

But if global warming is not the certainty that the political elites claim, then what evidence exists to refute their chicken-little assertions? Are important scientific facts being withheld?

There *is* ample scientific evidence that says the sky is not falling. Dr. S. Fred Singer, an atmospheric scientist and a professor of environmental sciences at the University of Virginia, has held several government and academic positions; among these, he was the first director of the U.S. Weather Satellite Service. But if you think that he sides with the gloom-and-doom crowd on this issue, think again. On July 27, 1998, Dr. Singer testified before the Committee on Small Business of the U.S. House of Representatives in Washington, D.C. He had some very interesting and succinct points to make to the Committee regarding the compelling science that refutes the conventional wisdom on the global warming theory.

- The recorded history of the earth shows many natural climate fluctuations, some more profound than the recent ones that supposedly have the human race on the edge of catastrophe. Real evidence (as opposed to computer models) in the form of tree rings, ice cores, and ocean sediment cores indicate that the climate was much warmer 1,000, 3,000, and 6,000 years ago. In other words, the earth and its ancient civilizations have periodically experienced drastic climate changes that had nothing to do with human activity. Still, the planet and its human inhabitants survived, and did so without the benefit of central air conditioning or insulated housing.
- Second, the theoretical models that we place so much faith in have *not* been validated by atmospheric data, that is, by hard evidence. Present models have nowhere near the processing power to

properly account for the effects of clouds on the global climate. In fact, in an article on greenhouse forecasting published in the May 1997 issue of *Science* magazine, Michael Schlesinger of the University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana, said that we need “ 10^{36} to 10^{37} more computer power. So we’re kind of stuck.”

Singer also reminded his audience of the growing consensus that increased atmospheric carbon dioxide speeds up plant growth. He said that a modest warming would lower sea levels, not raise them as some have claimed. Those who fear an inundating sea level rise point to the melting of polar ice caps that would result from a global warming. What they seem to forget, according to Dr. Singer, is that the planet would also experience an increase in the evaporation rate of the oceans, which would translate to greater rainfall and snowfall over the poles and finally, to thicker ice caps. Those of us who prefer to “look before we leap” should recognize this process as another old concept of science, the water cycle.

All of the sound and fury from the environmental lobby does indeed signify something. It just isn’t science.

International organizations such as the United Nations are pushing for drastic changes in the life-styles and economies of the industrialized nations. They are using the “green” movement as a disguise for the same old statist, freedom-stifling, Robin Hood policies that were much more recognizable to us when communism was alive. But if the political arguments do not impress you, atmospheric scientist Fred Singer and several thousands of his colleagues have shown us that the emperor indeed has no clothes.

Brett Organ is an environmental chemist and free-lance writer living in Tallahassee, Fla.