Climate change deniers:	True?	Climate change advocates:	essentiell.org comment:
"It is not possible to tie the increase of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere to human activity with any statistical significance or certainty."	Partially true*.	"Correct, if you mean that it would *only* depend on humans. But we don't claim that either. *That* humans affect the levels of greenhouse gases is however completely confirmed."	Thinks whether humans are the causal factor in itself is not significant. The levels of greenhouse gases are increasing. Period.
"It is not possible to tie the increase of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere to an increase in the global average temperature with any significance or certainty."	Partially True*.	"That greenhouse gases in the atmosphere affect the Global average temperature upwards is a fact. We even agree on that. Does the Global average temperature *only* depend on greenhouse gases, no. We don't claim that either."	Considers that just the fact *that* greenhouse gases increase the Global average temperature, is enough. We should therefore act to reduce the production of greenhouse gases.
"There are parts of, especially eastern, Antarctica where the ice sheet is increasing."	True*.	"True. But we have never claimed that there are no regions where ice sheets are increasing. It is the *total* amount of ice around the Arctic and Antarctica that is decreasing."	"Straw manning"... You have a house of 150m^2. You think it's cold and turn on the radiators. When it starts to get nice and warm, the neighbor comes to visit. You say, "Isn't the heat nice?". The neighbor goes up, opens the fridge and answers "Warm? It is freezing cold!"
"The global warming hysteria brings enormous economic research grants, which means there is a self-fulfilling incentive for scientists to maintain the concept of Global warming."	True*	"True in the sense that grants for climate research are relatively large. But as a scientist, you are really only interested in facts and how something works. Should one as a person consider career and strong finances to be more important than the driving force towards or for knowledge, the research profession is in every way the wrong profession."	essentiell.org would guess that if one as a researcher seeks career opportunities, the climate area is *completely* the wrong area to get into. Many people understandably think these issues are important for both their own future (family) and society at large. The competition is therefore fierce and the chance of getting grants would probably even *increase* if you could show that there is something fishy with the results in the climate issue.
"It is not possible to link, with any confirmed significance, examples of extreme weather conditions or states such as: more and stronger hurricanes, local heat records, melting of the Arctic, coral bleaching in the world's oceans, droughts, thawing of permafrost, reduction in the number of insects, more local tornadoes, the Gulf Stream being weaker... to either human impact or that they would be abnormal phenomena seen historically."	Partially True*	"Ok. We have never claimed such a thing either. It is also not a priority to statistically establish that the increasing trend of extreme weather phenomena is *not* natural variations. We note that these phenomena *are* increasing and think we should both reduce the causes we can do something about as well as how we, purely logistically and with respect to global infrastructure, manage the increasing amount of extreme weather phenomena."	Absolutely. In the current situation, it doesn't even feel relevant to wonder whether the increasing frequency of extreme weather is part of natural climate cycles or (only) depends on humans. The extreme phenomena are still in our lap and we must begin to consider how we should relate to extreme droughts and rising sea levels and how these will drive us towards system collapses w.r.t agriculture, trade, welfare, famine disasters and potential mass extinction of certain animal species and insects.
"CO_2 is not a dangerous gas, it is completely natural and plants *require* CO_2 otherwise they die."	True*	"True. No one has claimed anything else either. There is no controversy between us and the skeptics regarding whether it is a greenhouse gas or not."	Even this is probably not a well-thought-out argument. No one has claimed that carbon dioxide is dangerous or "unnatural". On the contrary. Life is dependent on carbon dioxide because plants are. But just because plants thrive under a certain range of CO_2 levels, must it mean that the same levels are good in all other ways and that the levels plants thrive in do not affect the permeability of the sun's radiation and thus our Global temperature, at all?
"The warmest year in history was 1913, but back then no one talked about Global Warming."	True*	"True. Again, researchers who consider that Global warming is a trend look at global temperatures over longer time intervals than that. Looking at one year's average temperature to determine a trend over several years is simply poor research methodology."	Probably correct. Even this is an argument that is not so well thought out. The whole concept of Global Warming is after all average temperatures over a given time interval. No serious advocate for one side or the other would base a trend on 1 (one) year's Global average temperature.
"The predicted increase in sea levels was wrong. The increase was smaller, which shows how unreliable the models are."	Partially true*	"That is correct. Between the years 2011 and 2012, the increase (which incidentally is so far measured in millimeters) was smaller than the predicted increase."	essentiell.org considers that just the fact that sea levels are rising, is enough. Period. Sea levels are increasing seen in a longer time perspective. It doesn't matter much whether it is normal, due to Global warming or due to humans. They are increasing, and if they continue to increase according to the most pessimistic models, we are facing a global systemic collapse in 50-100 years.
And then the generally most important one: "Even if the global average temperature were to increase, it is constitutive and is part of completely natural variations of the Earth's climate."	Partially True*	"Yes. It *may* be due to natural variations in the Earth's climate cycles, although practically all research indicates that the increase we see now is both due to human activity and the rate of increase is also (unprecedentedly) higher than what we have ever seen in the Earth's history."	Absolutely. As already pointed out earlier. essentiell.org doesn't consider it so important whether the current trend of Global Warming is natural or not. If it continues and we do not act to at best counteract the warming or at least prevent further increase, we *will* face the said collapse of systemic proportions.
And lastly and also the latest: "The coldest temperature ever measured in history occurred in 2010"	True*	"True"	True. But as said Global means global as in "looking at the *entire* earth". Trend, means some phenomenon, and in this case *average* temperatures, seen over a *longer time perspective*. If we continue the metaphor with our house, it is like saying that the whole house has had an average temperature during the year of +4°C just because the temperature in the fridge was +4°C on January 17th.

*In research, one usually has a "probability of truth" (or so-called significance) of 95%. I.e. if some phenomenon or result cannot be calculated to be correct with a probability of at least 95%, the result is negative. Not even a 94% probability is enough.

Back