

# Brace Yourself for the Global Warming Non-Debate

☒ Recently it was reported that last month was the warmest July for North America since temperature recording started in 1895. This should predictably bring all of the global warming alarmists out of the woodwork, demanding action. They like to wait for a moment such as this to seize upon possible fear, and set aside rational debate. The media loves to jump on this bandwagon, and always places emphasis on whether it is warming or not. Warming is only the first part of the debate, and intelligent people can part ways with the “Global Warming Agenda” at any point along the way. Let’s try that debate exercise...

- Is global warming occurring?

The data show that there has been some warming. As the 1895 date above attests, we have only been measuring temperature for a little over 100 years. How reliable is 100 year old data for us to draw conclusions from? Other than North America and Europe, what date does the rest of the world’s data become reliable? Is the fact that those involved in collecting the data are advocates of a position, skewing the results?

- If it is occurring, is man responsible?

If we are to believe scientists who are convinced there is warming today, we should look at the broader picture to find causation. There have been roughly 12 mini ice ages (glaciations) in the last million years with the latest advancement of ice taking place 15,000 years ago. Ice sheets extended to the northern border of Kentucky, and glaciers formed the palisades where the George Washington Bridge crosses today. In between these ice advances there is warming, or else the Great Lakes would be called the Great

Glaciers. The internal combustion engine was not around for any of these warming periods. So we have been through these warming and cooling cycles regularly in Earth's history. Many scientists believe that the data says it is warming faster due to man's use of carbon based fuels.

- If it is warming, and it is due to man, can we reverse it?

The current suggested solution to this alleged problem is to force the implementation of environmentally friendly forms of energy. The expense of these alternatives will force us to live in cities, adopt more mass transit, get rid of cars, and live with less of almost everything we have grown accustomed. The most optimistic ideas, however, don't really change the results of warming. The Kyoto treaty which has now been rejected by most large countries, would have delivered a .2 (degree Celsius) change in temperature over 20 years. According to Kyoto this would cost an estimated 1% less worldwide GDP. At \$70 trillion per year, 1% cost over 20 years would mean (.7 x 20) \$14 trillion.

- If it is warming, and it is due to man, and we can reverse it, should we?

This is the conversation no environmentalist wants to have. With the sacrifices and trillions in costs to cut temperatures the slightest of amounts, is it worth it? Is there a case to be made that warming would be a net good? After all, there are many more deaths every year related to cold weather rather than hot.

You can get off this global warming debate train at any stop along the way. Seeing what it costs for the solution to the problem, makes the earlier issues almost moot. The public debate has neglected so many bigger points, yet the onslaught of vacant arguments sadly continue.