

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/3/2018 12:00:00 AM

First name: Anonymous

Last name: Anonymous

Organization:

Title:

Comments: If some said I can control earth's climate, now SPEND TRILIONS on my idea, WOULD YOU BELIEVE? It sounds more like a FICTION novel or Hollywood movie. Ever read Chick Little? Yet the world leaders raced into the Carbon Trading scheme without complete analyst on the back of Tax Payers. We should be highly skeptical of man-made climate change, look deep into CLEAN DEVELOPMENT MECHANISM, (CDM), and THE CREDIT TRUST, ask questions see who is PROFITING from this myth. FOLLOW THE MONEY. Catastrophic climate changes in the next century are unlikely based on observational data. The issue of global warming or change as a phenomenon, is one of the more contentious issues in science today. Superficially, it is frequently portrayed as a 'simple' issue. The issue is rendered more complex by the fact that the surface of the earth DOES NOT COOL primarily by means of radiation, but rather cools by evaporation and convection. the main greenhouse gas is water vapor which is both NATURAL IN ORIGIN and highly variable in its distribution. In the absence of good records of water vapor we ARE NOT even in a position to say how much total greenhouse gases have increased. If this weren't BAD enough, it isn't even the total amount of greenhouse gas which matters; for example, a molecule of water vapor at 12 km altitude is more effective than a thousand molecules near the surface. All of this might not be relevant if models were trustworthy, but satellite measurements of upper level water vapor show profound discrepancies in model results. Under the circumstances, it is surprising that there is any agreement among scientists, The CLIMATE is a NATURALLY variable system. That is to say, it varies WITHOUT any external forcing. Human society already has to deal with this degree of variability over which it has NO CONTROL. For anthropogenic climate change to be 'significant,' it must be as large or larger than natural variability. For smaller changes, the historical record demonstrates our capacity to adapt. the 1995 IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) statement is INCORRECT, and less important. Our ability to quantify the human influence on global climate is currently LIMITED because the expected signal is still emerging from the noise of natural variability, and because there are UNCERTAINTIES in key factors. These include the magnitude and patterns of long-term natural variability and the time-evolving pattern of forcing by, and response to, changes in concentrations of greenhouse and aerosols, and land-surface changes. The climate's behavior over the past century appears "UNLIKELY to be due to human variability (which seems totally compatible with theoretical understanding and makes no claims concerning the magnitude of global warming. Activist views are dependent on the ASSUMPTION that natural variability is replicated in models (IPCC 95 p. 430), an ASSUMPTION which is clearly UNTRUE since major observed components of natural variability like the quasi-biennial oscillation and El-Ni are either NOT replicated at all or replicated VERY POORLY. Indeed, the very structure of the circulation in models is different from what is observed in the data (Polyak and North, 1997). The specific feature which led Santer (the lead author of Chapter 8 of IPCC 95) to claim discovery of the discernible impact of anthropogenic forcing FAILS the most elementary test of statistical robustness: namely, it disappears when additional data is considered. Chapter 8 concludes that our ability to quantify the magnitude of global warming "is currently limited by uncertainties in key factors, including the magnitude and patterns of longer-term natural variability and the time-evolving patterns of forcing by (and response to) greenhouse gases and aerosols." In brief, a decade of focus on global warming and BILLIONS OF DOLLARS of research funds have still FAILED to establish that global warming is a significant problem. Normally, this would lead one to conclude that the problem is less serious than originally suggested. While the IPCC 1995 report does not go so far as to state this explicitly, it is certainly the most subdued and reserved of the numerous IPCC reports issued since 1990. It has been a remarkable example of semantic distortion that this weak and UNSUPPORTABLE VIEWS has encouraged environmental advocates to claim that endorses various catastrophic scenarios. IF CLIMATE CHANGE WAS REAL, WHY IS MONEY IN THE DECISION ? or someone financial gain to believe ?? This should not be a platform to enrich the elite. REFORM The Equal Access to Justice Act (EAJA) . GREATER USE use of Regulatory Flexibility Act to assess rules effects on small businesses. BETTER USE OF REINS Act expedited congressional vote on all major or significant rules before they are effective. . REFORM National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). REPEAL Dodd-Frank.

