

The Politics and Propaganda of Anthropogenic Global Warming

Written by Buryl Chadwick Cooper

This PDF is auto-generated for reference only. As such, it may contain some conversion errors and/or missing information. For all formal use please refer to the official version on the website, as linked below.

The Politics and Propaganda of Anthropogenic Global Warming

<https://www.e-ir.info/2008/04/17/the-politics-and-propaganda-of-anthropogenic-global-warming/>

BURYL CHADWICK COOPER, APR 17 2008

Several hypotheses have emerged to explain the global warming phenomenon. Among these theories, Anthropogenic Global Warming (AGW) has emerged as the leading theory, which deduces that the Earth is warming due to human activity and that as a result humans will eventually destroy the planet. The AGW theory has permeated nearly every facet of modern society. Over the past few decades, scientists, politicians, marketers, and Earth lovers alike, for various reasons, have employed propaganda techniques to promote the Anthropogenic Global Warming theory; in the process, they proactively sought to curtail the exposure of the truth in order to profit from people's apprehension of global warming.

Fears of the Earth's rising temperature are based on global temperature averages over the past 100 years, with special interest placed on the past decade. During the mid 1800's, the average surface temperature varied but, was close to -4°C . Contrasting the older temperatures with today's average of $.4^{\circ}\text{C}$, a difference of nearly $.8^{\circ}\text{C}$, has alarmed many and caused others to investigate the reasons for the perceived increase in temperature.

Human activity has borne the bulk of the blame for the increased temperatures. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), established by the United Nations to investigate the impact human activity has on the global climate, while recognizing other factors that influence the climate, attributes the majority of global warming to human activity.¹ Human activity includes land clearing, industrial emissions and transportation emissions, which increase greenhouse gasses and aerosols. The IPCC, the chief promoter of AGW, identified that the primary cause of increased temperatures worldwide is human-related carbon dioxide emissions from fossil burning fuels.

The IPCC recently published dire worldwide predictions based on their global warming calculations. While supporters of the AGW Theory often quote other sources, the IPCC is generally recognized as the most authoritative body on the subject. Their report concludes that the increasing global temperatures will cause ocean levels to rise and the water to become more acidic; the confident estimates predict that precipitation, wind, and ice will change as well- although there is no consensus on their magnitude.² The IPCC deftly presents all of the calculations, though nearly each one contains a caveat explaining that the models employed are lacking significant data or the phenomenon is too complex to accurately model.

Propaganda Techniques

Scholars have written volumes explaining the techniques and methodology of propagandists for hundreds of years. To propagandize, one need only read a how-to manual to learn the concepts of an effectively run propaganda campaign. Propaganda techniques include appealing to fear, appealing to authority, name-calling, transference, bandwagoning, obtaining disapproval, over simplification, utilizing virtue words, employing faulty logic and more. AGW proponents utilize all of these methods to further their goals, which will be discussed later.

Appealing to fear is perhaps the strongest technique used by propagandists. Hitler's Propaganda Minister, Goebbels exploited and motivated the German population by striking fear into them. Likewise, propagandists have attempted to use the *fear factor* to get the media's attention and gain front-page real estate. Headlines such as "Scientists fear

The Politics and Propaganda of Anthropogenic Global Warming

Written by Buryl Chadwick Cooper

global warming higher than expected” are designed to make the audience cringe with fear when they read that earth’s average temperature could rise by 7.8°C by 2300 with polar ice caps melting and seas rising by seven meters.³ Nearly every report concerning global warming is laced with calamitous consequences if something is not done soon. This type of propaganda is effective in catching readers’ attention and motivating them to some action.

In the early stages of AGW propaganda, global *warming* fears dominated public consciousness. Later, beginning in 1998, the Earth began to cool while atmospheric CARBON DIOXIDE continued to rise in complete contradiction to the theory. As a result, the phraseology of AGW alarmists became “climate change” so that any variation in the Earth’s climate could then be attributed to human activities.⁴ The problems with the scare tactic is that eventually people become immune to the warnings, prompting the AGW propaganda engine to produce more extreme warnings. John Ritch, director general of the World Nuclear Association, provided an excellent example of upping the *fear factor*; in June 2007, “Greenhouse gas emissions, if continued at the present massive scale, will yield consequences that are – quite literally – apocalyptic. ... If these predictions hold true, the combined effect would be the death of not just millions but of billions of people- and the destruction of much of civilization on all continents.”⁵ At some point, propagandists will be forced to rely on other tools of propaganda- as appealing to fear will eventually lose effectiveness.

AGW propagandists do not rely solely on fear to influence the masses however; an appeal to authority is a common technique. By invoking the infallible name of science, advocates can point to others who have advanced degrees and use scientific jargon to impress and beguile the masses. Because the average citizen does not have the time or resources to conduct her own study of the warming phenomenon, she is forced to rely on the opinions of those scientific authorities. Who on their own can readily cite hard numbers and create computer models to evaluate and project the future? Appealing to authority alleviates the average citizen of this academic burden.

Authoritative sources include dictionaries, which have become a tool of the propagandist. American Heritage Science Dictionary gives the following definition for global warming:

*An increase in the average temperature of the Earth’s atmosphere, especially a sustained increase great enough to cause changes in the global climate. The Earth has experienced numerous episodes of global warming through its history, and currently appears to be undergoing such warming. The present warming is generally attributed to an increase in the **greenhouse effect**, brought about by increased levels of **greenhouse gases**, largely due to the effects of human industry and agriculture. Expected long-term effects of current global warming are rising sea levels, flooding, melting of polar ice caps and glaciers, fluctuations in temperature and precipitation, more frequent and stronger El Niños and La Niñas, drought, heat waves, and forest fires.*⁶

Authoritative sources employ several other types of propaganda techniques, many of which overlap. The above appeal to authority includes the tactic of fear and faulty logic- using seemingly contradicting predictions concurrently; how can a worldwide drought simultaneously be accompanied by flooding and melting of land-locked glaciers? Contradictory statements by some authoritative sources seek to lend credibility to the AGW argument by oversimplifying the theory, yet making it confusing enough for the average citizen to leave in the hands of “experts”.

Name-calling is usually reserved for politically minded individuals and those audiences predisposed to agree with the one presenting the message. Words such as “right wing” or “ultra conservative” contain such a built-in prejudice, that when an author utilizes them to describe an opponent of AGW, the same prejudices are transferred to that individual- regardless of the opponent’s political leanings. Name-calling will often be invoked attacking the person, rather than the idea being presented. Kevin Trenberth, a prominent climate researcher became frustrated during a conference on Global Warming when challenged by Colorado State University’s William Gray, one of the nation’s preeminent hurricane forecasters and said that Dr. Gray is not a credible scientist, “Not any more. He was at one time, but he’s not any more”.⁷ Name-calling attempts to discredit individuals and the ideas they represent- is unprofessional, and unfortunately, individuals on both sides of the AGW theory engage in it.

Additionally, name-calling is often applied to naturally occurring molecules in nature; carbon dioxide is regularly labeled as a pollutant- something that is essential for plant life and, subsequently, all life. Labeling those who

The Politics and Propaganda of Anthropogenic Global Warming

Written by Buryl Chadwick Cooper

disagree with AGW as less than educated or ignorant stifles scientific thought and academic deliberation, favoring the pro-AGW theorists. Further, attempting to categorize carbon dioxide as a pollutant wrongly demonizes nearly every oxygen breathing carbon dioxide emitting organism, but primarily places the blame on humans- who release CARBON DIOXIDE in the air when burning fossil fuels. Additionally, placing carbon-dioxide in the category of pollutant emphasizes, as many AGW supporters do, that it is a major green house gas, which it is not. Water vapor, the primary greenhouse gas, may soon be targeted and placed on the list of pollutants.

Proponents of AGW engage in a propaganda technique known as “transfer.” Transfer occurs when the positive or negative traits of one thing or person are associated with that of another. For example, when the supporter of AGW addresses a television audience, he wears a white lab coat, whether or not he works in a lab, because people associate white lab coats with scientists and truth untainted. Conversely, when interviewing a skeptic of AGW, the deft AGW reporter will find a suitable candidate among a Texas oil town or a steel worker in Detroit. In each case, the viewer will associate a negative or positive image of the person speaking with what he or she is presenting.

A vivid illustration of transfer is the attack by Ben Stewart of Greenpeace on the American Enterprise Institute (AEI), the primary think tank that opposes the AGW theory. Stewart says, “The AEI is more than just a think tank, it functions as the Bush administration’s intellectual Cosa Nostra”.⁸ By equating the AEI to the Mafia, Ben Stewart attempts to transfer the negative feelings and images of the terrorist/criminal organization to that of the AEI and President Bush- simultaneously, he engages in name-calling to discredit the AEI. Mr. Stewart does not attack the concepts presented by AEI or any of the rational behind their objections to AGW, he attacks those funding the organization and appeals to outside organizations predisposed to bias.

Bandwagoning and polarization go hand in hand. The propagandist will attempt to simplify the issue, presenting only two extreme options: you can either pollute, drive big SUV’s, burn coal and waste energy *or* you can join the eco-friendly, caring people who want to preserve the Earth for future generations- which is what every other responsible person is doing. These techniques are highly effective because while one may not completely agree with what is presented, it is easier to go along with what everyone else is doing- thousands of scientists and millions of other people can’t be wrong.

Bandwagoning is invoked regularly when discussing the Kyoto Protocol. Propagandists will posture that every other nation has agreed to the Protocol except for the United States. The manipulator will then polarize the argument, presenting America as the reckless polluting capitalist giant, which has excluded itself from the responsible nations of the world. Nevertheless, even those “responsible” nations recognize the implications of the Kyoto Protocol. Margot Wallstrom, the European Union’s commissioner for the environment and global warming said, “[the Kyoto Protocol] is not a simple environmental issue where you can say it is an issue where scientists are not unanimous. This is about international relations; this is about economy, about trying to create a level playing field for big businesses throughout the world. You have to understand what is at stake and that is why it is serious.”⁹ The EU knows that if the US agreed to the protocol, it would disadvantage the US economically. The technique of bandwagoning and polarizing the issue can only be effective among those less informed masses; those who fully understand the subject comprehend the myriad issues and consequences of such actions.

Propagandists capitalize on the public’s disapproval of big industry and the distrust of oil companies. Several websites posit that oil companies fund the bulk of the research disputing AGW through its primary opponent, AEI.¹⁰ Whether this is true or not, it implies that: because oil companies and big industry cannot be trusted, neither can the results of their research. Despite the fact that AEI scholars and fellows are required to disclose in their published work any affiliations they may have with organizations with a direct interest in the subject of that work, detractors continually cast doubt on the work of their scientists and scholars.¹¹ In fact, a popular website declares the AEI as “an extremely influential, pro-business right-wing think tank ... [which] promotes the advancement of free enterprise capitalism, and succeeds in placing its people in influential governmental positions. It is the center base for many neo-conservatives.”¹²

Direct attacks on this organization are representative of a propagandistic technique to obtain disapproval. In other words, if group X (which the audience believes is inherently bad) likes or approves of something, then that something

The Politics and Propaganda of Anthropogenic Global Warming

Written by Buryl Chadwick Cooper

must be wrong or bad.

Over-simplification of the issue is a pitfall in which nearly every media outlet falls. The issues and contributing factors surrounding global warming are so numerous that even the scientists who created the models for the IPCC admit that there is simply not enough computer power to account for all the variables affecting the global warming phenomenon.¹³ To address even the major factors in a scientific setting requires multiple volumes and numerous charts and data; presenting the findings to the average citizen, in terms he can understand, demands simplification. The propagandist has succeeded in convincing the typical American that consuming energy and driving cars, cause global warming; the result of which is that the Earth is getting hotter and will eventually result in the annihilation of humanity.

Because the argument for AGW has been oversimplified, the ordinary citizen believes that she understands the concept and the factors related to it. Buzz words such as deforestation, O-zone, rising ocean levels, shrinking ice caps, pollution, over population and death become intermingled and blurred; the simpler the idea, the easier it is to remember. Never mind the complex concepts of global forcing, the fact that Antarctica is actually getting colder or that the Earth is continuously either warming or cooling- and has been for millennia, or that the oceans can rise and shrink simultaneously; the average person cannot and will not devote the time and energy required to pursue an advanced degree or dedicate the time required to understand the complex issues surrounding the AGW theory. Simplifying the message and presenting the idea in terms that most can understand help to further the AGW propagandist's agenda.

Expert and novice propagandists have long wielded virtue words and slogans. Virtue words impart value to the idea to which they are associated. For example, when considering the abortion slogans, "pro-choice" sounds so much more positive and human rights oriented than "anti-life" which carries a negative connotation. Likewise, AGW propagandists have chosen slogans that are endearing and hard to argue against. Phrases such as "Save Our Earth" imply the Earth is in need of saving and, that we can and should do something to save it. Who could argue the opposite phrase "destroy our planet"? This slogan draws on the bandwagon technique, implying that the individual needs to join others in saving "our" planet.

Other virtue words commonly used by proponents for AGW include *science*, *Mother Earth*, *health*, and *civilization*. Such words evoke emotion and their usage prompts actions to protect and defend the ideas to which they are attached. Pro AGW articles that claim *science* predicts global warming will *end civilization* as we know it, *endanger our health* and *destroy Mother Earth* are designed to stir up feelings of fear, one of the previously discussed propaganda techniques.¹⁴ There is literally no end to the list of virtue words; a propagandist can harness any word that has an intense or personal meaning to someone to elicit a thought or response from his audience.

AGW supporters regularly incorporate faulty logic into arguments when attempting to explain something for which there are not yet answers or reasonable explanations. Just because B chronologically follows A, it does not mean that A causes B. The AGW adherent will claim that the Earth's temperature is rising and so is the carbon dioxide levels from humans, illogically concluding that this means human carbon dioxide emissions are causing the temperature to raise. Another form of faulty logic is an accident resulting from over simplification. While exploring alternative fuels, several scientists have discovered that palm oil burns cleaner than petroleum. AGW supporters jumped on this idea and championed the research to modify vehicle engines that will burn palm oil, a readily renewable resource. Little did they know the issue was more complicated than simply burning a new fuel; harvesting palm oil is a major cause of rain forest deforestation and is associated with the widespread use of chemicals, which damage health and pollute the environment.¹⁵ While honest mistakes are sometimes made, good intentions are not enough to justify illogical actions.

An AGW defender may argue from ignorance; claiming that an idea is accurate simply because it has not been proven false. The AGW propagandist might suppose, "I don't know what this means, but it must be bad because the unknown is frightening." Further, circular reasoning is employed when campaigning for decreased emissions of pollutants. Example: An AGW champion posits that all pollutants that increase green house gases must be regulated. When asked what pollutants she is concerned about, she responds, "the ones that cause increased green house

The Politics and Propaganda of Anthropogenic Global Warming

Written by Buryl Chadwick Cooper

gases.” There are many other types of faulty logic, all of which have been employed in the argument for AGW.

The Reasons for AGW Propaganda

The propaganda techniques discussed are tactical methods to convince the world population that humans are the primary cause of global warming. The strategic goal, however, is to incorporate as many of these methods into the daily life of the average citizen, so that he accepts the theory as fact. From new articles, t-shirts, laundry detergent, political speeches, movies, and appliances to car insurance commercials, AGW has permeated modern society to the point where there is no escape. A discussion of the benefits that AGW supporters receive will offer explanations why the AGW theory has received overwhelming backing.

Anthropogenic Global Warming theory is a marketers dream. It has paved the way for the development of new inventions, provided funding for scientists, and created a demand for eco-friendly products, including everything from hairspray to solar panels. The effectiveness of AGW propaganda can be measured by the demand for environmentally friendly products in the past two decades. Various companies have sought the endorsement of the EPA to tout their products to the recently converted AGW believers.

A Google search for “eco-friendly” results in 12,000,000 hits; while a search for “eco” alone yields over 81 million.¹⁶ Products offered include vacationing, health food, books, beauty products, air filters, soap, home products, pest control, televisions, insurance and more. Nearly every type of company, hawking every type of good or service has capitalized on eco-friendly marketing. AGW propaganda propels multi-billion dollar industries to exploit the fears that global warming proponents have sown into the unwitting minds of the masses.

Businesses are not the only entities that have profited from the AGW propaganda. Foreign nations, such as China, France and Germany regularly use the theory as diplomatic leverage to pressure the United States to curb its industry, attempting to weaken the US as the world’s lone super power. Developing nations in South America have attempted to use their rain forests as leverage to receive foreign aid and political clout. The Brazilian government has asked for over \$1.5 billion in aid to fund projects that are aimed at preserving their rainforests- similar to demanding a ransom.¹⁷ While it is doubtful that they will receive the blank check their government has asked for, it is clear that hundreds of millions of dollars will continue to flow to the region in an attempt to prevent them from destroying their own rainforests.

The AGW scientists, of course, are recipients of the successful propaganda as well. As governments and industry realize that their continued power and income rely on new “shocking” revelations by authoritative scientists, more funding will be provided to ensure a steady flow of fodder for the propaganda engine. Scientists will receive grants and endowments to undertake new and expensive studies to solidify the theory and guarantee their salaries for years- that is, as long as their reports confirm the AGW theory. In turn, those universities that produce the scientists benefit from the surge in new students seeking to “save the Earth” as well as from grants, scholarships, and funding to increase the programs, which feed the AGW machine.

The United States may also strategically benefit from the AGW theory- if it can politically resist the worldwide call for it to join the Kyoto Protocol. During the economic “eco-surge,” scientists and inventors are receiving mass funding to develop and discover new environmentally friendly fuels, including bio-fuels and hydrogen engines. If the scientists are successful and entrepreneurs can find a way to profitably market these new products, the United States, and consequently the world, will come to depend less on oil as a source of energy. Although only 20% of US oil consumption comes from the Middle East, OPEC, the largest conglomeration of oil producing countries that determines production rates for those nations, is comprised primarily of Middle Eastern nations. This is in-line with the current administration’s policy: “By applying the talent and technology of America, this country can dramatically improve our environment, move beyond a petroleum-based economy, and make our dependence on Middle Eastern oil a thing of the past”.¹⁸ It seems that nearly everyone and every nation can benefit from the AGW theory to accomplish its goals- including the United States.

The Problem

The Politics and Propaganda of Anthropogenic Global Warming

Written by Buryl Chadwick Cooper

If so many benefit from the AGW theory, what is the problem with promoting it? From a marketer's viewpoint, probably nothing; however, a moral dilemma presents itself when the truth about global warming is discovered and attempts to cover it up and discredit it occur. For hundreds of years, scientists, which the AGW proponents hold up on a pedestal, have used a process of experimentation called the scientific method. The basic tenant of the Scientific Method is that you can only attempt to disprove a hypothesis. A hypothesis that cannot be disproved does not mean that it is correct; it simply becomes a theory, which other scientists must then try continually to disprove.

Why then do scientific organizations and communities set out to support or prove the AGW theory? As scientists, they should be trying to disprove the theory rather than find ways to reinforce it. Further, the entire study of AGW theory is based on peer review, which conclusions form an authoritative basis for future development on the theory. The problem is that good experiments are *not* based on authority. If Galileo had based his reasoning on authoritative writing of his day, he would never have developed the fact that the universe does not revolve around the Earth. However, working theories do serve to create a model to predict future observations- this is what the IPCC has done, with illogical results that only perpetuate the theory.

For years, supporters of the AGW theory have warned that the human activities have led to global warming and threaten the existence of human life itself. The hotter temperatures, they say, will cause crops to wither and famine to spread as moisture is evaporated from the soil. Indeed, AGW champions have used every method of propaganda to convince the world's population that it will soon die.

Bad Models

In a petition signed by more than 17,000 scientists, they urged the US government *not* to sign the Kyoto Protocol. They argued that the research data on climate change does not show that human use of hydrocarbons is harmful. Conversely, they claim that there is good evidence that increased atmospheric carbon dioxide is environmentally *helpful*.

"There is no convincing scientific evidence that human release of carbon dioxide, methane, or other greenhouse gases is causing (or will in the foreseeable future cause) catastrophic heating of the earth's atmosphere and disruption of the earth's climate. Moreover, there *is* substantial scientific evidence that increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide produce many beneficial effects upon the natural plant and animal environments of the earth."¹⁹

The science behind the AGW theory is simply not good science. The logic does not add up, the experiments are based on a faulty hypothesis, the models based on that hypothesis are unsurprisingly incorrect as well- which lead to inaccurate predictions designed to only accomplish the agenda of the backers

Assuming, momentarily, that the AGW theory is true, that humans have caused the earth to warm exponentially, logical conclusions could be drawn based on the theory. Indeed, contrary to the dire predictions of fearful environmentalists, a warmer planet will have beneficial consequences on the world's food supplies. Longer growing seasons, more sunshine and precipitation, shorter winters and less frequent frosts, with summertime temperatures rising only slightly, will create a better environment for humans, plants and animals alike.

According to the AGW theory, as the planet warms, the oceans will release copious amounts of carbon dioxide, a chemical compound that plants thrive on and require for life. With the increased amounts of carbon dioxide, plant life will flourish, absorbing the chemical as a fertilizer. Since 1950, in a period of global warming, the increase of carbon dioxide released from humans and the oceans have helped the world's grain production soar from 700 million more than 2 billion tons last year.²⁰ Clearly, the increased mean temperature and warming in the northern hemisphere will have positive effects for farmers across the world.

Continuing with the assumption that AGW model predictions on the melting ice caps are true, the melting and warming of the polar ice caps will have an equalizing effect on equatorial currents and wind currents. Because there will be less drastic contrasts in temperatures, hurricanes and violent storms, currently understood to be caused when a cold air front meets a massive warm front and the shifting air currents erupt in intense weather, will be less

The Politics and Propaganda of Anthropogenic Global Warming

Written by Buryl Chadwick Cooper

frequent. The warming temperatures will result in more evaporation, as the calamitous IPCC predictions suggest, however, the evaporation will occur on the ocean surface as well- which the increased atmospheric temperatures will not be able to retain, causing life giving rainclouds to form, delivering much needed rain to regions already suffering drought. The predictions presented by the AGW crowd seem to only cover the negative aspects of the model, stressing the evaporation portion of the hydrological cycle, yet forgetting the rain that the evaporation inevitably brings.

The Center for Global Food Issues reports that, based on satellite reports, the Earth has been getting greener since 1982, thanks apparently to increased rainfall and CARBON DIOXIDE; and, worldwide vegetative activity generally increased by 6.17 percent between 1982 and 1999- despite extended cloudiness due to the 1991 eruption of Mount Pinatubo and other well-publicized environmental stresses.²¹ Apparently, plants thrive in carbon dioxide rich environments; these studies have prompted greenhouse owners to pump large amounts of it into their greenhouses resulting in record size tomatoes and flowers.

Real science is based on repeatable scientific experiments that can be reproduced anywhere in the world. Actual experiments have resulted in finds from nearly 800 scientific observations around the world that a doubling of carbon dioxide from present levels would improve plant productivity on average by 32 percent across species.²² While the theory of AGW may not be disprovable, the predictions based on the theory are wildly illogical and serve only the agendas of AGW propagandists and those they serve.

The Real Story

The fact is that the Earth's climate is always changing and has been since it was formed. Ice core samples taken from the Vostok Station in Antarctica show that major ice ages followed by warming periods, sprinkled with minor ice ages are a natural phenomenon; that is, they occur regardless of human activity. What causes these ice ages and warming periods is unknown; however, it is likely that several factors contribute to the episodes outside of human control.

Over millions of years, as Earth orbits the sun, its axis changes ever so slightly. This is known as global forcing- what causes this is unknown. A few degrees of change, however, can impact the temperature of the Earth. Additionally, levels of green house gasses can impact the temperature of the Earth by acting like an insulator to keep solar radiation in the atmosphere. Further, major catastrophes, such as substantial volcanic activity can impact the global temperature and climate as well as extra-terrestrial factors including solar flares, asteroids and cosmic wind. Finally, a factor that is rarely discussed amongst anthropologic global warming propagandists is the theory that the Earth's core is responsible for the fluctuations in the ocean temperatures, and subsequently, the atmospheric warming and cooling.

The increase of greenhouse gasses has been correlated with the increase of temperature. Examination of the ice cores shows that levels of carbon dioxide can be used to estimate historical temperatures. A fallacy that AGW proponents have perpetuated, is that carbon dioxide levels *cause* the temperature to rise, when the most logical explanation for the relationship is a warming/cooling cycle where the increase of temperatures causes the oceans to release large amounts of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. The increased release of carbon dioxide and water vapor, the primary green house gas, subsequently compounds the warming process until the skies become super-saturated with cloud cover. The increased cloud cover blocks the incoming solar radiation leading to lower surface temperatures and increased snowfall, and denser carbon dioxide levels in the oceans, rather than the skies. The decreased cloud cover results in the surface temperatures rising and the oceans releasing carbon dioxide; and the cycle starts over again.

Another possibly significant contributing factor to climate change is solar flares and sun spots. Occasionally, the sun releases extra amounts of energy, which is visible in the form of solar flares and sunspots. These flare ups generate solar wind which disturbs the path of cosmic dust in the path of the Earth's orbit, blowing it out of the way. The cosmic dust would normally collide with the Earth's atmosphere, bonding to water vapor found in the atmosphere, generating cloud cover. When solar flares erupt, cloud cover is significantly reduced, causing temperatures to rise

The Politics and Propaganda of Anthropogenic Global Warming

Written by Buryl Chadwick Cooper

temporarily. This factor is generally understood to be insignificant in the macro view of global climate change.

Ocean water retains heat at a much higher percentage than the atmosphere and has the ability to transfer heat at a much higher rate than the atmosphere. This simply means that the oceans cannot be easily warmed by atmospheric temperatures; yet, the opposite is true for the atmosphere. The ice suspended over the oceans is 90% submerged. To melt the polar ice caps, the water surrounding them must be warmed. A simple demonstration can be constructed to show that ice melts faster in water than it does out of it.

This phenomenon can be observed in both the northern and southern poles. The Arctic ice caps, which are suspended in the ocean, are melting rapidly, as are the ice caps over the ocean in near Antarctica. However, the ice over the land mass in Antarctica is actually thickening- evidence that that it is the *oceans* warming over the poles rather than the air. Since the ice caps are already floating in the ocean, melting them will not cause the oceans level to rise- except for the ice melted over land which drains into the oceans.

A further observation regarding the theory that the heat is originating from the oceans instead of the atmosphere is increased precipitation levels. The United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP) reported that during the last 100 years, precipitation has increased over land at high latitudes of the Northern Hemisphere, especially during the cold season.²³ Increased atmospheric gas temperature results in increased water vapor retention; conversely, increases in the oceans' temperature results in evaporation, which results in more precipitation. The report from UNEP supports the theory that during periods of cooler atmospheric temperatures, precipitation increases. Because of the increase in precipitation, ice is in fact thickening over the landmasses at Antarctica and Greenland, as shown by satellites, which use radar to measure thickness of ice.²⁴ The snowfall over the southernmost continent will remain there for a long time and will continue to accumulate until a balance has been achieved.

Atmospheric temperatures have increased significantly in micro-climates regionally due primarily to the rising ocean temperatures; though world-wide air temperatures have not increased much at all. Europe and Greenland have experienced a rise in surface temperatures due to the Gulf Stream, which gathers heat from the Atlantic Ocean and delivers it to what would otherwise be a cooler climate. North America is experiencing a warmer atmosphere due to the warming of the arctic- due to the melting of the ice caps surrounded by water, where most of the cooler air for North America originates. These explanations can all be attributed to the warming of the oceans.

The Earth's molten core is heating the oceans. Heat continually radiates from the core to the mantle and is evidenced in the form of volcanoes, geothermic wells, geysers, and the fact of geothermal gradients, meaning that the deeper into the Earth one travels, the warmer the temperature. Because the center of the Earth is liquid, it may move from place to place depending on gravity and centrifugal forces. Since absolute North changes periodically, it may indicate that the core is changing position as well. Observations from space show that the Earth is not round, but pear-shaped, with the bulk of the Earth located in the Southern Hemisphere.²⁵ If the absolute center of the Earth has recently relocated to the Southern Hemisphere, it may account for the increased ocean temperatures- as less land mass is located in the lower half.

Conclusion

Whether the Earth is warming from the oceans or from the sun, it is imperative to recognize propaganda for what it is. Anthropogenic Global Warming may be the largest misunderstanding of the Earth nature since we thought the world was flat. The tools used to convince the masses that such a theory is true are tools of pure propaganda. The unscrupulous scientists that perpetuate the lie are only partially to blame, as they are manipulated by the politics and commerce of the world. As AGW propagandists play with the heartstrings of the Earth's population and billions of dollars are invested to prevent its demise, monetary funds are drawn away unnecessarily from other more worthy projects. The AGW propaganda has found its way into the lives of citizens by every possible avenue; the truth is available for those who earnestly seek it; though covered by years of propagandistic lies.

Bibliography

The Politics and Propaganda of Anthropogenic Global Warming

Written by Buryl Chadwick Cooper

American Enterprise Institute. "AEI's Organization and Purposes." Accessed 24 September 2007

<http://www.aei.org/about/>

Euractive.com "Scientists fear global warming higher than expected." Accessed online 24 September 2007.

<http://www.euractiv.com/en/sustainability/scientists-fear-global-warming-higher-expected/article-146995>

Friends of the Earth. "Greasy Palms." Accessed online 25 September 2007.

http://www.foe.co.uk/resource/reports/greasy_palms_summary.pdf

Global warming. (n.d.). The American Heritage® Science Dictionary. Retrieved September 26, 2007, from Dictionary.com website: <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/global%20warming>

Google.com Accessed 25 September 2007.

<http://www.google.com/search?hl=en&safe=active&rls=com.microsoft%3Aen-US&q=eco+friendly>

Hummel, Richard. Consent #33(January 2003) "Kyoto or Else" Accessed online 25 September 2007.

http://www.freedomparty.org/consent/cons33_1.htm

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Accessed 24 September 2007. http://ipcc-wg1.ucar.edu/wg1/docs/WG1AR4_SPM_Approved_05Feb.pdf

Kranish, Michael. "Bush calls for US to cut oil reliance Modest domestic goals mark State of Union." Globe Staff.

February 1, 2006. Accessed online September 26, 2007.

http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2006/02/01/bush_calls_for_us_to_cut_oil_reliance/

Mathematics of the Earth's Shape. Accessed 26 September 2007.

http://www.mckinleyville.com/cart/cabinet/cab_math.html

National Center for Policy Research. "Nonsense By Any Other Name: Calling Carbon Dioxide a Pollutant Doesn't Make It A Pollutant." Accessed 24 September 2007 <http://www.nationalcenter.org/NPA458.html>

Out of the Jungle. "The Empire Strikes Back! Disputing Global Warming" Accessed 24 September 2007

<http://outofthejungle.blogspot.com/2007/02/empire-strikes-back-disputing-global.html>

Pearce, Fred. "First Aid for the Amazon." New Scientist. Published 28 March 1992.

Petition Project. Accessed 26 September 2007. <http://www.oism.org/pproject/>

Center for Global Food Issues, Global Warming Famine or Feast, May 19, 2005.

<http://www.cgfi.org/cgficommentary/global-warming-famine-or-feast>

Rocky Mountain News. "Tempest erupts over hurricanes" Jim Erickson. Accessed 26 September 2007 at:

http://www.rockymountainnews.com/drmn/local/article/0,1299,DRMN_15_5094006,00.html

Science Magazine, "Snow-fall driven Growth in East Antarctic Ice Sheet Mitigates Recent Sea Level Rise." Curt Davis. Access 26 September 2007 online: <http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/abstract/308/5730/1898%20>

Source Watch. "American Enterprise Institute." Accessed 25 September 2007.

http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=American_Enterprise_Institute%23Funding

UNEP. Precipitation Changes. Accessed 26 September 2007. <http://www.grida.no/climate/vital/18.htm>

WashingtonTimes.com "Separating climate fact from fiction." Timothy Ball, Tom Harris, Accessed online 26

The Politics and Propaganda of Anthropogenic Global Warming

Written by Buryl Chadwick Cooper

September 2007:

Wheeler, Thomas. "It's the End of the World as We Know It." Baltimore Chronicle. Accessed online 25 September 2007 <http://baltimorechronicle.com/080304ThomasWheeler.shtml>

Wikipedia. "American Enterprise Institute" Accessed online 24 September 2007. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American_Enterprise_Institute

1 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Working group one. Accessed 22 September 2007. http://ipcc-wg1.ucar.edu/wg1/Report/AR4WG1_Print_FAQs.pdf

2 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Accessed 24 September 2007. http://ipcc-wg1.ucar.edu/wg1/docs/WG1AR4_SPM_Approved_05Feb.pdf

3 Euractive.com "Scientists fear global warming higher than expected." Accessed online 24 September 2007. <http://www.euractiv.com/en/sustainability/scientists-fear-global-warming-higher-expected/article-146995>

4 WashingtonTimes.com "Separating climate fact from fiction." Timothy Ball, Tom Harris, Accessed online 26 September 2007

5 IBID pg.2

6 global warming. (n.d.). *The American Heritage® Science Dictionary*. Retrieved September 26, 2007, from Dictionary.com website: <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/global+warming>

7 Rocky Mountain News. "Tempest erupts over hurricanes" Jim Erickson. Accessed 26 September 2007 at:

http://www.rockymountainnews.com/drmn/local/article/0,1299,DRMN_15_5094006,00.html

8 Out of the Jungle. "The Empire Strikes Back! Disputing Global Warming" Accessed 24 September 2007 <http://outofthejungle.blogspot.com/2007/02/empire-strikes-back-disputing-global.html>

9 National Center for Policy Research. "Nonsense By Any Other Name: Calling Carbon Dioxide a Pollutant Doesn't Make It A Pollutant." Accessed 24 September 2007 <http://www.nationalcenter.org/NPA458.html>

10 Source Watch. "American Enterprise Institute." Accessed 25 September 2007. http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=American_Enterprise_Institute%23Funding

11 American Enterprise Institute. "AEI's Organization and Purposes." Accessed 24 September 2007 <http://www.aei.org/about/>

12 Wikipedia. "American Enterprise Institute" Accessed online 24 September 2007. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American_Enterprise_Institute

13 Hummel, Richard. Consent #33(January 2003) "Kyoto or Else" Accessed online 25 September 2007. http://www.freedomparty.org/consent/cons33_1.htm

14 Wheeler, Thomas. "It's the End of the World as We Know It." Baltimore Chronicle. Accessed online 25 September 2007 <http://baltimorechronicle.com/080304ThomasWheeler.shtml>

15 Friends of the Earth. "Greasy Palms." Accessed online 25 September 2007. http://www.foe.co.uk/resource/reports/greasy_palms_summary.pdf

The Politics and Propaganda of Anthropogenic Global Warming

Written by Buryl Chadwick Cooper

16 Google.com Accessed 25 September 2007.

<http://www.google.com/search?hl=en&safe=active&rls=com.microsoft%3Aen-US&q=eco+friendly>

17 Pearce, Fred. "First Aid for the Amazon." *New Scientist*. Published 28 March 1992.

18Kranish, Michael. "Bush calls for US to cut oil reliance Modest domestic goals mark State of Union." *Globe Staff*. February 1, 2006. Accessed online September 26, 2007. http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2006/02/01/bush_calls_for_us_to_cut_oil_reliance/

19 Petition Project. Accessed 26 September 2007. <http://www.oism.org/pproject/>

20 Center for Global Food Issues, *Global Warming Famine or Feast*, May 19, 2005. <http://www.cgfi.org/cgficommentary/global-warming-famine-or-feast>

21 IBID

22 IBID

23 UNEP. *Precipitation Changes*. Accessed 26 September 2007. <http://www.grida.no/climate/vital/18.htm>

24 Science Magazine, "Snow-fall driven Growth in East Antarctic Ice Sheet Mitigates Recent Sea Level Rise." Curt Davis. Access 26 September 2007 online:

25 Mathematics of the Earth's Shape. Accessed 26 September 2007. http://www.mckinleyville.com/cart/cabinet/cab_math.html

—

Written by: Chad Cooper

Date written: 2007