

# Today is Al Gore's global warming doomsday

Here we are on January 26, 2016. Do you feel the heat? Do you see the clouds are gone and the sky is glowing red?

Ten years ago, on January 25, 2006, Al Gore stood before his Sundance audience at the screening of his "An Inconvenient Truth."

Al Gore waved his quivering finger in the air and told his audience that unless the world takes drastic measures to reduce greenhouse gases within the next 10 years, we will reach a point of no return.

Gore said our CO<sub>2</sub> emissions would cause Earth to go into a runaway heat death.

The Washington Post reported Al Gore "believes humans may have only 10 years left to save the planet from turning into a total frying pan."

CBS News wrote Gore predicted the earth would be in "a true planetary emergency" within the next ten years unless drastic action is taken to reduce greenhouse gases.

Al Gore's people have been singing like the Donkey in Schrek, "I believe, I believe."

Eco-freak groups have tried in vain to save the planet from our CO<sub>2</sub>. Don't they know it's too late? It's over? We're done for?

Nothing they can do now can save Earth. Al Gore said so. They can relax now and enjoy the heat before we all perish.

Could it be that Al Gore is mistaken? That cannot be.

If Al Gore is wrong then he has betrayed millions of global warmers. They have devoted their lives to Al Gore. Their devotion is their religion. Because global warming is their religion they cannot hear, see, or touch any evidence that might prove their religion is wrong.

But. But. But.

Unless there are no more clouds in the sky and no more snow on the ground, then Al Gore is wrong. You know what Richard Feynman said about the scientific method:

If your prediction is wrong then your hypothesis is wrong.

And if you reject the scientific method then you reject true science. Unless you reject your hypothesis that our CO<sub>2</sub> causes global warming (or climate change) then your belief is a religion, not science.

You see, Al Gore believed the climate models. But climate models are not reality. Models are but an attempt to simulate reality. We must test models against reality. If the models' predictions are wrong then the climate models are wrong.

Look at the red line in the chart. That is the average climate model prediction. According to the average of climate model prediction, Earth's global temperature has risen 0.7 C since 1980.

No wonder it's so hot and there is no snow in Washington, D.C.

But wait. That is a model prediction, right? A model prediction is not reality, right?

Have you ever witnessed an incorrect weather prediction? Now you have witnessed an incorrect climate prediction.

The blue circles and green squares show the real data. They show the earth's global temperature is only 0.2 C higher than in 1980. Al Gore is wrong. The climate models are wrong. The

hypothesis that our CO2 causes global warming is wrong. Checkmate.

Isn't it time the ecofreaks check their climate religion at the door and wake up to reality? If they did, they would save the world a lot of money.

Epilog

Aztecs priests cut out beating hearts, then rolled decapitated heads down the temple stairs to make rain. When rain came, the priests claimed their methods worked. The people believed the priests. So the priests stayed in business.

Today, global warming priests shut down coal-fired electric power plants, tax you to pay for electric cars and wind farms, and sic the EPA on your state to control your businesses and industry.

We think the Aztecs were delusional. But today, as a nation, we are just as delusional as the Aztecs.

Today's ecofreaks waste time and money trying to "address" climate change when they don't even understand what causes climate change. Today's ecofreaks would have supported the Aztec priests in their day.

Today, our schools do not teach students how to think. They don't teach students how to tell a bad hypothesis from a good hypothesis.

Can you tell me what is wrong with the Aztec hypothesis?

You know the Aztec hypothesis is wrong. But can you tell me the general method you would use to reject the Aztec hypothesis?

If not, then your schools have defrauded you of an education. You are ripe to believe in any wacko idea that comes along.

Just because you agree with me about global warming does not prove you have learned how to think.

Many rightwing folks agree with me about global warming because it is a part of their political "religion." Well, the ecofreaks believe just the opposite because it's a part of their religion.

We have many obstacles to overcome in order to learn how to think

We have Pope Francis who preaches the climate cult religion. He should promote good science like Catholic schools taught when I went to high school.

We have a Montana governor who does not know how to appoint qualified people to a climate board. Our Montana climate board has no climate scientist. This is like a medical board with no medical doctor.

Our Montana climate board has medical doctors who "believe" our carbon dioxide emissions cause wildfire smoke. Is "belief" the qualification for a board? The board has no one to suggest the doctors have not properly diagnosed the cause-effect relationships of our atmosphere.

I don't practice medicine but some medical doctors practice atmospheric physics. Does our governor not understand the difference between scientific disciplines?

Is there anything more important in life than to be able to tell the difference between a valid cause-effect relationship and a fraudulent one?

Look at some of the reasons ecofreaks "believe" in global warming. They say polar bears are dying, animals are going extinct, the seas are going acidic, the oceans are rising, and, yes, atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> is rising.

But for CO<sub>2</sub>, these claimed events are incorrect, but suppose

they were correct. Would that prove our carbon dioxide emissions caused the events?

What is the fallacy of this reasoning?

The fallacy is consequences do not prove causation. Just because something happens does not prove what causes it to happen. The only way to determine causation is to use the scientific method.

There are three parts to the global warming hypothesis:

1. Our carbon dioxide emissions cause the increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide.
2. Added atmospheric carbon dioxide increases global temperature.
3. Therefore, our carbon dioxide emissions cause dangerous global warming.

As we will show, all three parts are wrong.

Our government has spent some \$100 billion on climate models. These climate models were supposed to show the above three part hypothesis is correct.

The problem is the climate models have failed. Climate models failed because they do not include accurate atmospheric science. Today's climate models are the premier example of garbage in, garbage out.

Our atmosphere and its interactions with our biosphere and oceans are vastly more complicated than Al Gore told you. Our atmosphere is as complicated as the human body. No simplistic hypothesis about how either of them work is acceptable.

If we really want to know what drives climate, we must throw out the Al Gore "science" and look to the real science.

Here are some highlights in the real science

As I have previously outlined, there are major problems with

the simplistic view that CO<sub>2</sub> acts like a blanket that warms what is under it.

Dr. Murry Salby is the author of the 666-page, 2012 textbook "Physics of the Atmosphere and Climate." He shows that the first part of global warming hypothesis is wrong. Our carbon dioxide emissions do not cause the observed increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide.

Salby uses advanced physics and math to analyze CO<sub>2</sub> data. He proves mathematically that surface temperature, not human CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, causes the change in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>.

Salby's conclusion does not depend on theory. It results from proper data analysis and mathematics.

Watch Salby's two presentations. If you do not follow Salby's lecture then you do not understand atmospheric science.

Dr. Ferenc Miskolczi shows how part two of Al Gore's global warming hypothesis is wrong. Added atmospheric carbon dioxide does not increase the greenhouse effect or global temperature.

Miskolczi's peer-reviewed scientific papers show atmospheric water vapor and clouds adjust to changes in CO<sub>2</sub> to keep Earth's greenhouse effect constant. Miskolczi's predictions match observations. Changes in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> do not change the greenhouse effect and do not cause global warming.

Dr. Willie Soon is lead author of a 2015 peer-reviewed paper that shows our sun, not CO<sub>2</sub>, drives climate. He shows how CO<sub>2</sub> and total solar irradiance correlate with temperature from 1880 to 2013.

In the figure, the blue temperature lines in each plot are the same. Only the red line is different.

In the first plot, the red line represents CO<sub>2</sub>. It shows CO<sub>2</sub> is not similar to temperature. Therefore, CO<sub>2</sub> does not drive temperature.

In the second plot, the red line represents total solar irradiance. The good match shows total solar irradiance is a major driver of earth's temperature.

Dr. David Evans is an expert mathematician. He found a serious error in climate models. When Evans corrects for this model error alone, climate model temperature predictions decrease by 80 to 90 percent.

Climate models use the old Arrhenius assumption that Earth responds to CO2 change like it responds to change in solar radiation. The Arrhenius assumption is incorrect. Climate responds much differently to changes in CO2 than it does to changes in solar radiation.

Dr. Ivar Giaever won the 1973 Nobel Prize in Physics. He is a Democrat who puts scientific truth above partisanship. He is not an ecofreak.

Giaever explains why Al Gore's global warming hypothesis is pseudoscience. He says climate alarmists have made their idea a new religion and therefore can't question it. He shows many conflicts of the alarmist climate idea with the real world of physics.

## Conclusions

The choice is yours. You can either accept true science or reject it. If you reject it, you will live in a world of delusion. You will be like the Aztecs who believed their human sacrifices really caused rain.

Of course, you will not believe in same delusions the Aztecs did. But you will believe in delusions that are just as irrational. You will not know your belief is wrong. If your belief is like a religion, you will refuse to consider evidence your belief is wrong.

So, here's your homework:

If you had a time machine to transport back to an Aztec community, what argument would you use before an impartial court to show their human sacrifices did not cause the subsequent rain?

© 2016 Edwin X Berry, PhD – All Rights Reserved