

THE INCONVENIENT SCIENTIFIC METHOD

The purpose of this article is to review the scientific proofs of “global warming” according to ex-United States Senator Al Gore right out of his book entitled “An Inconvenient Truth” and movie of the same title. It will categorically list the so-called proofs and then compare them in accordance with the very objective Scientific Method. The Scientific Method is basically the universal edict of all science that provides this basic framework in the pursuance of scientific fact: 1. Postulation 2. Gathering of data, experimentation, etc. 3. Confirmation or rejection of one’s proposed theory, postulate, etc. based on step number 2. Additionally, a conclusion will be provided at the end. Here’s the general outline:

- I. Mr. Gore’s Postulate
- II. The Science of Global Warming From “An Inconvenient Truth”
 1. There is a direct correlation between CO₂ and temperature increase. The increased CO₂ directly results in increased average worldwide temperatures or “global warming”
 2. Temperatures world wide are going to increase
 3. The Temperatures of the last decade are the warmest on record
 4. Global Warming is responsible for increases in both the intensity and quantity of hurricanes
 5. Glaciers world wide along with the Arctic ice caps are melting which proves “global warming”
 6. Massive Flooding Prediction
 7. Miscellaneous Abuse of Objective Science
- III. “Global Warming”: Even “The Gore Method” Says No
- IV. Conclusion

I. Mr. Gore's Postulate


This is relatively simple: The last 150 years' industrialization of mankind that relies on the widespread burning of fossil fuels including oil, coal, natural gas, etc. is producing excessive carbon dioxide (CO₂) in to the atmosphere that in turn is causing world wide temperature increases or "global warming" for short. In nature atmospheric CO₂ allows sunlight to hit the earth's surface but the reflected sunlight because it is at a different wavelength cannot escape through this same CO₂. Mr. Gore concludes that excessive *man-made* CO₂ is the causative agent of this "global warming" phenomenon. Essentially this man-made excessive CO₂ warms the atmosphere world wide over and above what happens with 'natural' atmospheric CO₂ (e.g., that of plant respiration, volcanoes and oceanic contributions). This in turn will lead to various world wide natural calamities.

II. The Science of Global Warming From “An Inconvenient Truth”

1. There is a direct correlation between CO₂ and temperature increase. The increased CO₂ directly results in increased average worldwide temperatures or “global warming”.

i. The “Hockey Stick” Graph

Mr. Gore shows this graph in his movie and prints it in his book. However, it’s of little scientific use because it doesn’t contain detailed numerical values on either the horizontal or vertical axis:



From Al Gore, “An Inconvenient Truth”

However, here’s the same graph obtained online:





Figure 1 The history of atmospheric CO₂ back to 420 kyr ago as recorded by the gas content in the Vostok ice core from Antarctica⁴. The ratio of deuterium to hydrogen in ice (expressed as the term δD) provides a record of air temperature over Antarctica, with more negative δD values corresponding to colder conditions. The history of global ice volume based on benthic foraminiferal oxygen isotope data from deep-sea sediment cores⁹⁶ is plotted as relative sea level, so that ice ages (peaks in continental ice volume) appear as sea level minima, with a full glacial/interglacial amplitude for sea level change of about 120 m (ref. 18). During peak glacial periods, atmospheric CO₂ is 80–100 p.p.m.v. lower than during peak interglacial periods, with upper and lower limits that are reproduced in each of the 100-kyr cycles. Ice core records, including the Vostok record shown here, indicate that atmospheric CO₂ was among the early parameters to change at the termination of glacial maxima, roughly in step with Southern Hemisphere warming and preceding the decline in Northern Hemisphere ice volume.

From “Glacial/interglacial variations in atmospheric carbon dioxide”, *Nature*, Vol. 407, October 2000

And I then blew this graph up several times:



Here only half of the full graph is presented for illustrative purposes (please note the graph reads “backwards” on the horizontal axis so year 0 is actually today). This graph does seem to show some kind of correlation between CO₂ (the top graph) and world wide temperature (the middle graph). According to Mr. Gore there’s definitely a correlation *and* the correlation is that temperature increase as a direct result of higher CO₂ levels or put another way CO₂ increases cause (and therefore precede) temperature increases as per his postulate outlined above.

However, a simple review of the large scale version of the graph indicates problems with that very specific conclusion. For simplicity I picked out four time periods in 10,000 year increments that are shown across the horizontal axis. Let’s start with the most distant time period number 1 and work back to today, number 4.


Time Period 1 (220,000 to 210,000 years ago): The temperature maximum point PRECEDES the CO₂ maximum point by approximately 5000 years. Also, the trend line for temperature is down while CO₂ is still climbing.

Time Period 2 (150,000 to 140,000 years ago): The trend line for temperature is down while the exact OPPOSITE is true for CO₂.

Time Period 3 (120,000 to 110,000 years ago): The trend line for temperature is steadily down while CO₂ fluctuates and even shows a localized maximum. Therefore, we observe a non-relationship at best or INVERSE (i.e. opposite) relationship at worst.

Time Period 4 (10,000 years ago to today): The trend line for temperature is generally down while CO₂ is up; once again the temperature trend is directly OPPOSITE of CO₂.

Outside of these specific time periods there appears to be a correlation between CO₂ and temperature. However, outside of the four 10,000 year time periods referenced above, it is generally difficult to establish which increase comes first with this graph (i.e., the thickness of the graph lines versus the large time period of 10,000 years represented by relatively short increment on the horizontal axis). However it was just shown in multiple instances temperature trends in the exact opposite of CO₂ or maximizes PRIOR to CO₂. Temperature *as a driver* of CO₂ makes scientific sense since CO₂ behaves like most gases in that its solubility decreases with increasing temperatures as indicated by the following graph:




From jcbmac.chem.brown.edu/myl/hen/CO2Water.gif

So basically the earth's temperature fluctuates (which it has always done as indicated by this graph itself) which means at times it increases or it experiences "global warming". By so doing this increase then heats up the oceans (major sources of dissolved CO₂) which consequently release more gaseous CO₂ out of liquid solution (i.e., a decrease in solubility).


ii. CO₂ Quantity

Also, CO₂ as an atmospheric component is very minor and in turn mankind's contribution to it is miniscule. So mankind is a minor contributor to a minor component of the atmosphere. Continuing, other atmospheric components that are much more prevalent including water vapor factor in to the earth's climate as well but "...CO₂ is the most important by far" according to Mr. Gore. However, this is a wholly unjustifiable conclusion based on the following series of graphs that indicates the relative percentages of the so-called greenhouse gases including CO₂

The "greenhouse gases" broken down on a relative scale:



Mankind's contribution to the "greenhouse gas" itself, carbon dioxide:



All graphs from "A Global Warming Primer" from The National Center for Policy Analysis

What this amounts to is that mankind's contribution to the "greenhouse gas" CO₂ is a fraction of a "greenhouse gas" that is in turn a fraction of the "greenhouse gases" (most notable water vapor) as a whole.

iii. Conclusion

From this relatively simple analysis we can conclude the following:

1. CO₂ as a cause of "global warming" is suspect at best.
2. CO₂ as the "most important" cause of "global warming" is demonstrably false.
3. Mankind's emission of CO₂ as the cause of "global warming" is therefore completely nonsensical. *In other words, humans couldn't cause "global warming" if we tried.*

This is the linchpin of Mr. Gore's conclusions that "the debate is over" on "global warming" but it has just been objectively demonstrated to be fundamentally flawed. (And we haven't even gotten to the fun stuff yet as this is the best "science" employed in "An Inconvenient Truth".)

2. Temperatures world wide are going to increase

In this instance Mr. Gore defers to the computer models developed by the United Nation's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) that seem to indicate specific temperature increases as outlined in the table below:

Table SPM.3. Projected global average surface warming and sea level rise at the end of the 21st century. {10.5, 10.6, Table 10.7}

Case	Temperature Change (°C at 2090-2099 relative to 1980-1999) ^a		Sea Level Rise (m at 2090-2099 relative to 1980-1999)
	Best estimate	Likely range	Model-based range excluding future rapid dynamical changes in ice flow
Constant Year 2000 concentrations ^b	0.6	0.3 – 0.9	NA
B1 scenario	1.8	1.1 – 2.9	0.18 – 0.38
A1T scenario	2.4	1.4 – 3.8	0.20 – 0.45
B2 scenario	2.4	1.4 – 3.8	0.20 – 0.43
A1B scenario	2.8	1.7 – 4.4	0.21 – 0.48
A2 scenario	3.4	2.0 – 5.4	0.23 – 0.51
A1FI scenario	4.0	2.4 – 6.4	0.26 – 0.59

Table notes:

^a These estimates are assessed from a hierarchy of models that encompass a simple climate model, several Earth System Models of Intermediate Complexity and a large number of Atmosphere-Ocean General Circulation Models (AOGCMs).

^b Year 2000 constant composition is derived from AOGCMs only.

From “IPCC, 2007: Summary for Policymakers”

i. Computer Modeling

As one who has utilized several computer models in my academic and professional career I can tell you that they are very complex to say the least. And their output is only a “snapshot” of what happens in reality even after the most rigorous testing and validation. For example, if one wanted to model the *relatively* simple problem of a point discharge (i.e., a sewage plant) in to a stream it turns out to be an extremely complex endeavor. The input data would have to include:

- Time of year (solar conditions that in turn affects air temperature, plant photosynthesis, water temperature, dissolved oxygen content and so on)
- Biological waste parameters (the strength of the particular waste, its make up, its biological decay coefficient and so on)
- Stream parameters (stream flow, diffusion or dispersion characteristics, ground water inputs, dead areas, eddys and so on)
- Weather patterns (cloud cover, rain/snow potential, wind patterns and so on)
- Local land characteristics (run-off potential, quality of run-off including farms, roads and so on)

This is only a cursory overview of the types of data one would need in order to input in to the water quality model. The magnitude of the complexity and how all of these factors interact deems it impossible to model every situation or even one situation with anything

approaching perfect accuracy. I'm not saying it's totally worthless but one would have to input all this data, figure out how it all interacts and then calibrate (i.e., field test it) to adjust to get a real world picture or more accurately snap-shot of what's happening in our sewage plant-stream environment. From here you would do your best to analyze the effects the plant would have in certain situations. For example, one situation would be a "worst case" scenario where a drought minimizes stream flow that would disallow the sewage plant discharge to dissipate and decay efficiently. And it is from this type of thorough, objective albeit inherently imperfect analysis that water quality regulations are based. (As an aside it is this author's opinion that this type of scenario represents a legitimate case for environmental regulation).

And then there's "An Inconvenient Truth".

Now I have never personally used a so-called climate model but if one takes the relatively simplistic case just discussed and applies it to the atmosphere the complexity increases exponentially over an already complex situation. On the "common sense" level one need look no further than the local weather forecast. The inability many times to accurately forecast weather within say a one week time frame is a testament to the overall point: atmospheric and climactic computer models are severely limited in what they can accurately forecast. Yet the IPCC computer modelers Mr. Gore references in "An Inconvenient Truth" have accomplished the scientific impossible: the ability to measure the earth's average temperature 100 years out to within one tenth of one degree of accuracy. I'm going to defer to legitimate climatologists like Canada's Timothy Ball who have reviewed these so-called climate models. He states that the models don't account for major factors in climate like the sun and overemphasize certain parameters especially man-made CO₂ in making their projections. But as discussed in Section 1, CO₂ is a very minor contributor overall to climate and in all likelihood LAGS temperature increases. In other words, as the old adage goes "garbage in, garbage out". The output of any model can be made to read whatever you want it to be from the hypothetical case outlined above to "climate models" that overemphasize mankind generated CO₂'s contribution to "global warming". But as was stated these models need to be field verified or calibrated. How does one calibrate something with 100 year projections?

ii. Conclusion

These models represent a blatant abuse of standard objective scientific methods that would need to be employed in their validation. They overemphasize parameters like man-made CO₂ that have little if anything to do with weather and climate while disregarding the sun's effects. Therefore, they cannot be used to prove (or to be fair disprove) "global warming" and must be disregarded.

Okay, we're now 0 for 2 with the "science" of "global warming". Do you see a trend yet?

3. The Temperatures of the last decade are the warmest on record

This one is so bad that I even have trouble applying *any* kind of objective science to it. As per Section 1 *on the very graph* that Mr. Gore utilizes in “An Inconvenient Truth” one can easily see that temperatures fluctuate tremendously and have been for hundreds of thousands of years (assuming “Mother Earth” is that old; but that’s another story). But let’s try to remain scientific. In so doing a very rudimentary application of the Scientific Method or “The Gore Method” will be employed.

i. Mr. Gore’s own standard

Mr. Gore refers to very specific incidents of warm temperature periods including the record breaking temperatures in certain cities across the United States in the summer of 2005 as a proof of “global warming”.

However, there has also been record cold this past winter (2009-2010) in many places in the American south and throughout the world. In fact according to an article in the London Times this past January:

Arctic freeze and snow wreak havoc across the planet

Arctic air and record snow falls gripped the northern hemisphere yesterday, inflicting hardship and havoc from China, across Russia to Western Europe and over the US plains.

There were few precedents for the global sweep of extreme cold and ice that killed dozens in India, paralysed life in Beijing and threatened the Florida orange crop. (1)

Additionally, last year (2008-2009) saw winter snows in places that had not experienced any such thing in years including Las Vegas, New Orleans and Malibu. While weather anomalies like this would never past muster as legitimate evidence of any kind of trend by Mr. Gore’s simplistic reasoning (i.e., “The Gore Method”) they “prove” global cooling.

ii. The data collection supporting the warming trend is skewed.

Multiple reports have come in the last several years that the data collection points for temperature readings are located in sub-standard locations for objective, useable data collection. Some of these include asphalt parking lots and close proximity to air-conditioning exhausts of buildings. Additionally, many stations in areas like China that were previously located in rural areas have experienced localized development (not to mention many that have gone missing in colder regions). Again, the presence of man-made surfaces like asphalt tends to absorb more sunlight and thereby produces more localized heat conditions. Essentially, much of the “confirming” data for “global

warming” is erroneous since it is skewed to the increase side due to localized surface factors NOT associated with any kind of climactic trend.

iii. The story has changed

Amongst all of the scientific tomfoolery exposed in the “climategate” email controversy centered at England’s East Anglia University is that Phil Jones, one of the main scientists of the “global warming” proponents has recently admitted that there hasn’t been any significant global temperature increase in almost 15 years. One of his associates and “global warming” proponents, Penn State University climatologist Michael Mann, is himself embroiled in controversy over outright data manipulation in the “climategate” scandal. Mr. Mann is the one responsible for “the hockey stick graph” debunked previously.

iv. Conclusion

To conclude, in non-scientific terms you might refer to this as “cherry-picking” the data – which itself is suspect - to confirm your suppositions a la “The Gore Method” at best. At worst as per “climategate” this is tantamount to outright scientific fraud (it is not the intent here to make this latter case). This is a far cry from honest, objective science. Essentially one can easily make the claim of “global cooling” by “The Gore Method” as he himself does when he claims “global warming”. Therefore, this “proof” of “global warming” forwarded by Mr. Gore is demonstrably invalid and blatantly false.

4. Global Warming is responsible for increases in both the intensity and quantity of hurricanes.

i. Hurricane Quantity and Intensity

Again, one has an extremely difficult time applying the very objective Scientific Method to Mr. Gore's "science". So I defer, once again, to the "Gore Method". In very simplistic manner he references the 2005 hurricane season as evidence of "global warming". This season saw the production of 27 named hurricanes that were so numerous they had to utilize names from Greek since the traditional English names had run out as Mr. Gore documents in "An Inconvenient Truth". This has never happened before. However, the past four hurricane seasons (2006-2009) have been among the quietest in the history of recording hurricanes. Also, hurricanes have always varied in intensity as observation of any graph of their history will show. There is no statistical validity to the notion that their intensity has increased significantly within the last several years.


ii. Conclusion

So by the most rudimentary application of the Scientific Method (aka "The Gore Method") these four consecutive seasons of quiet hurricane activity *disprove* "global warming".

5. Glaciers world wide along with the Arctic ice caps are melting which proves “global warming”

i. World wide melting

The falsity of melting glaciers the world over has been exposed in multiple recent news articles reporting on the aforementioned “climategate” scandal. But we’re trying to remain scientific, as difficult as that is, with “An Inconvenient Truth”. Therefore, let’s focus in on the Arctic and Antarctic regions where Mr. Gore claims the melting sea and land ice in the region is proof of “global warming”. He in fact refers to them as “the canaries in the coal mine”. And, once again, I must defer to the simplistic application of the Scientific Method known as “The Gore Method”. A very casual observation of the following graphs illustrates that Mr. Gore is correct, there is massive ice melting happening in the Arctic and Antarctic. However, *he neglects to mention that there is also re-freezing and both happen on an annual basis* as shown on this graph of the Arctic (the Antarctic graph looks exactly the same):



Total Arctic sea ice extent, 1978 to 2007. Image courtesy of the National Snow and Ice Data Center, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO.

Graph from “Characteristics Arctic vs. Antarctic”, National Snow and Ice Data Center at the University of Colorado Boulder

Rudimentary review of this graph (as an aside, notice the specific data points and well delineated vertical and horizontal axes) readily indicates large ice area fluctuations on the order of three to four times between maximum and minimums. In other words, we’re talking about melting and re-freezing in the order of one million square miles of ice; in each region.

ii. Conclusion

So once again by application of “The Gore Method” the annual freezing of Arctic and Antarctic sea ice “proves” “global cooling” as readily as the annual melting “proves” “global warming”.

6. Massive Flooding Prediction

I. Archimedes Principle and the real numbers

There are multiple predictions in “An Inconvenient Truth” including mosquito outbreaks at higher elevations due to “global warming”, more massive inland flooding, droughts, and so on. These are not really quantifiable and therefore of little value in a scientific critique such as this.

However, leave it Mr. Gore to set himself up for one big whopper: world wide sea levels will rise by 20 feet as a result of “global warming”. This is because the Arctic *land* ice (i.e., Greenland) will completely disappear. And he’s approximately correct, mathematically at least.

I actually went and researched the numbers and here they are (Please be aware that these numbers are approximate):

Greenland land ice area = 656,000 square miles

Greenland land ice average depth = 1 mile

Total Volume = 656,000 cubic miles

Total Ocean Surface Area = 140 million square miles

Assuming even distribution: $0.656 \text{ million cubic miles} / 140 \text{ million square miles} = 0.005 \text{ miles} = 25 \text{ feet}$

Similarly Antarctic land ice is estimated at 7.2 cubic million miles and based on the exact same methodology this ice would cause a 272 foot rise in ocean levels.

Admittedly looking in to this has been quite an eye opener for me. Prior to this I criticized Mr. Gore for not accounting for the floating sea ice that would have to melt in conjunction with the land ice melting. This melted floating sea ice would actually *decrease* ocean levels via Archimedes principle. It basically states on a weight basis a less dense solid displaces the exact amount of the denser liquid in which it resides. Very simply this is why a glass of water rises when ice is placed in to it. However, when I ran the numbers based on average researched values for Arctic ice sheets (7.5 feet average thickness, 5.8 million square miles, ice specific gravity = 0.9) it only amounted to a 0.3 foot sea level fall world wide. This is essentially irrelevant against the 25 feet of potential rise just mentioned. The Antarctic sea ice melt came in at a relatively paltry 0.2 foot sea level decrease compared to the aforementioned 272 feet of rise due to melting land ice.

Somewhat ironically it does prove that Mr. Gore is even more suspect in his prediction. If all of the land ice in the Arctic is melting due to “global warming” then should not all of the land ice in the Antarctic melt as well? Can “global warming” affect only half of the globe? This is so stupid that it need only be asked in this context. I leave it to the reader to draw his or her own conclusion here. Continuing, of course the combination of the two would be absolutely astounding at approximately 300 feet ($272 + 25 = 297$ feet).

But Mr. Gore only stresses the Arctic and never mentions anything near this number. Why? Could it be because the trend in the Antarctic is for more sea ice?

According to the table presented in Part 2 above, even the United Nations' own "scientists" estimate a range of 0.18 to 0.59 meters or 0.6 to 1.8 feet of sea level rise over the next 100 years. In other words *13 to 34 times less* than what Mr. Gore forecasts; and these are the ones he relies on for most of his "science".


And to accentuate the blatant abuse of science and unjustifiable liberties Mr. Gore has granted himself in predicting a sea level rise of 20 feet he completely disregards the fact that Viking villages were farming in Greenland for around 300 years roughly between 1100 and 1400 AD. They had to leave since the climate turned colder but the name stuck, GREENland. In fact, Greenland's has thickened around 2 inches on average over the last decade. In other words, there is NO basis for Mr. Gore's 20 feet of ocean level rise due to ice melting off of the Island of GREENland even with the simplified version of The Scientific Method known as "The Gore Method".

ii. Conclusion

Basically, Mr. Gore is simply making numbers up with absolutely no scientific validation whatsoever even granting him the unjustifiable conciliation that the IPCC practices sound science.

7. Miscellaneous Abuse of Objective Science

I wasn't even sure where to place some of the other more atrocious abuses of science employed by Mr. Gore but one was too blatant to pass up. Let's take a look at this graph from "An Inconvenient Truth" not already mentioned:



Notice anything funny? Forget the large fluctuations in the earth's temperature already noted in the very "hockey stick" graph Mr. Gore uses to "prove" "global warming" that was debunked in Section 1. How does one depart from the average...both in the negative and the positive *simultaneously* over the last several decades as indicated on this graph??? It's like going in reverse and forward...*at the same time*. My friends this kind of idiocy is only the tip of the stupidity iceberg, pun intended, in "An Inconvenient Truth". One can literally write a book, a legitimate one without lots of pretty pictures common to Mr. Gore's elementary school level science book, criticizing "An Inconvenient Truth". But in the interest of time, both mine and yours the point has been made. In short, why bother?

III. “Global Warming”: Even “The Gore Method” Says No

After a thorough review of the “proofs” of “global warming” outlined in “An Inconvenient Truth” one can only conclude that it IS NOT any kind of problem. It does not represent anything close to worthy of the attention and intellectual and financial resources it has sequestered from solving legitimate environmental problems like say “oxygen sinks” that have been forming in the Gulf of Mexico. These have come about due to nutrient laden runoff as a result of the extra corn being grown to make corn based ethanol...ostensibly to solve the (non) problem of “global warming” (Unfortunately it’s quite common that the eco wackos cause legitimate environmental problems like this or say mercury laden crappy light bulbs that create a multi thousand dollar hazardous waste situation when you break one in your living room). This negative conclusion came about by employing the objective Scientific Method. In cases where the “science” was so bad and superficial an abridged version of the Scientific Method known as “The Gore Method” was employed.

IV. Conclusion

So what is one to conclude from this fiasco? Basically the same logic that was applied in regards to any number of the aspects of the so-called “conspiracy” in Section 2 of my book “The THEorY of LIVEvolution”: the issue (be it “global warming”, the “Federal” “Reserve” scam, the “separation of church and state” scam, etc.) is so stupid yet so pervasive and told with such utter and unmistakable recklessness that it cannot all be an accident. Therefore it HAS to be a “conspiracy”. But what of the so-called “scientists” and others who may not necessarily be interested in taking over the world? Well the nefarious people that would undertake such an endeavor happen to be the ones controlling the world’s banks including the “Federal” “Reserve”, the UN-dead, the IMF, the World Bank ad naseum. So “They” control the money and this how the little people support “global warming” according to John Coleman, founder of the Weather Channel and “global warming” skeptic:

Look here’s the deal. So you decide you are going to be a research scientist in meteorology and you spent ten years on university campuses obtaining your degrees and getting your position. Now you do a study of climate shift and let’s say the results of your study is you find that man’s pollution is having little impact on the climate and that the climate is not changing much. You’ve wasted your life because that study doesn’t mean anything. It’s not news. It’s not earth shattering. It doesn’t cause any...it’s not a call to arms. If you do a study, you’ve got to come up with dramatic results in order for your study to be noticed, published, to be quoted in the press in order to receive awards, in order to get research grants, more money and obtain a position at a higher institution. (2)

Welcome to “the conspiracy” my friends. With money “They” control the debate and decides who gets all the free press coverage (hello Al Gore) since “They” own the news media as well (hello Rupert Murdoch and Ted Turner both of Rockefeller’s Bilderberg Group). Essentially what is happening here is that these bought and sold “global warming” crazies *have gone in* with the assumption that mankind is the root of all evil and destroying “Mother Earth”. This is why they can just jump from “global cooling” to “global warming” to just plain ol “climate change” because then all bases are covered. In other words, we’re not dealing with rational people here: “They” have taken the Scientific Method and turned it on its head by making a false premise (i.e. mankind causing “global warming” or “climate change”) and then going back and justifying with a thin veneer of science so bad it is more accurately called “propaganda” as happened in a past legal ruling in England that labeled “An Inconvenient Truth” just that.

Overall, in today’s PC dumbed down (WATCH) TV (DON’T QUESTION) A(UTHORITY) (NO I) m(AGINATION) (SL)e(EP) rican ido(BEY)l society this is known as “misrepresenting the facts” or “misspeaking”. For those of us living outside the surreal Twilight Zone dream world of John Carpenter’s “THEorY of LIVEvolution” that is modern society, it’s known as lying.

Of course this means little to the wacked out eco wackos and their gang banker criminal handlers like the Rockefeller Foundation. The real message is that mankind must be limited to save "Mother Earth" just like was stated very clearly in the last several posts: BEWARE THE ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENT, BEWARE THE ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENT.

Ultimately this will lead us right back to our new friend Robert Christian, builder of the anti-10 Commandments known as the Georgia Guidestones...and believe it or not to the American ILLUMINATI sect known as "Skull and Bones", the real "Eastern Establishment". You guessed it, as usual when one peels away the onion layers of "the conspiracy" starting with the façade of "global warming" you end up back at the Garden of Eden where a certain serpent promised Adam and Eve the gift of sight or ILLUMINATION. (Next time we'll look in to this connection specifically.)

Pleased to meet you, hope you guess my name...

Footnotes

- 1- "Arctic freeze and snow wreak havoc across the planet", timesonline.co.uk, January 5, 2010.
- 2- John Coleman interview, Glenn Beck Program, November 12, 2007.

Bibliography

antarcticconnection.com, "Snow and Ice – The Frozen Continent"

cfact.org, "Melting the facts about Greenland's ice sheet"

Dailymail.co.uk, "Climategate U-turn as scientist at centre of row admits: There has been no global warming since 1995", February 14, 2010

Foxnews.com, "Ethanol Production May Expand Gulf 'Dead Zone'", March 18, 2008

Gore, Al "An Inconvenient Truth", (New York City: Rodale Publishing, 2006).

Gore, Al "An Inconvenient Truth", movie.

gdargaud.net "Antarctica"

Heraldsun.com.au, "The billion dollar hoax", January 27, 2010

hypertextbook.com, "Thickness of the Greenland Ice Cap" from "The Physics Factbook"

icecap.us, "NOAA Proves an Outlier Again in May", "Facts and Myths"

IPCC, 2007: Summary for Policymakers. In: *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Solomon, S., D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K.B. Averyt, M.Tignor and H.L. Miller (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.

Monckton, Christopher, ed., "SPPI Monthly CO2 Report" July 2009, Volume 1, Issue 7, The Science and Public Policy Institute, sppi.org

National Center for Policy Analysis, "A Global Warming Primer"

News.cornell.edu, "CU scientist terms co-based ethanol 'subsidized food burning'", August 23, 2001

The National Snow and Ice Data Center at the University of Colorado at Boulder
"Arctic Sea Ice News and Analysis", "Characteristics: Arctic vs. Antarctica",
"Quick Facts on Ice Sheets"

Ocregister.com, "From the Register's Opinion Page: What to say to a global warming advocate", February 12, 2010

pages.prodigy.net , "Surface Area of the Earth"

Seattle Post Examiner, "Corn-based ethanol not cheap, not green", April 11, 2007

Timesonline.co.uk, "World may not be warming, say scientists", February 14, 2010

WorldNetDaily.com, "Did EPA check global warming claims?", February 4, 2010