

...ians are contributing to ex  
...emic papers concerning glo  
...11 and accessible from [Web](#)  
...tracts expressed a position  
...d the **consensus view** that  
...shed in the [International Jo](#)  
...George Mason University a  
...ientists working in academia  
...7% agreed that that global t  
...% agreed that “human-indu  
...% disagreeing that human a

## Preface

---

*Consensus View* is one of a series of three books about the development of knowledge on Wikipedia, as viewed through the lens of the “Global warming” article. This book examines the sources of information and interpretation of scientific knowledge in a developing article.

Any person with an internet connection can edit almost any Wikipedia article. When an edit is made, editors typically leave a comment - an “edit summary” - explaining what they have changed and why they changed it. Wikipedia stores the history of edit summaries, along with what was changed, and makes this information publicly available.

*Consensus View* is a curated set of edits from Wikipedia history regarding scientific evidence of global warming that took place from 2002-2007, presented in chronological order. The spreads contain edit summaries and the article content that was changed by the editor. Highlighted blue text was added by editor, and text with a red strikethrough was deleted by the editor.

## Glossary of Terms

**RV** - Revert. The editor has rolled the article back to a previous version.

**NPOV** - Neutral point of view. One of Wikipedia’s five pillars states: “Wikipedia is written from a neutral point of view.”

**POV** - Point of view. Used to indicate a non-neutral point of view.

**Talk page** - A Wikipedia discussion board where editors have long form conversations and debates about the content of an article

**Weasel words** - Discreet words that drastically change the meaning of the content

14 January 2002

---

*“ please stop deleting  
scientific objections to  
global warming theory. ”*

Wikipedia Editor

23:53, 10 January 2002

---

*“ too much heat  
and not enough light ”*

*edit from:*

Ed Poor

## Source Bias

---

Because global warming is a controversial issue, every source of information has been accused, in one time or another, of having some kind of bias.

IPCC is accused by critics for exaggerating the dangers of global warming and **deliberately distorting its own research findings for political purposes**. Critics point out that IPCC needs to prove that global warming is happening and is important because they want more funds. However, even some critics agree that IPCC has some of the best raw data available.

Bjorn Lomborg (The Skeptical environmentalist) is a Danish professor, ex-Greenpeace, that seems to represent only himself. It can be pointed out that professor Bjorn Lomborg is looking for fame and fortune. His US book presentation on Capitol Hill has been sponsored by the "Competitive Enterprise Institute", an industry-funded "think tank". **On the other hand, Lomborg, himself a card-carrying green activist and professor of statistics, set out to disprove a critic of the movement, and discovered to his surprise that much of what we carelessly accept as "fact" is actually based on mistakes, misquotations, and junk science.**

03:18, 14 January 2002

---

*“ added information about SEPP,  
Singer, perception of IPCC ”*

*edit from:*

Eloquence

## Source Bias

---

Because global warming is a controversial issue, every source of information has been accused, in one time or another, of having some kind of bias.

IPCC is accused by critics for exaggerating the dangers of global warming. Critics point out that IPCC needs to prove that global warming is happening and is important because they want more funds. However, even some critics agree that IPCC has the best information available, and media watch organizations like PR Watch claim that the critical perception of the IPCC is the result of a deliberate campaign by the fossil industry.

Bjorn Lomborg (The Skeptical environmentalist) is a Danish professor, ex-Greenpeace, that seems to represent only himself. It can be pointed out that professor Bjorn Lomborg is looking for fame and fortune. His US book presentation on Capitol Hill has been sponsored by the “Competitive Enterprise Institute”, an industry-funded “think tank”.

SEPP maintains that it is scientific, rather than political, and that IPCC is politically biased. See [www.sepp.org](http://www.sepp.org). SEPP was originally set up by the Rev. Sun Myung Moon's Unification Church, “a frequent patron of conservative political causes” (Sheldon Rampton and John Stauber: “Trust Us, We're Experts”. NY 2001. p. 273.) It is no longer affiliated with Moon's cult, but Director Singer's editorials regularly appear in the Washington Times newspaper, which is owned by the Unification Church. Director S. Fred Singer's work was massively sponsored and broadcasted by the early industry-funded front group “Information Council for the Environment”, whose stated goal was to, in its own words, “reposition global warming as theory (not fact)” (Stauber and Rampton). According to Peter Montague of the Environmental Research Foundation, S. Fred Singer “is now an ‘independent’ consultant” for various oil companies.

13:43, 29 August 2002

---

*“ added 3 paragraphs  
summarizing the issue. changed  
first subhead from ...warming to  
...temperature record ”*

*edit from:*

Ed Poor

## Global Warming

---

**Global warming** is an increase over [time](#) of the [average temperature](#) of [Earth's atmosphere](#). Many are afraid that this will lead to a worldwide harm to the [environ-ment](#) and damage to [agriculture](#) (see [global warming hypothesis](#)), so the issue has become a matter of [public policy](#). Not all global warming is attributed to the action of [humans](#); global warming that is attributed to such causes is called [anthropogenic global warming](#) (see also [greenhouse gases](#)).

Researchers disagree on whether the effects of global warming will be beneficial or detrimental. Some researchers feel that up to 1.5 degrees Centigrade of warming would increase crop yields and stabilize weather. Many researchers, especially those associated with the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) predict disastrous consequences for such a warming; moreover, they predict warming of 2 to 5 times that amount.

There is also some disagreement on the historical temperature record. Depending on what direct measurements and proxies are accepted, researchers have presented various scenarios: stable temperature followed by a sudden, steady rise in the 20th century vs. fluctuations of 1 or 2 degrees Centigrade, with near-stable temperature since 1940.

Advocates of the [global warming hypothesis](#) who predict adverse consequences from as little as 1.5 degrees Centigrade of warming nearly all support the [Kyoto Protocol](#) as a countermeasure. Some researchers, politicians and businesses oppose it.

17:35, 7 February 2003

---

*“ changed ‘are causing’ to  
‘might cause’ — this is the major  
point in contention ”*

*edit from:*

Ed Poor

## Scientific Opinion

---

### The greenhouse gas theory

...What climatologists are concerned about, rather, is that increased levels of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere ~~are causing~~ might cause more heat to be trapped. Concentrations of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere are currently at approximately 25% above pre-industrial values. This is considerably higher than at any time during the last 420,000 years, the period for which reliable data exists, from ice cores. From less direct geological evidence it is believed that values this high were last attained 40 million years ago.

09:58, 11 February 2004

*“ socialists activists saying it  
like it isnt. must undo. ”*

*anonymous edit from:*

*IP address 67.170.31.123*

## Global Warming

**Global warming** is an increase over time of the average temperature of Earth's atmosphere and oceans. It is claimed to be a world-wide climatic phenomenon—that the average global surface temperature increased over the last 150 years. Whether this increase is significant or even present or not is subject to debate. Natural and anthropogenic (man-made) causes were proposed to explain the possible phenomenon. It is generally used to describe the temperature rise over the past century or so, and the effects of humans on the temperature. The more neutral term **climate change** is usually used to describe previous natural variations. The term may be used to describe theories explaining such an increase or the crisis that many advocates say will arise if no one does anything to prevent such an increase from occurring.

Since 1990, the prospect that the earth's atmosphere might heat up too much—because of carbon dioxide and other “greenhouse gases”—has been a hotly debated topic. Some people believe that increased concentrations of anthropogenic greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, which causes more of the energy radiated from the Sun to be absorbed by the Earth (through the greenhouse effect), play an important role in global warming.

### Temperature Records

All quantitative reconstructions show temperatures as having been roughly stable for the last 1,000 years but sharply rising in the last century (see **Temperature record of the past 1000 years**). These records, combined with attribution analysis, indicate that it is likely this is due to human activity (see **anthropogenic climate change**). Environmentalists have been quick to believe this and generally urge quick and radical action to save the environment (see **Kyoto Protocol** and **UNFCCC**).

The main evidence for global warming comes from thermometer measurements from land stations all over the world since 1860. The data, some claim, shows that the average surface temperature has increased by  $0.6 \pm 0.2$  C during the 20th century. Most of the warming occurred during two periods: 1910 to 1945 and 1976 to 2000. (Source: IPCC) However, the raw data was filtered to remove certain extreme measurements, when those measurements are included, no evidence of warming is found.



20:43, 5 January 2006

---

*“ last version was to weak —  
there is no serious scientific  
controversy. ”*

*edit from:*

*Stephan Schulz*

## Causes of global warming

---

The climate system varies both through natural, “internal” processes as well as in response to variations in external “forcing” from both human and non-human causes, including changes in the Earth’s orbit around the Sun ([Milankovitch cycles](#)), [solar activity](#), and volcanic emissions as well as greenhouse gases. (See [Climate change](#) for further discussion of these forcing processes.) ~~Although most~~ Nearly all climatologists accept that the earth has warmed recently, ~~the~~. The cause or causes of this change is [somewhat](#) more controversial, especially outside the scientific community. The [attribution of recent climate change](#) article deals with the discussion in more detail.

22:06, 7 March 2006

---

*“rv. unnecessary and misleading qualifications. there is consensus, and everything is ‘disputed’ by someone. there is no serious scientific dispute about the core GW theory. ”*

*edit from:*

*Stephan Schulz*

## Overview

---

The [scientific consensus](#) on global warming is that the [Earth](#) is warming, and that humanity's [greenhouse gas](#) emissions are making a significant contribution. This consensus is summarized by the findings of the [Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change](#) (IPCC). In the [Third Assessment Report](#), the IPCC concluded that “most of the warming observed over the last 50 years is [attributable to human activities](#)”. This position, ~~though-disputed~~, was recently supported by an international group of science academies from the [G8](#) countries and [Brazil](#), [People's Republic of China](#) and [India](#) [3]...

Although the combination of ~~apparent~~ scientific consensus and economic incentives were enough to persuade the [governments of more than 150 countries](#) to ratify the [Kyoto Protocol](#), there are issues about just how much greenhouse gas emissions warm the planet. Some politicians, including [President of the United States George W. Bush](#) [8], Prime Minister of Australia [John Howard](#) [9], and public intellectuals such as [Bjørn Lomborg](#) [10] and [Ronald Bailey](#) [11] have argued the cost of [mitigating global warming](#) is too large to be justified. However, some segments of the [business community](#) have accepted both the reality of global warming and its attribution to anthropogenic causes, as well as the need for actions such as [carbon emissions trading](#) and [carbon taxes](#).

00:25, 10 August 2006

---

*“ moved Global warming to  
Global warming hoax:  
The content in is complete  
anti-intellectual bunk. ”*

*edit from:*

*Karbinski*

## ~~Global Warming~~

---

~~Global warming is the observed increase in the average temperature of the Earth's atmosphere and oceans in recent decades:~~

~~The Earth's average near-surface atmospheric temperature rose  $0.6 \pm 0.2$  °Celsius ( $1.1 \pm 0.4$  °Fahrenheit) in the 20th century. The prevailing scientific opinion on climate change is that “most of the warming observed over the last 50 years is attributable to human activities” [1].~~

~~The increased amounts of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) and other greenhouse gases (GHGs) are the primary causes of the human-induced component of warming. They are released by the burning of fossil fuels, land clearing and agriculture, etc. and lead to an increase in the greenhouse effect.~~

~~The measure of the response to increased GHGs, and other anthropogenic and natural climate forcings is climate sensitivity. It is found by observational [2] and model studies. This sensitivity is usually expressed in terms of the temperature response expected from a doubling of CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere. The current literature estimates sensitivity in the range 1.5–4.5 °C (2.7–8.1 °F). Models referenced by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) predict that global temperatures may increase by between 1.4 and 5.8 °C (2.5 to 10.5 °F) between 1990 and 2100. The uncertainty in this range results from both the difficulty of predicting the volume of future greenhouse gas emissions and uncertainty about climate sensitivity. An increase in global temperatures can in turn cause other changes, including a rising sea level and changes in the amount and pattern of precipitation. These changes may increase the frequency and intensity of extreme weather events, such as floods, droughts, heat waves, hurricanes, and tornados. Other consequences include higher or lower agricultural yields, glacier retreat, reduced summer stream flows, species extinctions and increases in the ranges of disease vectors. Warming is expected to affect the number and magnitude of these events; however, it is difficult to connect particular events to global warming. Although most studies focus on the period up to 2100, warming (and sea level rise due to thermal expansion) is expected to continue past then, since CO<sub>2</sub> has a long average atmospheric lifetime.~~

18:23, 25 October 2006

---

*“ since global warming is a left wing myth, you need to illustrate it as such. portraying it as fact is a lie, a pathetic attempt at winning elections through fear mongering. ”*

*anonymous edit from:*

*IP address 12.145.177.110*

## Global Warming

---

Global warming is the observed increase in the [average temperature](#) of the Earth's [atmosphere](#) and [oceans](#) in recent decades.

The Earth's average near-surface atmospheric temperature rose  $0.6 \pm 0.2$  °Celsius ( $1.1 \pm 0.4$  °Fahrenheit) in the 20th century. The prevailing [left wing secularist](#) “[scientific](#)” [opinion on climate change](#) is that “most of the warming observed over the last 50 years is [attributable to human activities](#)”<sup>[1]</sup>.

Some [left wing scientists](#) think the increased amounts of [carbon dioxide](#) (CO<sub>2</sub>) and other [greenhouse gases](#) (GHGs) are the primary causes of the human-induced component of warming. They are released by the burning of [fossil fuels](#), land clearing and [agriculture](#), etc. and lead to an increase in the [greenhouse effect](#). The first speculation that a [greenhouse effect](#) might occur was by the [Swedish chemist Svante Arrhenius](#) in 1897, although it did not become a topic of popular debate until some 90 years later.

16:11, 22 October 2007

---

## “ INTRODUCTION ”

*edit from:*

*Atbackus*

## Global Warming

---

### GLOBAL WARMING or GLOBAL COOLING?

By: Angelos Backus

Only a moron would have an answer!

Most likely it is the same moron that will make the claim that they know which came first: the Chicken or the Egg? all without asking about the role of the rooster!

### INTRODUCTION

It is embarrassing to constantly read about or hear educated politicians, news reporters, news commentators, quack scientists, and even a past Vice President of the United States making claims that the planet Earth is undergoing a period of global warming or global cooling. It is especially disturbing when these claims are made without first offering any logical scientific or mathematical evidence. Listening to some of these unsubstantiated statements, I can't help myself from wondering what century we live in. Is it during the life of Aesop, where we were governing our thoughts by Aesop's fable The Wind and the Sun or maybe during the eighteenth century and The Caloric Theory?

If this is indeed the twenty-first century, then we must be aware of the historic Brownian Movement and the advancement of Dalton's molecular and atomic theory, which led to the conciliation that all matter is composed of molecules.

### THE PROBLEM

There is one overriding problem now surrounding the global warming/global cooling debate. It is this problem that is arguably causing much of the overwhelming confusion among the public. Simply stated, the central problem is that both the interested and disinterested parties to the debate have no solid or tangible scientific and mathematical understanding of what temperature and heat actually are.

Obviously, most anyone can provide a definition of the words temperature and heat. A normal person would define the word heat as how hot something is or feels. That same person would likely define temperature in mostly the identical way. While those definitions sound logical and correct, they are in fact complete misrepresentations of what temperature and heat are in a scientific and mathematical sense.

16:14, 22 October 2007

*“ Save these jokes for April 1 ”*

*edit from:*

*Count Iblis*

## Global Warming

---

~~GLOBAL WARMING or GLOBAL COOLING?~~

~~By: Angelos Backus~~

~~Only a moron would have an answer!~~

~~Most likely it is the same moron that will make the claim that they know which came first: the Chicken or the Egg? all without asking about the role of the rooster!~~

### ~~INTRODUCTION~~

~~It is embarrassing to constantly read about or hear educated politicians, news-reporters, news commentators, quack scientists, and even a past Vice President of the United States making claims that the planet Earth is undergoing a period of global warming or global cooling. It is especially disturbing when these claims are made without first offering any logical scientific or mathematical evidence. Listening to some of these unsubstantiated statements, I can't help myself from wondering what century we live in. Is it during the life of Aesop, where we were governing our thoughts by Aesop's fable The Wind and the Sun or maybe during the eighteenth century and The Caloric Theory?~~

~~If this is indeed the twenty-first century, then we must be aware of the historic Brownian Movement and the advancement of Dalton's molecular and atomic theory, which led to the conciliation that all matter is composed of molecules.~~

### ~~THE PROBLEM~~

~~There is one overriding problem now surrounding the global warming/global cooling debate. It is this problem that is arguably causing much of the overwhelming confusion among the public. Simply stated, the central problem is that both the interested and disinterested parties to the debate have no solid or tangible scientific and mathematical understanding of what temperature and heat actually are.~~

~~Obviously, most anyone can provide a definition of the words temperature and heat. A normal person would define the word heat as how hot something is or feels. That same person would likely define temperature in mostly the identical way. While those definitions sound logical and correct, they are in fact complete misrepresentations of what temperature and heat are in a scientific and mathematical sense.~~