Alex Iacob

Professor Brister

Philosophy 103

November 5, 2019

Assignment 8: Fallacies

Type: Selectivity(Cherry Picking)

Link: skepticalscience.com/3-levels-of-cherry-picking-in-a-single-argument.html

www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2014/01/140122091736.htm

Throughout this article, the different forms of selectivity are explained. There are generally three levels of such fallacy in a discussion about climate change. As the name entails, this form of cherry picking is using the only part of the statistics to back the argument up, making it fallacious. The first of which is only selecting “one particular temperature record”. This article in specific uses the Hadley Climatic Research Unit Temperature(HadCRUT). According to the article, this dataset only shows abnormally high temperatures. These higher temperatures can be explained by El Niño, yet that was only in a certain region. This temperature unit has not considered the rest of the world, hence the cherry picking the data commences.

The second speaks about completely ignoring what is “happening to the rest of the climate”. Like the first example, this is yet again taking only what you desire for your argument, yet in this case, you blur everything else out. Most of the climate change arguments only speak of the land and atmospheric temperatures increasing, yet *many* are forgetting the fact that the ocean heats up as well. The total heat content of the Earth has only ever been measured by the

land and atmospheric heat content, but in comparison to the ocean, the heat capacity of the land and atmosphere are mere child's play. Yet only after considering the ocean heating was the data non-fallacious.

The last of the three involves "comparing single years rather than statistical trends", which again is completely fallacious. When comparing the overall climate temperature change, many have resorted to only using specific years to hyperbolize the actual effects. Doing so throws the actual statistics off the charts. Statistics have used the years of El Niño(heating effect) and La Niña(cooling effect) to show the dramatic difference in temperatures. When these specific years have been compared to the global trends, the effects were not as large.

There was another article that explained the drastic skewing in global climate change research written by ScienceDaily. They mention how the stats are being biased towards richer countries and skewed toward the poorer countries. The richer countries are feeling almost none of the effects while the poorer countries are barely surviving with what is happening. Due to the wealth of certain countries, the contents of the stats are also skewed toward the politicians in said countries.