

Natural climate change does more good than damage

by Randy Bright <http://www.tulsabeacon.com/?p=5923>

Aerospace engineer Robert Zubrin has posted an intriguing article on the National Review website entitled, “Carbon Emissions are Good.” It is one of those rare common-sense discourses for what has arguably become one of the most contentious subjects in science and politics today – anthropogenic (man-made) global warming.

Zubrin makes that case that rising CO2 levels actually creates benefits for the planet. He writes, “... it is quite clear that they (humans) are raising atmospheric CO2 levels. As a result, they are having a strong and markedly positive effect on plant growth worldwide. There is no doubt about this. NASA satellite observations taken from orbit since 1958 show that, concurrent with the 19 percent increase in atmospheric CO2 over the past half century, the rate of plant growth in the continental United States has increased by 14 percent.”

That appears to be true in my corner of the world. In 2007, the City of Tulsa and a large area surrounding it experienced an ice storm that damaged or destroyed nearly all of its trees. On my own acreage of timber, not one of my trees escaped the damage. Most had most or even all of their limbs torn off by the weight of the ice, yet few of them have died and most have already regenerated their limbs. Two years after the storm, I had the entire acreage mowed to clean up fallen limbs and reduce the danger of fire. In three short years, the entire acreage is covered with thick new growth, including new trees that have grown over five feet.

Zubrin continued, “is it a good thing or a bad thing (global warming)? Answer: it is a very good thing. Global warming would increase the rate of evaporation from the oceans. This would increase rainfall worldwide. In addition, global warming would lengthen the growing season, thereby increasing still further the bounty of both agriculture and nature.”

In an article in American Thinker, climate scientist S. Fred Singer takes Professor Michael E. Mann to task for his role in perpetuating the myth of man-made global warming. Mann is responsible for creating the now discredited “hockey stick” graph that Al Gore and the IPCC (United Nations) used for years to convince people that humanity was responsible for creating global warming. Two Canadian scientists later proved that there were “serious errors” in Mann’s method of analysis and the United Nations no longer accepts the graph.

Mann concluded that the last one thousand years have been the warmest on record, dismissing the known Medieval Warming Period (900-1200 A.D.) and the Little Ice Age (1400 – 1800). He relied on proxy data (such as tree rings) to discount these instead of actual temperature readings which, of course, weren’t available during those periods of time.

As Zubrin points out, “a thousand years ago, the world was significantly warmer than it is today...the snow line in the Rockies was a thousand feet higher than it is now, and Canadian forests flourished tens of kilometers farther north... oats and barley were grown in Iceland,

wheat in Norway, hay in Greenland, and the vineyards of England produced fine wines as far north as York. These warm temperatures were no disaster. On the contrary, persisting through the twelfth century, they are believed by historians to have contributed materially to the significant growth of population and prosperity during the High Middle Ages (roughly the years 1000 to 1300).”

Singer, a specialist in atmospheric and space physics, has been attempting to get the University of Virginia (where he is a professor emeritus) to release Mann’s e-mails (Mann was an assistant professor at UV), but so far it has refused to release all of them, even after the State Attorney General demanded them. Singer believes that there is some explanation and the truth somewhere in those 12,000 e-mails. The matter is now in the courts to determine whether or not UV must release them.

Singer is convinced that the release of the information will create an “earthquake that will encompass IPCC scientists, politicians in America and Europe, and the United Nations”, and Zubrin believes it is all designed for “power to oppress humanity”. I believe both are correct. Though it would be interesting and probably revealing to get the documents and prove Mann’s data to be wrong, intentional or not, to me the real issue is why we are not looking at the facts of climate change, and call it what it is – natural climate change. Furthermore, natural climate change could do far more good for us than we currently think, if only we can get the scientists and politicians to do what is right. What wonders of science and human ingenuity are we missing because we are being forced to believe a hoax?

©2012 Randy W. Bright

Randy W. Bright, AIA, NCARB, is an architect who specializes in church and church-related projects. You may contact him at 918-582-3972, rwbrightchurcharch@sbcglobal.net or www.churcharchitect.net.

This entry was posted on Thursday, April 26th, 2012 and is filed under [Columns](#).