

The documents below consider Global Warming. Read them **both** in order to answer all the questions on the question paper.

**Document 1:** adapted from 'A Logical Argument Against Man Made Global Warming for the Layman' by Erik Bays. This was written in June 2009 as part of a degree course in Journalism at the University of Oregon.

Did you know the Earth has been cooling for the last decade? Did you know that the poles of the planet are gaining about as much ice as they are losing? Did you know that for 420,000 years changes in Earth's temperature have happened before? These are not things you are likely to learn listening to mainstream media.

Before getting to the actual logical arguments against global warming, it is necessary to address a common fallacy used to support it and give some political background. The fallacy is the presumed authority of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).

The IPCC was created by the United Nations (UN). The IPCC was to be an objective scientific body that could produce reports on climate change for politicians worldwide. In 2007 the IPCC won the Nobel Peace Prize with Al Gore for informing the world about global warming.

The IPCC cannot be trusted as an objective scientific body. In its Second Assessment Report the IPCC made headlines when it announced for the first time that 'the balance of evidence suggests a discernible human influence on global climate.' This was a ground-breaking change from its position in its First Assessment Report, and it had heavy political significance. Shortly after this Report, the United States announced that it would now support a binding but realistic target for emissions. It was on the basis of this Report that the Kyoto Protocol\* was entered into.

A coalition of oil, coal and utility companies quickly accused the IPCC of misconduct. The accusations had to do with revisions made to Chapter 8 of the Report, the most controversial section. A working group of six dozen climate scientists met and debated each portion of the chapter. Based on this discussion the chapter was written, submitted to the IPCC and accepted. Then government representatives had, under IPCC rules, the opportunity to respond. The lead author, under IPCC rules, was required to revise the chapter in response to these government comments. He made the revisions without consulting the other scientists.

This revision amounted to deliberate fraud and 'corruption of the peer review process.' Specifically, the following statement was deleted, 'None of the studies cited above has shown clear evidence that we can attribute the observed changes to the specific cause of increases in greenhouse gases' and the following statement was added, 'The balance of evidence suggests a discernible human influence on global warming.'

These practices continue to this day. For the 2007 Fourth Assessment Report, the summary was released months before the text being summarised was completed. Then anything in the scientific text that did not agree with the predetermined summary was changed. In short, the IPCC cannot claim to be a scientific body as long as government has input into the decision making process.

There is no good reason for government review and feedback during the generation of a scientific report. And historically, governments have used global warming as an excuse to expand their control and authority.

\*[Kyoto Protocol] = A United Nations-backed agreement on climate change.]