

- **What the Earth knows** - Robert B. Laughlin in the *American Scholar*
A Nobel laureate argues that "Any serious conversation about the planet's climate" needs to incorporate an appreciation of the Earth's vast geological history. "Climate change," he says, "is a matter of geologic time, something that the earth routinely does on its own without asking anyone's permission or explaining itself." The middle section of this essay is a little tough going, but the beginning and end are excellent.
- **Global Warming Advocacy Science: a Cross Examination** - Jason Scott Johnston, University of Pennsylvania Law School (82-page PDF)
"[M]y cross examination has...revealed that on virtually every major issue in climate change science, the [Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's assessment reports] and other summarizing work by leading climate establishment scientists have adopted various rhetorical strategies that seem to systematically conceal or minimize what appear to be fundamental scientific uncertainties or even disagreements. The bulk of this paper proceeds by cataloguing, and illustrating with concrete climate science examples, the various rhetorical techniques employed by the IPCC and other climate change scientist/advocates in an attempt to bolster their position, and to minimize or ignore conflicting scientific evidence. "
- **When to Doubt a Scientific 'Consensus'** - Jay Richards in *The American*
An excellent discussion which argues that a consensus is not the same as evidence, and points out that "with really well-established scientific theories, you never hear about consensus. No one talks about the consensus that the planets orbit the sun, that the hydrogen molecule is lighter than the oxygen molecule...when you've got decisive scientific evidence on your side, you argue the evidence. When you've got great arguments, you make the arguments. When you don't have decisive evidence or great arguments, you claim consensus."
- **It's Always the End of the World As We Know It** - Denis Dutton, *New York Times* op ed
End of the world scenarios - and a belief that humanity will be punished by the gods, Mother Nature, or by our own technological inventions - are ancient ideas that continue to have a powerful grip on our imaginations. This article adds some much-needed historical context to the discussion of impending climate catastrophe.
- **Wikipedia's Climate Doctor** - Lawrence Solomon in the *National Post*
The ClimateGate e-mails revealed that William Connelly, who appointed himself arbiter of all things climate on Wikipedia, is an official member of the RealClimate.org team - a blog run by activist scientists who are [notorious](#) for deleting reader comments that dispute their views. This article notes Connelly single-handedly created or re-wrote 5,428 Wikipedia entries, deleted 500 more, and was responsible for having 2,000 other Wikipedia contributors banned.
- **Global Warming With the Lid Off** - *Wall Street Journal* editorial
A good intro to some of the more disturbing aspects of "Climategate" - the release of

thousands of e-mails and other documents from the Climate Research Unit (CRU) of the UK's East Anglia University by a hacker or whistleblower in late 2009. The CRU is a prominent center for climate study and the e-mails reveal close relationships with many well-known climatologists elsewhere. These documents suggest that, rather than being dispassionate scholars, some of these scientists have morphed into activists who apparently feel exempt from commonplace checks-and-balances such as the need for one's scientific findings to be replicated by independent third parties. [more ClimateGate discussion [here](#)]

- **Promises, Promises** - Stuart Blackman writing in *The Scientist*
This piece explores reasons why modern scientists feel pressure to exaggerate their research findings and to make predictions that don't come true. Scientists are encouraged by both politicians and journalists to oversimplify and dramatize. Fierce competition for research funds also encourages them to hype the potential relevance of their work. "Scientists know about science, at least their own subdisciplines," says Dan Sarewitz (in the sidebar), "but they often know a lot less about technology and innovation and political context, so it's not very surprising that they're often wrong in their predictions."
- **Sea Rise and Climate Change: Let's Do The Science** - column in Seattle's *Crosscut*, by Todd Myers
This article, by an author who believes in global warming, does a great service by highlighting an internal incoherence that was exacerbated when the Nobel Prize was awarded jointly to Al Gore and the IPCC. The sea level rise portrayed in *An Inconvenient Truth* is far larger than IPCC estimates. If the IPCC represents a "scientific consensus" and such a consensus is the last word, then IPCC data cannot be disregarded when filmmakers feel a need to be dramatic. Moreover, activists who insist "scientific consensus" trumps all have no business citing topics such as ocean acidification - where the science is so immature that the matter hasn't even been examined by the IPCC yet.
- **A Skeptical Take on Global Warming** - meteorologist Matt Rogers blogging at the *Washington Post*
As he lists 10 reasons why he feels skepticism is warranted, this writer embeds links directly to his source material. A recurring theme: complex systems are not easily predicted. (The global warming argument is based on what certain experts *think* will happen in the future.) Observes this writer: "We poor hapless meteorologists learned the chaos theory lesson long ago."
- **Kyoto Protocol Based on Flawed Statistics** - a 2005 Dutch magazine article by Marcel Crok (translated)
An overview of the Michael Mann "hockey stick" controversy. This article notes that Mann and others have been less-than-cooperative about sharing their source data so that their calculations may be verified. The peer-review process failed to spot serious concerns with the iconic hockey stick graph, which was later distributed far and wide by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. "Mann denies any errors and rejects any criticism in strident tones."
- **Does Global Warming Diminish With Accurate Temperature**

Measurements? (Part 4) - a column by Thomas Fuller, *San Francisco Examiner*

This author, who believes in global warming, points out that NASA curiously eschews satellite temperature data in favor of ([compromised](#)) land-based temperature readings. NASA then uses proprietary software to crunch the numbers - software designed by militant environmental activist James Hansen. While satellite data shows that temperatures have been cooling recently, Hansen's data indicates steady warming.

- **The Double Standard in Environmental Science** - an article by Stanley W. Trimble, soil erosion expert

This author argues that research findings that suggest we're making environmental progress get rejected by prestigious journals, even though they're based on decades of real-world measurements. Yet papers that reach alarming conclusions get published, even when their authors have little expertise and scant data. This article suggests politics have unduly influenced journal publication decisions since at least the early 1980s. When prestigious journals exhibit long term, overt bias, who can society depend on for reliable information?

- **Does Global Warming Diminish With Accurate Temperature**

Measurements? (Part 2) - a column by Thomas Fuller, *San Francisco Examiner*

This author believes in global warming. Nevertheless, he notes that there are problems with the way temperatures are measured which, in turn, cast doubt on recent observed trends. "[T]he fact that global warming as measured to date is almost exactly equal to the adjustments performed to the data makes some sensible people queasy..."

- **A Tale of Two Scientific Consensuses** - an article by Ronald Bailey, *Reason* magazine

While environmentalists insist that the "scientific consensus" on global warming trumps all dissent, these same groups reject the broad scientific consensus that says genetically modified foods are safe. For some people, therefore, "scientific consensus" is merely a convenient talking point in the global warming debate - not a cherished principle on which they consistently base their positions. [\[read a related blog post here\]](#)

- **Why the EPA Should Have Listened to Alan Carlin on Global Warming** - a column by Thomas Fuller, *San Francisco Examiner*

This author believes global warming is a problem. But he points out that the US Environmental Protection Agency is basing 2009 decisions on a report that considered only pre-2006 research. "70% of everything written about [climate models] has been published in the past 5 years."

- **The Wrong Trousers: Radically Rethinking Climate Policy** - a 47-page PDF by [Gwyn Prins and Steve Rayner](#) (professors from Oxford University and the London School of Economics)

These writers believe in global warming theory. However, they explain why the Kyoto Protocol is an abject failure and warn that pursuing more Kyoto-style initiatives will do little to help the environment. [\[read a blog post about their paper here\]](#)

- **Global Warming: Forecasts by Scientists versus Scientific Forecasts** - a 27-page PDF by Kesten C. Green and J. Scott Armstrong (professors from Australia's

Monash University and the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania)

These writers explain that while a body of research has identified best practices with respect to making forecasts, the Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) appears unacquainted with this research. As a result, the methods used by the IPCC to predict future global warming contravene basic forecasting principles.

- **Science, Belief and Rational Debate** - an editorial appearing in the *Scientific Alliance Newsletter*

A brief overview of the scientific method and of how "scientific consensus" is typically achieved and then modified when new information becomes available. In the case of global warming theory, this article alleges that new information is being rejected out-of-hand rather than evaluated seriously. Contains a few typos.