Alaska are shown to “prove” that glacier melt is a serious problem. However, natural processes, rather than man-made causes, are evident in both glaciers. A study of Glacier National Park shows that glaciers have repeatedly advanced and retreated over the last 300 years. Another study found that glaciers in Alaska have had numerous periods of advance and retreat for at least 700 years. According to a study done by the University of Alaska-Southeast, Herbert Glacier retreated many miles and a forest grew in its place. Then the glacier advanced again, then retreated, and then advanced again. And now is again receding.

The point is, if glacier expansion and retreat has happened before many, many times and it is clear that man did not cause those changes, why does Mr. Gore demand that we all accept that current similar changes are suddenly to be blamed on human activity?

Does Warming Increase Diseases?

Midway through the movie, Gore talks about the impact of warmer weather on disease — showing a chart with a scary list of illnesses, among them SARS (Severe-Acute Respiratory Syndrome), malaria, ebola virus, and avian flu (bird flu). He tells us these diseases are “quite a serious problem....” The only purpose in listing all these diseases and warning us that they are “a serious concern” while discussing global warming was to imply that warmer temperatures would aid the spread of SARS, ebola, and bird flu.

However, these diseases are not spread as a result of climate factors. Not even malaria, a mosquito-born illness, has any serious relationship to climate change.

Simply stated, Al Gore was once again exaggerating and misstating the truth. Just a reminder — Gore did not “take the initiative in creating the Internet,” his parents did not sing him a Union jingle to help him sleep when he was 27, and global warming doesn’t make SARS or bird flu or Ebola worse.

What Al Gore didn’t tell you ...

Al Gore’s movie presents selectively chosen bits of information and misinformation. Likewise, Gore fails to tell the full story. Here are a few interesting facts that he failed to mention in his movie, *An Inconvenient Truth*:

- Al Gore doesn’t mention weather satellites collecting data about atmospheric temperatures. Yet, the satellite data is the most important data we have because it is accurate and comprehensive (i.e. collecting data from tens of thousands of locations around the world rather than just at a few hundred airports or weather stations around the world). Why doesn’t Al Gore ever mention weather satellites in his movie? Because the data collected from the satellites does not support his position. To Al Gore, the empirical data collected by weather satellites is a very inconvenient truth.

- When Al Gore had an office in the West Wing of the White House, average automobile fuel-efficiency hit a 19-year low. Fuel economy was worse during the Clinton/Gore years than during the presidency of Ronald Reagan who won his first term in November 1979. Another surprise, George W. Bush has raised fuel standards (CAFE or Corporate Average Fuel Economy Standards) more than during the Clinton/Gore years. Perhaps this explains why Gore shows a chart of fuel

economy beginning in 2002. But he does not show the Clinton/Gore years on his chart – it would have shown that Reagan, Bush and Bush all outperformed him on improving fuel economy standards.

- Gore has repeatedly said that the “science is certain” and the “debate is over,” yet his own science advisor for the movie, an ecologist, Rosina Bierbaum at the University of Michigan, when asked about some of Gore’s claims, acknowledged that there is a debate and said, “There’s nothing ever settled in science.”

- Gore is fond of stating that the United States isn’t doing enough about global warming, but the truth is that the U.S. government has spent \$18 billion on climate research since 1990, three times as much as any other nation.

- In his movie, Gore explains how his Harvard professor, oceanographer Roger Revelle, strongly influenced his views on global warming. However, Revelle co-authored an article in 1991 that concluded, “The scientific base for a greenhouse warming is too uncertain to justify drastic action at this time.” Revelle died shortly thereafter and never sided with Gore.

- Al Gore exaggerates and makes dire predictions of cataclysmic harm and disaster. However, many climate and economic experts believe that a modest warming trend – whether man-made or natural – has significant economic benefits. An anthology by 26 specialists studied the impact climate change would have on the US economy and determined that, “Agronomic studies suggest that carbon fertilization is likely to offset some if not all of the damages from warming.”

- Gore argues that global warming “is a moral issue” and that moral people will obviously accept his views and support his command and control policy prescriptions. Al Gore’s remedies include severe or draconian energy rationing. But wouldn’t government-planned deprivation pose serious moral issues? The energy generated by fossil fuels has raised the world’s standard of living and made possible things our great-grandparents could not have dreamed of. During the past century, energy was instrumental in driving starvation to all-time lows, almost doubling life expectancies, and lowering most disease rates. Gore makes wild predictions about weather and then tells us if we don’t buy into his remedies, we’re ignoring a moral issue. But Gore ignores the moral issues presented by the life and death decisions that his polices would force upon the poorest in the world.

- Gore says that evidence of the Clean Air Act can be seen “with the naked eye” in Antarctic ice-core samples. However, it can’t. He’s making that up.

- Gore presents a simplified world in which “big-oil” is evil and he and his extreme environmentalist friends are saintly and good. Yet, energy has made possible advances that allow people to live longer, healthier, and in greater comfort. The poorest among us have been freed from lives of dangerous and backbreaking labor. If energy is so evil, why has it done so much good in the world? On the other hand, what has Al Gore done that is comparable to improve the lives of the poor and downtrodden? So much for his good versus evil labels!

- Gore treats population growth as a terrible problem and a great embarrassment. He highlights his point by stating that human population has grown more during the past 65 years than in all previous history combined. This is a great feat of human discovery, innovation and achievement. This population growth was made possible because of advances in agriculture, food storage and preservation, transportation, science and medicine. This growth was possible because humans are not merely mouths to feed. They have brains to solve problems and invent needed technology. They have hands to build, create and fix things. But, sadly, to Al Gore and the zero-population crowd, humans are simply mouths to feed.

Conclusions ...

Here are a few conclusions about Al Gore and his movie, An Inconvenient Truth:

- Gore begins his discussion by insisting that nothing he says in the movie is scientifically controversial. It turns out that virtually nothing he says is actually scientific. It isn't good science. It is weak and shoddy science fiction with a little political fiction mixed in. Too bad Gore didn't add a little political thriller to the mix to make the movie more entertaining.

- Discussions of global climate trends require an understanding of history. It is because of our "historical experience" that we do not become alarmed when the seasons change and the temperatures drop in the fall and winter or rise in the spring and summer. At a young age, we learn that the seasons are simply natural variations and not a sign of anything catastrophic. Likewise, a review of long-term climate history shows that the Earth has experienced many, many cooling and warming trends — none of which were caused by man's activities. There is no compelling reason to believe that recent trends are outside the norm of these historical natural fluctuations.

- Beware of "Chicken Little" alarmists who frantically warn that the sky is falling and promise that if you will give them more of your money (i.e. higher taxes) and sacrifice more of your freedom and opportunity (i.e. more mandates and regulations), they will save you from the falling sky. The truth is, there is no conclusive or reliable scientific proof that the sky is falling or that Earth's climate is experiencing cataclysmic warming caused by man's activities.

George Landrith is the President of the Frontiers of Freedom Institute — a public policy think tank devoted to promoting a strong national defense, free markets, individual liberty, and constitutionally limited government. Mr. Landrith is a graduate of the University of Virginia School of Law, where he was Business Editor of the Virginia Journal of Law and Politics. As an adjunct professor at the George Mason School of Law, Mr. Landrith has taught constitutional law, appellate advocacy, and legal writing. Mr. Landrith appears frequently on television and radio news programs. He has been quoted in many of the nation's leading newspapers. In 2004, Mr. Landrith published a book entitled, *On Politics and Policy: Views on Freedom from an American Conservative*.