

Claim	Exemplar text (italicized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 1: Global warming is not happening.										
1.1.1. Antarctica isn't melting	More evidence backing up Ball's position comes from the polar regions. <i>New reports from the National Snow and Ice Data Center suggest Antarctic ice levels are at record highs. Ball said the southern hemisphere has been cooling for some time.</i> He believes the clinching evidence comes from the Arctic Circle.	P1: The southern hemisphere is cooling. P2: Sea ice at a record high. C: Global warming is not happening.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: If global warming is happening, no region will experience cooling. P4: If global warming is happening, sea ice would only decrease.	2	P1: Antarctica is cooling. P2: Sea ice is increasing. C: Global warming is not happening.	P3: If global warming is happening, no region will experience cooling. P4: If global warming is happening, sea ice would only decrease.	P1: Misleading P2: Misleading P3: Misleading P4: Misleading	P1 <i>Cherry picking</i> —focuses on parts of Antarctica which are cooling ignores the warming regions such as West Antarctica and the Southern Ocean. P2 <i>Slothful induction</i> —An outdated argument given latest observations. Antarctic sea ice showed an increasing trend from 1980 to 2014 but then suffered a deep drop in extent. At the moment, there's no clear long-term trend in Antarctic sea ice extent. P3 <i>Impossible expectations</i> —it is unreasonable to expect that every single region will show warming in a period of global warming. P4 <i>Single cause</i> —assumes temperature is the only factor driving sea ice trends when there are other factors. For example, winds blowing from the Antarctic continent have been increasing, creating open water that essentially acts as a sea ice factory.
	As the <i>great bulk of Antarctica continues to cool, so too does the amount of sea ice that surrounds the continent continue to increase, both of which observations provide little justification (actually, none at all) for the climate-alarmist claim that CO 2 -induced global warming is a reality</i> , especially when most climate models predict it should be most evident in earth's polar regions, where it obviously is nowhere to be seen .	P1: Antarctica is cooling and gaining sea ice. P2: Models suggest warming should be greatest in polar regions. C: Human-caused global warming is not happening.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: If global warming is happening, no region will experience cooling. P4: If global warming is happening, sea ice would only decrease.					
Super claim 1: Global warming is not happening.										
Super claim 1: Global warming is not happening.										
1.1.2. Greenland isn't melting	The Danish Meteorological Institute reports that <i>Greenland's ice sheet has seen more growth so far this year than in the last four years. Greenland's ice sheet growth in 2015 is also higher than the mean growth for 1990 to 2011.</i>	P1: Greenland's ice sheet is growing. C: Global warming is not happening.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: If ice sheets are growing anywhere, then global warming is not happening.	2	P1: Parts of Greenland's ice sheet are not melting. C: Global warming is not happening.	P2: All parts of ice sheets must be melting under global warming.	P1: Misleading P2: Misleading	P1 <i>Cherry picking</i> —only looks at part of the ice sheet, not what's happening as a whole. P2 <i>Single cause</i> —ignores that sometimes parts of an ice sheet can grow under warming conditions such as due to increased humidity <i>Impossible expectations</i> —it's impossible to expect every part of an ice sheet to melt even under warming conditions.
	Climate fraudsters keep telling the press that Greenland is melting down. <i>With satellite technology, you can see that they are lying. There is a strip about 60 miles wide on the northern and western edges of the ice sheet where significant melting is occurring. The rest of the ice sheet shows very little signs of melt.</i>	P1: Only parts of Greenland are melting. P2: The rest of Greenland is not melting. C: Global warming is not happening.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: As only the west and the north of Greenland are melting, ice sheet melt is insignificant.					

Claim	Exemplar text (italicized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 1: Global warming is not happening.										
1.1.3. Arctic isn't melting	The Arctic sea ice concentration reached its minimum around September 15th this year. Figure 2, below, from the Polar Research Group at the University of Illinois, shows the distribution of ice in the Arctic on that day. As you can see, the North Pole was not even close to being ice free. <i>Figure 3 shows the Arctic Basin sea ice area for the last 365 days. Note that in mid-September the the sea ice area anomaly for the Arctic Basin was about negative 0.75 million square kilometers, but there were still 2.5 million square kilometers of ice yet to melt. Again, not even close to zero.</i>	P1: There is 2.5 million square kilometres of unmelted Arctic sea ice. C: Arctic sea ice is fine.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: If there is some Arctic sea ice now, there will continue to be Arctic sea ice in the future.	3	P1: In the short term, Arctic sea ice hasn't changed much. C: Arctic sea ice is fine.	P2: If Arctic sea ice maximum extent hasn't changed much in the short-term, then Arctic sea ice is fine in the long-term.	P1: True P2: Misleading	P2 <i>Cherry picking</i> —looks at a short period of sea ice data while ignoring the long-term decline in Arctic sea ice.
	<i>The Arctic sea ice has probably reached its greatest extent for this year. It usually occurs at the end of March last year it was March 21st. There have been some reports that this years maximum extent was the lowest since satellite monitoring began in 1979, and it certainly looks low hovering around 13 million km2 for over a month, see Fig 1 (click on image to enlarge). But looking back over past behavior its maximum extent was similar last year and in 2011 and 2005-7 (Fig 2). Hence this years extent is not that unusual being similar to that observed ten years ago!</i>	P1: Arctic sea ice maximum extent is similar to that of recent years. C: Arctic sea ice is fine.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: If Arctic sea ice maximum extent hasn't changed much in the short-term, then Arctic sea ice is fine in the long-term.					
	Arctic sea ice extent in April 2012 averaged 14.73 million square kilometers (5.69 million square miles). <i>Because of the very slow rate of ice loss through the last half of March and the first three weeks of April, ice extent averaged for April ranked close to average out of 34 years of satellite data.</i>	P1: Ice extent in a single month was close to the 34-year average. C: Arctic sea ice is fine.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: If Arctic sea ice maximum extent hasn't changed much in the short-term, then Arctic sea ice is fine in the long-term.					
Claim	Exemplar text (italicized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 1: Global warming is not happening.										
1.1.4. Glaciers aren't melting	Paper demonstrates the claim made by the IPCC that Himalayan glaciers were retreating at an abnormal rate and would disappear by 2035 was unsubstantiated. <i>Glaciers in the Himalayas, over a period of the last 100 years, behave in contrasting ways, some shrinking, some expanding, some staying about the same. It is premature to make a statement that glaciers in the Himalayas are retreating abnormally because of the global warming.</i>	P1: In the past, glaciers have shrunk, expanded, or remained the same. C: Global warming is not causing glacier retreat.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: Past glacial change is the same as current glacial change.	3	P1: Glaciers are growing in some regions C: Glaciers are fine.	P2: If glaciers are growing anywhere in the world, then glaciers must be fine.	P1: Partially true, some regions glaciers may be growing as those regions cool with global warming, however this is not the overall trend which is a decline in glacier mass globally. P2: Misleading	P2 <i>Cherry picking</i> —focuses on growing glaciers while ignoring the vast majority of shrinking glaciers. <i>Oversimplification</i> —glaciers are influenced by a number of factors, predominantly temperature and precipitation. While most glaciers will retreat under warming conditions, some glaciers may even grow if precipitation and local conditions are favorable. Nevertheless, overall, glaciers across the globe are shrinking at an accelerating rate, threatening water supplies for millions of people.
	Mr Ramesh said the rate of retreat of glaciers in the Himalayas varied from a couple of centimetres a year to a couple of metres, but that this was a natural process that had taken place occurred over the centuries. <i>Some were, in fact, growing</i> , he said.	P1: Glaciers are growing. P2: Glacier retreat is natural. C: Glaciers are fine.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: If glacial retreat is a part of the natural cycle, global warming is not causing glacial retreat.					
	<i>After years of decline, glaciers in Norway are again growing</i> , reports the Norwegian Water Resources and Energy Directorate (NVE). Read more here .	P1: Glaciers declined in the past. P2: Glaciers are now growing in some regions. C: Glaciers are fine.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: If glaciers are growing anywhere in the world, global warming cannot be occurring.					
	However, glaciologists find such figures inherently ludicrous, pointing out that most Himalayan glaciers are hundreds of feet thick and could not melt fast enough to vanish by 2035 unless there was a huge global temperature rise. <i>The maximum rate of decline in thickness seen in glaciers at the moment is 2-3 feet a year and most are far lower.</i>	P1: Glaciers are hundreds of feet thick. P2: Current glacial decline is 2-3 feet. C: Glaciers are fine.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: Because there Glaciers are abundant in mass now, they will be remain abundant in the future.					

Claim	Exemplar text (italized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 1: Global warming is not happening.										
1.2 Heading into an ice age	A Dormant Sun: In February, TWTW reported a study from the Pulkovo Observatory in Russia stating that <i>if the current solar cycle pattern continues, with little solar activity, the globe may experience a new Little Ice Age</i> . To the researcher, what is necessary to understanding the influence of the sun is the response of the earth is lagged behind the solar cycles. http://ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/apr/article/view/14754/10140	P1: Solar activity is low. C: If solar activity stays low, we may experience an ice age.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: Greenhouse gases don't have much warming effect.	2	P1: Current climate change is driven by natural factors. P2: Natural factors are currently having a cooling effect. C: If natural cooling continues, we will experience more cooling in the future.	P3: Greenhouse gases don't have much warming effect.	P1: Misleading P2: True P3: Misleading	P1 <i>Cherry picking</i> —arguments that cooling is happening either look at short time periods or narrow aspects of the climate such as weather events or a single region. <i>Slothful induction</i> —argues that global warming isn't happening while ignoring many warming indicators being observed across our climate. P3 <i>Misrepresentation</i> —greenhouse gases have a strong warming effect and overpower any cooling influence from natural factors.
	The Northern Hemisphere, North Atlantic, North Pacific and East Pacific SST Anomalies are all dropping. It will not be long before the Atlantic Coast and the Arctic regions will show similar cooling as the AMO goes cool or negative. <i>North America is more likely see much cold weather during the next 20-30 years rather than global warming of 3-6C as predicted by the IPCC</i> . The recent severe winter weather along Alaska and the US east coast was just a sample of what may lie ahead. <i>This cooling has been building for a decade now. So how can global warming be causing current and future extreme weather events when global warming as predicted has not been happening for a decade and is unlikely to happen during the next 30 years since the world 60-year climate cycle is heading for colder weather due to changing ocean surface temperatures and changes in deep ocean currents?</i>	P1: Global warming has not been happening for a decade. P2: We are in a 60-year ocean cycle. C: We are heading for colder weather.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: Greenhouse gases don't have much warming effect.					
	<i>The world has been chilling sharply for about twenty years. If present trends continue, the world will be about four degrees colder for the global mean temperature in 1990, but eleven degrees colder in the year 2000. This is about twice what it would take to put us into an ice age.</i>	P1: Global cooling has been happening for around 20 years. C: If this trend continues, we will head into an ice age	Deductive	Invalid	P2: Greenhouse gases don't have much warming effect.					
	<i>Recent global climate variation is entirely within natural cyclical variation, cooling trend now underway and is likely to continue to 2030's, according to best data.</i>	P1: We're in a natural cycle. P2: We're currently experiencing cooling. C: Cooling is likely to continue in the future.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: Greenhouse gases don't have much warming effect.					
Claim	Exemplar text (italized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 1: Global warming is not happening.										
1.3 Weather is cold	<i>I want to know when global warming will start. Im still freezing my ass off at the end of April.</i>	P1: Cold weather events are occurring. C: Global warming is not happening.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: If global warming was happening, we wouldn't experience cold events.	2	P1: Cold weather events are occurring. C: Global warming is not happening.	P2: If global warming was happening, we wouldn't experience cold events.	P1: Misleading P2: Misleading	P1 <i>Anecdote</i> —uses isolated incidents limited in place and time to make conclusions about global warming. P2 <i>Impossible expectations</i> —cold events will continue to happen under global warming but they are less likely to happen while hot events are more likely to occur.
	<i>Yet another bitterly cold, snowy winter is destroying alarmist global warming claims, proving once again that over-the-top global warming predictions are proving no more scientifically credible than snake oil.</i>	P1: Cold weather events are occurring. C: Global warming is not happening.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: If global warming was happening, we wouldn't experience cold events.					
	The city's maximum temperature of 12.1 degrees is four below the average maximum for this time of year. For some western suburbs, it was even colder, only reaching nine in Richmond and 10 in Penrith, both eight below average and their coldest day in at least 15 years. (source)	P1: Cold weather events are occurring. C: Global warming is not happening.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: If global warming was happening, we wouldn't experience cold events.					

Claim	Exemplar text (italicized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 1: Global warming is not happening.										
1.4 Hiatus on warming	<i>(i) Over the last 16 years, global average temperature, as measured by both thermometers and satellite sensors, has displayed no statistically significant warming ; over the same period, atmospheric carbon dioxide has increased by 10%.</i>	P1: Global temperatures has not shown statistically significant warming over the last 16 years. C: Global warming is not happening.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: A short time series of global temperature is sufficient to make conclusions about climate trends.	3	P1: There's been no warming over a short period. C: Global warming is not happening.	P2: Short time periods are sufficient to make conclusions about climate trends.	P1: Misleading P2: Misleading	P1 <i>Cherry picking</i> —short-term trends are not sufficient to make conclusions about long-term climate trends. <i>Slothful induction</i> —ignores other warming indicators such as the build up of heat in the world's oceans, shifting seasons, migrating species, etc. P2 <i>Misrepresentation</i> —the surface temperature record is noisy which is why longer time series are needed to detect statistically significant trends. <i>Cherry picking</i> —less noisy signals like sea level rise and ocean heat show significant trends in much shorter time periods so focusing on noisy surface temperature is cherry picking one dataset over others that show a clearer global
	Of the 100 papers we identified, 65 didnt have anything to do with recent global temperature trends (these typified papers published prior to about 2010). Of the remaining 35 papers, every single one of them acknowledged in some way that a hiatus, pause, or slowdown in global warming was occurring.	P1: 35 papers support the notion of a pause in global warming. C: Global warming is not happening.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: No scientific papers support the notion of global temperature rise.					
	This year is likely to be the ninth warmest on record, with global temperatures in 2012 cooler than the average for the past decade	P1: This year is cooler than other recent years. C: Global warming is not happening.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: Global temperature in a single year is sufficient to make conclusions about climate trends.					
Claim	Exemplar text (italicized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 1: Global warming is not happening.										
1.6 Sea level rise is exaggerated	<i>Satellite measurements show global sea level has risen merely 0.83 inches during the first decade of the twenty-first century (a pace of eight inches for the century) and has barely risen at all since 2006. This puts alarmists in the embarrassing position of defending predictions that are not coming true in the real world.</i>	P1: Sea levels have barely risen over a decade. C: Sea level rise is exaggerated.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: If sea level rise is slow now, it will not get faster in the future.	2	P1: Sea levels within a specific time period or region have not shown dramatic increase. C: Sea level rise is exaggerated.	P2: Results from a narrow set of sea level rise data can be generalized more broadly. P3: Regional factors like subsidence are not a factor in sea level measurements.	P1: Misleading P2: Misleading P3: Misleading	P1 <i>Cherry picking</i> —only looks at sea level rise over a short period like a decade while ignoring sea level rise over the last century as well as the accelerating trend. P2 <i>Slothful induction</i> —ignores that the rate of sea level rise is increasing so future sea level rise will be faster than current levels. P3 <i>Oversimplification</i> —assumes that if sea level rise is falling in one place, it must be because global sea level rise is falling rather than local factors like subsiding land, local ocean warming/cooling, or gravitational effects due to large land masses.
	These tide gauges show that sea levels are rising and falling around Vanuatu over the last 20 years (feast your eyes, there is a 30cm range on that graph below). Where is that CO2 signal? Seas around Vanuatu have been falling since 2008. Getting long term trends out of short data with large natural swings is misleading. Slightly different start or end points will change the rate dramatically. In 2009 the rate of sea level was listed as 6.5mm/yr since 1993. 1 By 2011, the trend was 5.2mm/yr . 2 There is no newer report, but clearly it would be even lower now.	P1: Sea levels around Vanuatu are falling. C: Sea level rise is exaggerated.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: Regional factors like subsidence are not a factor in sea level measurements.					
	8:30 International tide gauges also show: No acceleration in sea level rise. In fact tide gauges show a deceleration. Puls asked the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research for an answer, but they have yet to reply.	P1: Sea level rise is not accelerating. C: Sea level rise is exaggerated.	Inductive	Invalid	P2: If sea level rise doesn't show acceleration within a small time period, it isn't accelerating.					

Claim	Exemplar text (italicized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 1: Global warming is not happening.										
1.7 Extremes aren't increasing	UPDATE : Marc at ABC NewsWatch usefully summarises the flood history of SE Queensland here . Guess what, <i>there have been less severe floods and more severe floods and no floods at all and nothing has changed. Did anthropogenic CO2 cause the floods in 1893 perhaps? Hang on, lets get the script right : No direct link between global warming and the 1893 floods, but climate change would lead to heavier, more frequent rain.</i> Unspoken conclusion: leading to more floods like the one we just happen by chance to be talking about right now That's the sneaky thing about flood plains, they flood duh.	P1: Flooding happened in the past before global warming. C: Global warming is not linked to flooding.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: If global warming didn't affect past floods, they mustn't be affecting current floods either. P3: The frequency or intensity of floods isn't getting worse.	3				P2 <i>False equivalence</i> —assumes that past extreme weather is similar to current conditions. However, global warming is generally making extreme weather more intense and/or frequent. For example, a 1 in 1000 year event is now happening more regularly. P3 <i>Cherry picking</i> —often extreme weather arguments focus on particular types of extreme weather where the science is more complex, such as tornadoes or hurricanes where formation of these events is complex. The global warming signal is clear for extreme weather events like heatwaves are becoming more intense and frequent. The situation is more nuanced with hurricanes where it's hard to detect a change in the frequency of hurricanes but they are becoming more intense due to more energy in the system.
	Then also, why would we want to end a recent lull in harsh weather conditions? Like, for example, <i>the lack of increase in the strength or frequency of landfall hurricanes in the worlds five main hurricane basins during the past 50-70 years; the lack of increase in the strength or frequency in tropical Atlantic hurricane development during the past 370 years; the longest U.S. period ever recorded without intense Category 3-5 hurricane landfall; and no trend since 1950 evidencing any increased frequency of strong (F3-F5) U.S. tornadoes.</i>	P1: Hurricanes have not gotten stronger or more frequent over time. P2: It has been the longest period recorded without very strong hurricanes, 350 years C: Global warming is not linked to hurricanes.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: If hurricanes events not getting worse or stronger, they can't be linked to global warming.					
	In another paper, Davi et al . (2006) developed a reconstruction of streamflow that extended from 1637 to 1997, based on absolutely dated tree-ring-width chronologies from five sampling sites in west-central Mongolia, all of which sites were in or near the Selenge River basin, the largest river in Mongolia. <i>Of the ten wettest five-year periods, only two occurred during the 20th century (1990-1994 and 1917-1921, the second and eighth wettest of the ten extreme periods, respectively), once again indicative of a propensity for less flooding during the warmest portion of the 360-year period.</i>	P1: Tree ring data shows it was warm in the past and there were fewer floods. C: Global warming is not linked to flooding.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: If global warming didn't affect past floods, they mustn't be affecting current floods either. P4: The frequency or intensity of floods isn't getting worse.					

Claim	Exemplar text (italicized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 2: Human greenhouse gases are not causing global warming.										
2.1.1. It's the sun	Baliunas: <i>We are looking to find all the causes of natural change of the climate of the Earth, the sun being one of them. That way we can subtract out the natural changes and look for the human signal. We see, essentially, no signal of human activity. Most of the changes that we see line up with the changes in the sun. Now there's some uncertainty, so there may be a human signal. But if there is, it's quite tiny. . . .</i>	P1: Most of climate change is caused by the sun. C: Global warming is not caused by humans.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: If the sun can affect climate, it must be affecting current climate change.	3	P1: There is a link between solar activity and climate. C: Recent climate change is caused by the sun.	P2: If the sun can affect climate, it must be affecting current climate change.	P1: True P2: Misleading	P1 <i>Slothful induction</i> —ignores the fact that the Sun has been getting colder for the last 30 years as the Earth has been warming. Sun and climate are moving in opposite directions. P2 <i>Single cause</i> —assumes that because solar activity does affect climate, then it must be the cause of current climate change, ignoring that there are other factors that also cause climate change like greenhouse gas warming.
	If you were to hear there was significant planetary warming which is causing a melting of the polar ice caps, you might think you were hearing about global warming. And of course, you would be right just not about earth, but rather Mars instead. This according to the Heartland Institute, which reports how recent NASA findings confirm that for the past three Martian summers, deposits of frozen CO2 from the Martian south pole have shrunk, indicating a significant planetary warming underway. <i>Scientists attribute this Martian warming not to any manmade emissions, but to possible increases in the sun's solar output, which may mean as much as thirty percent of any warming that has occurred on earth could be attributable to this natural cause.</i>	P1: Other planets are warming. P2: The sun is causing these planets to warm. C: The sun must also be causing Earth to warm.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: There is a solar sytem wide phenomana (solar activity) at work which is causing all planets to increase in warming. (SKS 2022)					
	Researchers in the UMaine Climate Change Institute (http://www.climatechange.umaine.edu/) have focused on the relationship between solar variability and climate, particularly the use of isotopes in tree rings and ice cores to provide an indication of the suns strength. The ice core data reported in the paper demonstrates a direct atmospheric consequence associated with changing solar radiation.	P1: There is a link between solar activity and climate. C: Recent climate change is caused by the sun.	Deductive	Vaild	P2: If the sun can affect climate, it must be affecting current climate change.					
Super claim 2: Human greenhouse gases are not causing global warming.										
Claim	Exemplar text (italicized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 2: Human greenhouse gases are not causing global warming.										
2.1.2. It's geological	Here we explain that <i>the root cause of the 2000-2015 western Pacific Ocean warming is increased heat flow from deep ocean volcanoes, hydrothermal vents, and heat emitting fault zones not man-made atmospheric global warming . Data supporting this contention are diverse, reliable, and abundant. A summary of key points substantiating a geological heat flow origin to warming in the western Pacific Ocean:</i>	P1: Heat is flowing from deep ocean volcanoes. C: Ocean warming is not caused by humans.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: Ocean warming can only be caused by natural geological processes.	2	P1: Heat is flowing from geothermal sources. C: Warming is not caused by Humans.	P2: Natural geological process is the only cause of warming.	P1: True. The ocean does get heated by geothermal vents and activity. P2: Misleading. Atmospheric warming affects ocean warming. atmospheric warming is caused by the human-induced greenhouse effect. Geothermal activity in the ocean is the sole cause of ocean warming.	P2 <i>Single cause</i> —assumes only one cause of ocean warming when there are multiple causes, including atmospheric warming. <i>Slothful induction</i> —ignores that patterns of ocean warming are consistent with atmospheric warming.
	<i>If you believe that the observed West Antarctica warming is caused by the warming of the atmosphere. Recent studies show that the heat is coming from volcanoes below the glacier. Besides, air temperatures in the area are far below zero. Ice doesn't melt in subfreezing air.</i>	P1: West Antarctica is warming from volcanoes below glaciers. P2: Antarctica's warming is not caused by the warming of the atmosphere. C: Global warming is not caused by humans.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: Ocean warming can only be caused by natural geological processes.					

Claim	Exemplar text (italicized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 2: Human greenhouse gases are not causing global warming.										
2.1.3. It's the ocean	El Nio: A warming of parts of the tropical Pacific indicates that an El Nio may be building. Although largely ignored by the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), <i>El Ninos and the opposite La Ninas apparently have a significant impact on global temperatures, hence global warming</i> . Strong El Nios warm, La Nias cool. The great temperature spike in 1998 was from a super El Nio. Physicist Donn Rapp has a lucid historical explanation on Climate Etc. Some alarmists are calling for a strong El Nio, as it would restart global warming. Based on the historic data, Joe Bastardi of WeatherBELL Analytics asserts that if it materializes, it will not be strong.	P1: El Niño and La Niña (ocean cycles) influence global temperature. C: Ocean cycles are causing global warming.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: If ocean cycles affect global temperatures in the short term it then they must affect it in the long term.	2				
	Why should you be interested? <i>Sea surface temperature records indicate El Nio and La Nia events are responsible for the warming of global sea surface temperature anomalies over the past 30 years, not manmade greenhouse gases. I've searched global sea surface temperature records for more than 4 years, and I've searched ocean heat content records for more than 3 years, and I can find no evidence of an anthropogenic greenhouse gas signal. That is, the data indicates the warming of the global oceans has been caused by Mother Nature, not anthropogenic greenhouse gases.</i>	P1: El Niño and La Niña are responsible for the warming of global sea surface temperatures. C: Man-made greenhouses have not caused global sea surface warming.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: If ocean cycles affect global temperatures in the short term it then they must affect it in the long term.					
	1) The oceans contain many orders of magnitude more energy than the atmosphere, are insulated from space by it, and emit energy into it via the latent heat of evaporation, radiation, convection and conduction . <i>Changes in sea surface temperature (SST) precede related changes in lower tropospheric temperature (LT) by 3-6 months</i> . Conversely, the oceans are opaque to the radiation emitted by the atmosphere and mechanisms for transferring energy via back radiation, convection or conduction down into its bulk from the atmosphere are extremely limited. <i>In summary, the oceans drive the atmospheric temperature.</i>	P1: Sea surface temperatures precede related changes in the lower tropospheric temperatures. P2: Oceans drive the atmospheric temperature. C: Greenhouse gases are not the cause of global warming.	Deductive	Valid	P3: If oceans Drive the atmospheric temperature it is the only reason the atmospheric global warming is occurring.					

P2
Single cause—infers that there is a correlation between natural cycles in the oceans (El Niño and La Niña) and global sea surface temperature, so anthropogenic greenhouse gases cannot also be contributing to global warming.
False equivalence—assumes two things are similar in one way so must be similar in another way. For example, short-term temperature change is similar to long-term temperature change, because they both involve temperature change. But they are not equivalent because ocean cycles involve transfer of heat between the ocean and atmosphere while global warming is a planetary build-up in heat.

Claim	Exemplar text (italicized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 2: Human greenhouse gases are not causing global warming.										
2.1.4. Past climate change	<p>There is growing evidence that <i>worldwide temperatures were higher than at present during the mid-Holocene</i> (especially 5 000-6 000 BP), at least in summer, though carbon dioxide levels appear to have been quite similar to those of the pre-industrial era at this time (Section 1 i Thus parts were a few degrees warmer in July during the mid- Holocene than in recent decades (Yoshino and Urushibara, 1978, Webb ct al 1987, Huntley and Prentice, 1988, Zhang and Wang 1990) Parts of Australasia and Chile were also warmer. <i>The late tenth to early thirteenth centuries (about AD 950-1250) appear to have been exceptionally warm in western Europe, Iceland and Greenland</i> (Alexandre 1987, Lamb, 1988) This period is known as the Medieval Climatic Optimum China was, however, cold at this time (mainly in winter) but South Japan was warm (Yoshino, 1978). <i>This period of widespread warmth is notable in that there is no evidence that it was accompanied by an increase of greenhouse gases</i></p>	<p>P1: Temperatures were higher in the past. P2: When temperatures were warmer, carbon dioxide levels were not high. C: Greenhouse gas levels do not affect global warming.</p>	Deductive	Invalid	<p>P3: If past warming was not caused by GHG then todays global warming cannot be caused by GHG.</p>	3	<p>P1: Climate has changed due to natural causes in the Earth's past. P2: Climate is changing now. C: Current climate change must be natural.</p>	<p>P3: Current climate change is similar to past climate change. P4: What caused climate change in the past must be the same as what's causing climate change now.</p>	<p>P1: True P2: True P3: Misleading P4: Misleading</p>	<p>P3 <i>False equivalence</i> —current warming is faster than past climate change. Also, CO2 induced global warming has a different warming pattern in the atmosphere. CO2 causes lower atmosphere to warm and upper atmosphere to cool. while natural causes would cause both lower and upper atmosphere. another difference between todays warming and past warming is the rate of warming, past warming has been slow, while todays has been rapid. P4 <i>Single cause</i> —assumes that what caused climate change in the past (natural factors) must be the same as what's causing climate change now.</p>
	<p>In fact, it seems <i>the only constant in climate history is change-continuous change</i>, in varying ways at various times, collectively spanning a very broad range of temperatures. <i>What causes these changes is unclear.</i> Temperatures have been warmer than now, and greenhouse gas concentrations higher but which caused which remains uncertain. As the NRC wrote, "climate is continually varying on time scales ranging from seasons to the lifetime of Earth."</p>	<p>P1: Climate has changed due to natural causes in the Earth's past. P2: Climate is changing now. C: Current climate change must be natural.</p>	Deductive	Invalid	<p>P3: Current climate change is similar to past climate change. P4: What caused climate change in the past must be the same as what's causing climate change now.</p>					

Claim	Exemplar text (italicized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 2: Human greenhouse gases are not causing global warming.										
2.3.1. CO2 is a trace gas	This explanation by the IPCC is clearly misleading, if not wrong. The inference that the greenhouse gases are acting like a blanket suggests that they are increasing the insulating properties of the atmosphere. However, <i>the main gases of the atmosphere are oxygen and nitrogen, non-greenhouse gases, and they are also excellent insulators against the conduction of heat (like a blanket); adding additional trace amounts of carbon dioxide will have no appreciable impact on the insulating properties of the atmosphere.</i>	P1: Other gases (oxygen and nitrogen) have insulating properties. P2: These gases are more abundant than carbon dioxide. C: Carbon dioxide cannot be a major driver of global warming.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: Insulation of the atmosphere always depends on gases that are the most abundant in the atmosphere.	2				
	10. <i>Since CO2 is incapable of causing climatic warming by itself (CO2 makes up only 0.038% of the atmosphere and accounts for only a few percent of the greenhouse gas effect), is there evidence of concomitant increase in water vapor (which causes more than 90% of the greenhouse gas effect)?</i>	P1: Carbon dioxide is a trace gas comprising only 0.04% of the atmosphere. C: Carbon dioxide cannot be a major driver of global warming.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: Trace elements of a substance cannot have a strong effect.					
	So what are the key players in Climate Change? The major driver is the sun. Warming depends on the sun. Cooling is due to the lack of sun's energy. Radiant energy enters the earth's atmosphere. Air (on a dry basis) consists mainly of nitrogen 78.08% and oxygen 20.94%. Of the 0.98% remaining, 95% of that (ie 0.934%), or almost all is the inert gas argon. <i>Carbon dioxide CO2 is a trace. It is less than 400ppm (parts per million) or 0.04% of all the atmosphere (on a dry basis). Surprisingly, less than a fifth of that is man-made CO2 (0.008% of the total), and that is only since the beginning of the industrial era and the rapid increase in world population.</i>	P1: Carbon dioxide is a trace gas comprising only 0.04% of the atmosphere. C: Carbon dioxide cannot be a major driver of global warming.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: Trace elements of a substance cannot have a strong effect.					
Super claim 2: Human greenhouse gases are not causing global warming.										
Claim	Exemplar text (italicized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 2: Human greenhouse gases are not causing global warming.										
2.3.2. Greenhouse effect is saturated	The warming effect of 4,500 ppm was pretty small, too. The total warming is approximately proportional to the logarithm of the relative concentration increase. You know, the warming doesn't start to accelerate when the concentrations grow (an obvious myth that some people want to be promoted among the gullible laymen): quite on the contrary, <i>the warming effect of one CO2 molecule slows down as the concentration increases.</i>	P1: The warming effect of CO2 slows down as the concentration increases. C: Adding more CO2 to the atmosphere will not impact warming.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: CO2 is saturated in the upper atmosphere.	1				
	<i>This diminishing influence of a new CO2 molecule over time is actually a function of known climate physics - the logarithmic effect of carbon dioxide . Essentially, from lab testing it was determined that increasing levels of CO2 caused a diminishing returns effect, which is better described here .</i>	P1: CO2 has a diminishing effect on warming over time. C: Adding more CO2 to the atmosphere will have a negligible impact.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: CO2 is saturated in the upper atmosphere.					
	<i>As the temperature increasing effect of atmospheric CO2 is known to diminish logarithmically with increasing concentration , these notes clarify the actual amount of warming that might result from additional CO2 released into the atmosphere by man-kind and the temperature reduction impact of any policy actions to control CO2 emissions.</i>	P1: When the CO2 concentration in the atmosphere goes up, there is less warming effect. C: Adding more CO2 into the atmosphere does not impact warming.	Deductive	Valid	P2: CO2 is saturated in the upper atmosphere.					

Claim	Exemplar text (italicized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 2: Human greenhouse gases are not causing global warming.										
2.3.3. CO2 lags climate	For example, when scientists analyzed the relationship between atmospheric CO2 levels and temperatures dating back 250,000 years, inferred from ice cores drilled in Greenland and the Antarctic, they found that sometimes the concentration of CO2 was high when the temperature was low, and sometimes the CO2 was low when the temperature was high. ⁹ Moreover, a careful analysis showed that some of the atmospheric CO2 changes did not precede the temperature changes, as the greenhouse warming theory would predict. Instead, changes in atmospheric carbon dioxide followed the temperature changes. The atmospheric CO2 changes were not the cause of the temperature changes; the CO2 changes were likely driven by vegetation changes in response to natural variations in air and sea-surface temperatures.	P1: CO2 lagged temperature in the past. C: CO2 does not drive temperature.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: If temperature affects CO2, then CO2 cannot affect temperature.	1	P1: CO2 lagged temperature in the past. C: CO2 does not drive temperature.	P2: If temperature affects CO2, then CO2 cannot affect temperature.	P1: Misleading P2: Misleading	P1 <i>Slothful induction</i> —while CO2 lags temperature in the Antarctic ice core record, that is not the case in Greenland ice cores or tropical ocean sediment cores. Consequently, it's false to say that CO2 always lags temperature. It's a regional phenomena restricted to Antarctica. P2 <i>False choice</i> —while it is true that CO2 causes global warming, that doesn't mean global warming might not also lead to increased atmospheric CO2. Just because a chicken comes from an egg doesn't mean eggs don't come from chickens—both are true. Similarly, CO2 causes warming and warming causes more CO2. The two combined comprise a reinforcing feedback.
	These continental ice shields had reached their maximum extent approximately 20,000 years ago but had completely melted away some 5,000 years ago. Now that's real climate change in action! Yes the CO2 levels increased too, but only with a time lag of 800 years. As clearly established from deep ice cores on Greenland, that CO2 increase was not the cause but the consequence of the melting.	P1: CO2 lagged temperature in the past. C: CO2 does not drive temperature.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: If temperature affects CO2, then CO2 cannot affect temperature.					
Claim	Exemplar text (italicized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 2: Human greenhouse gases are not causing global warming.										
2.3.4. Water vapor	Like water vapour, carbon dioxide also absorbs some incident Solar radiation, particularly in the 2.7 micron band. So it prevents this radiation from reaching and warming the surface. However, the atmosphere has only about 0.04% carbon dioxide, compared with about 1% to 4% water vapour. Each water vapour molecule absorbs and radiates in a far wider range of wavelengths than each carbon dioxide molecule and so, as some have estimated, the overall effect of all the carbon dioxide could be as little as 0.1% that of all the water vapour. And that effect is likely to be a net cooling effect anyway.	P1: Water vapor traps more heat than CO2. C: Water vapor contribute more to global warming than CO2.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: The warming of a greenhouse gas depends on quantity or heat-trapping ability.	2	P1: Water vapor is more heat-trapping or plentiful than CO2. C: Water vapor contributes more to global warming than CO2.	P2: The warming of a greenhouse gas depends on quantity or heat-trapping ability.	P1: True P2: Misleading	P2 <i>Misrepresentation</i> —this argument misrepresents the behavior of water vapor in the atmosphere. Water vapor doesn't drive climate change: climate change drives water vapor. The amount of vapor in the air depends on air temperature. Warming causes water vapor to rise, which causes further warming: a reinforcing feedback. The fact that water vapor is a strong greenhouse gas means it amplifies the warming from greenhouse gases.
	Humidity acts as a blanket. Water vapor is a potent greenhouse gas the is very active in the infrared part of the spectrum. It absorbs IR radiation emitted by the surface and re-emits IR radiation back to the ground...thus contributing to warming at the surface.	P1: Water vapor traps more heat than CO2. C: Water vapor contribute more to global warming than CO2.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: The warming of a greenhouse gas depends on quantity or heat-trapping ability.					
	Now its necessary to scrutinize the figure very carefully. Looking across the wavelength scale at the bottom, H 2 O absorbs strongly in the 3-micron region, and again between 5 and 7 microns; then it absorbs to some degree beyond about 12 microns. CO 2 has absorption bands centered around 2.5 microns, 4.3 microns, and has a broad band out beyond 13 microns. Consequently, CO 2 adds a small contribution to the greenhouse effect. Notice that sometimes CO 2 bands overlap with H 2 O bands, and with vastly more H 2 O present, CO 2 doesnt matter in those bands.	P1: Water vapor makes up more of the atmosphere than CO2. C: Water vapor is more responsible for warming than CO2.	Deductive	Vaild	P2: The warming of a greenhouse gas depends on quantity or heat-trapping ability.					

Claim	Exemplar text (italized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 2: Human greenhouse gases are not causing global warming.										
2.3.5. Tropospheric hot spot	The hotspot in the models is due to a thickening of the water vapor blanket during global warming, as more water evaporates and the blanket of warm moist air displaces cold dry air above. This thickening causes 2/3 of the warming in the models. But in reality <i>there is no hotspot, so the models exaggerate temperature increases by at least a factor of 3.</i>	P1: Models predict a tropical hot spot due to global warming. P2: The hot spot hasn't been observed. C: Climate models have exaggerated warming	Deductive	Invalid	P3: If there's a discrepancy between models and observations, the models must be wrong.	2	P1: Greenhouse warming should cause a tropospheric hot spot over the tropics. P2: The hot spot hasn't been observed. C: Global warming is not caused by greenhouse gases.	P3: If there's a discrepancy between models and observations, the models must be wrong. P4: The hot spot is a unique fingerprint of greenhouse warming.	P1: True P2: Misleading P3: Misleading P4: Misleading	P2 <i>Slothful induction</i> —ignores new data that has found a clear signal for the hot spot. Past studies did not have the technology advanced enough to get correct measurements regarding the Hotspot, so this used to be true, however today a clear signal for the Hotspot has been measured as technology to get accurate measurements has improved over time. P3 <i>Misrepresentation</i> —assumes observations are inherently superior to models. This isn't necessarily the case and it turns out that in this situation, models got it right and limitations with observations was why the hot spot wasn't immediately observed. P4 <i>Misrepresentation</i> —there are many lines of evidence/ fingerprints confirming greenhouse gases are causing of warming and the hotspot is not a fingerprint of anthropogenic warming—it is the result of any type of warming regardless of the cause. Cooling in the stratosphere is a more appropriate fingerprint of anthropogenic warming.
	It is generally agreed that <i>if greenhouse warming was occurring, the strongest warming would be in the upper atmosphere above the tropics. Recent research shows this is not occurring, which indicates that warming is not being caused by greenhouse gases:</i>	P1: Greenhouse warming should cause a tropospheric hot spot over the tropics. P2: The hot spot hasn't been observed. C: Global warming is not caused by greenhouse gases.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: If there's a discrepancy between models and observations, the models must be wrong. P4: The hot spot is a unique fingerprint of greenhouse warming.					
Claim	Exemplar text (italized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 3: Climate impacts are not bad.										
3.1 Sensitivity is low	Positive cloud feedback amplifies global warming in all the climate models now used by the IPCC to forecast global warming. But <i>if cloud feedback is sufficiently negative, then manmade global warming becomes a non-issue</i> .	P1: Negative feedbacks in the climate system reduce warming. C: Climate sensitivity to CO2 emissions is low.	Deductive	Valid	P2: Negative feedbacks cancel out the positive feedbacks.	1	P1: Negative feedbacks in the climate system reduce warming. C: Climate sensitivity to CO2 emissions is low.	P2: Negative feedbacks cancel out the positive feedbacks.	P1: True P2: Misleading	P2 Slothful Induction—ignores the many lines of evidence that the net effect of climate feedbacks is strongly positive.
	Suddenly <i>we are also seeing studies showing that warming wont be so bad after all, and that CO2 climate sensitivity is much lower than first thought</i> . The policy-making pressure coming from the threat of climate change is disappearing rapidly.	P1: CO2 climate sensitivity is low C: Global warming is not that bad	Deductive	Valid	P2: Negative feedbacks cancel out the positive feedbacks.					

Claim	Exemplar text (italized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 3: Climate impacts are not bad.										
3.2.1. Species can adapt	The five researchers report that changes associated with both management, its absence, and the 1998 ENSO were found, but they say that the changes were generally small and that ecological measures indicated stability or improvements over the period of their study. <i>In fact, they state that northern Tanzania reefs have exhibited considerable resilience and in some cases improvements in reef conditions in the face of dire global predictions for overfishing, climate change, and their interaction.</i>	P1: Species have shown resilience to climate change. C: Species can adapt to climate change.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: If one reef shows resilience, then we can assume other or all other reefs will also be resilient.	2	P1: Species have shown resilience to climate change either now or in the past. C: Species can adapt to climate change.	P2: Species have been resilient to date so they will continue to be resilient in the future.	P1: Misleading P2: Misleading	P1 <i>Cherry picking</i> —looks at a single species while ignoring the many species that are not adapting to climate change. P2 <i>Slothful induction</i> —looks at past examples of warming examples and assumes it is the same as current warming. <i>False equivalence</i> —assumes that current climate change is equivalent to past climate change when what is happening now is unprecedented in millions of years.
	The three Canadian researchers conclude that "moose in their southern range either ameliorate heat stress at a finer resolution than we measured or are more resilient to temperature than previously thought," thereby casting significant doubt upon what climate alarmists "intuitively" claim will occur in a warming world.	P1: Species are resilient to certain warming conditions. C: Climate change won't impact species.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: Species have been resilient to date so they will continue to be resilient in the future.					
	Corals have survived such warmth and worse many times in the past, including the Medieval Warm Period, Roman Warm Period, Holocene Optimum, as well as throughout numerous similar periods during a number of prior interglacial periods; and there is no reason to believe they cannot do it again, if the need arises.	P1: Species have survived climate change in the past. C: Species will be fine through current climate change.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: Current climate change will be no more harmful than past climate change.					
Claim	Exemplar text (italized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 3: Climate impacts are not bad.										
3.2.2. Polar bears are ok	* Polar bears are drowning because a warming planet is melting the Arctic. Fact: Four bears drowned during a particularly violent storm, and <i>polar bear populations are actually increasing in Alaska and Canada.</i>	P2: Polar bear populations are increasing in some regions. C: Global warming is not harming polar bear populations.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: Polar bear populations cannot be increasing anywhere under global warming.	3	P2: Polar bear populations are increasing in some regions. C: Global warming is not harming polar bear populations.	P2: Polar bear populations cannot be increasing anywhere under global warming.	P1: Partially true P2: Misleading	P1 <i>Cherry picking</i> —focuses on regions where polar bear populations are increasing while ignoring regions where their populations are declining. P2 <i>Oversimplification</i> —a variety of factors influence polar bear populations. One threat (hunting) has been removed but replaced with an increasing threat (melting sea ice). Polar bears need sea ice to hunt so the shrinking of Arctic sea ice is endangering their populations.
	Synopsis: Polar bears have survived much hotter and colder periods. <i>Continued polar bear hunting is the primary danger to polar bear species. Source here . "Polar bears have survived changes in climate that exceed those that occurred during the twentieth century or are forecast by the IPCCs computer models. Most populations of polar bears are growing, not shrinking,..."</i>	P1: Polar bears have survived past warming events. C: Global warming is not harming polar bear populations.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: Current climate change will be no more harmful than past climate change.					
	Once again, perhaps his speechwriters were aware of claims of falsified records and the besmirched Charles Monnett (whose observations of drowned polar bears helped galvanize the global warming movement), and <i>reports of rebounding polar bear populations. While they dont get much mainstream press coverage, several scientists are reporting an unprecedented increase in the worlds polar bear population.</i>	P2: Polar bear populations are increasing in some regions. C: Global warming is not harming polar bear populations.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: Polar bear populations cannot be increasing anywhere under global warming.					

Claim	Exemplar text (italicized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 3: Climate impacts are not bad.										
3.2.3. Oceans are ok	Range et al. (2012) : There is <i>no evidence of CO2-related mortalities of juvenile or adult mussels even under conditions that far exceed the worst-case scenarios for future ocean acidification.</i>	P1: Coral reefs are resilient against acidification. C: Climate change impacts on coral reefs are not serious.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: Acidification is the only negative climate change impact on coral reefs. P3: If one species shows resilience to climate change, we can assume other species will also be resilient.	3	P1: Coral reefs are resilient against acidification and bleaching. C: Climate change impacts on coral reefs are not serious.	P2: Acidification or bleaching alone are the only negative climate change impacts on coral reefs. P3: If one species shows resilience to climate change, we can assume other species will also be resilient. P4: Current climate change will be no more harmful than past climate change.	P2: Misleading P3: Misleading P4: Misleading	P2 <i>Cherry picking</i> —focus on one reef that has shown resilience ignores the many reefs that are being damaged by climate change. P3 <i>Oversimplification</i> — focuses on one impact while ignoring that multiple impacts afflict coral reefs. For example, an exclusive focus on bleaching ignores acidification, while an exclusive focus on acidification ignores bleaching. P4 <i>Slothful induction</i> —reefs may only be able to recover if there is no new disturbance. Bleaching events will become more frequent with time decreasing this chance of recovery.
	In fact, he later <i>admitted this bleaching had a minimal impact and his team was genuinely surprised/relieved about how quickly some of these coral colonies had recovered</i> . In 2007, he warned temperature changes were again bleaching the reef.	P1: Coral reefs have recovered from bleaching. C: Climate change impacts on coral reefs are not serious.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: Bleaching is the only negative climate change impact on coral reefs. P3: If one species shows resilience to climate change, we can assume other species will also be resilient.					
	Lehr: There is nothing we can do about it. Bleaching is a natural outcome, and Lehr described concern about the Great Barrier Reef as fear mongering. <i>Bleaching has occurred in a small portion of the reef, but an underwater survey of the 1,000 mile long reef shows that it is thriving; there is no more bleaching than was present 20 years ago.</i>	P1: Coral reefs are resilient against bleaching. C: Climate change impacts on coral reefs are not serious.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: This reef will remained unbleached into the future					
	No evidence exists for this claim. <i>The mass-bleaching events of recent decades have coincided with surface water warming resulting from periods of extended calm associated with strong El Nino events. This impedes normal evaporative cooling as well as wave driven mixing. There is no evidence of any increase in the frequency or strength of El Nino events, and climate models project increased wind speeds from warming, not more calms.</i> The report further states:	P1: Corals have survived past events. C: Climate change impacts on coral reefs are not serious.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: Current climate change will be no more harmful than past climate change.					
Claim	Exemplar text (italicized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 3: Climate impacts are not bad.										
3.3.1. CO2 is plant food	Idso pointed out that there is a huge body of literature on the biological impacts of rising temperatures and atmospheric CO2 levels that the International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) ignores. <i>He emphatically stated that atmospheric CO2 is not a pollutant. In fact, increased levels of CO2 reduce the negative effects of a number of plant stresses including: high salinity, low light, high and low temperatures, insufficient water, air pollution, and protects against herbivores i.e. being eaten by animals and insects.</i>	P1: Increased levels of CO2 reduces negative effects for plants. C: CO2 is not a pollutant.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: Increased CO2 only has beneficial effects for plants.	2	P1: CO2 is beneficial for plant growth. C: Emitting more CO2 will be good for plants.	P2: Increased CO2 only has beneficial effects for plants.	P1: True P2: Misleading	P2 <i>Oversimplification</i> — ignores the ways that climate change impacts agriculture through increased heat stress and flooding. CO2 fertilisation is just one factor affecting plant growth. The full picture shows that negative impacts outweigh benefits. <i>Cherry picking</i> —this may be true for some plants, but overall, it is likely that the range in which plants will be able to grow will decrease and the overall effect is negative.
	<i>The tiny effect of rising CO2 levels on climate contrasts sharply with their enormous benefits to plant growth and agriculture. Not only is more CO2 greening deserts, forests and grasslands; it is increasing grain and food yields worldwide, and helping people in developing nations live longer, healthier lives.</i>	P1: Increased CO2 increases crop yield. P2: Increased crop yield is increasingly life expectancy in developing countries. C: CO2 is not a pollutant.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: Increased CO2 only has beneficial effects for plants.					

Claim	Exemplar text (italicized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 4: Climate solutions don't work.										
4.1.1. Policy increases cost	<p>Moreover, <i>every responsible economist acknowledges that drastic action to reduce fossil fuel use would increase energy costs, which would in turn reduce household income around the world. Wealthier is healthier, and richer is cleaner. Limiting economic activity therefore can have a dramatic impact on quality of life, not least by reducing life expectancy.</i> Researchers have found a direct correlation between income and mortality, with a disproportionate impact on poorer communities. Thus, policies that reduce societal wealth can be expected to induce premature mortalities, and increase disease and injury rates.</p>	<p>P1: Climate action increases costs. P2: Increased cost reduces income. P3: Lower-income decreases quality of life. C: Climate policy is harmful.</p>	Deductive	Invalid	<p>P4: Fossil fuels increases household wealth which increases the quality of life. P5: Fossil fuel use doesn't have any negative economic impacts. P6: Climate action doesn't have any positive benefits.</p>	2	<p>P1: Climate policy increases energy costs. P2: Increased energy costs will have harmful effects. C: Climate policy is harmful.</p>	<p>P3: The cost of climate action is greater than the cost of climate impacts. P4: Climate action doesn't have any positive benefits.</p>	<p>P1: Potentially misleading P2: True P3: True P4: Misleading P5: Misleading</p>	<p>P1 <i>Oversimplification</i> —some policies reduce the impact on families through policy instruments such as rebates going to lower income families to offset increased energy prices. P4 <i>Slothful induction</i> —looks at short term impacts and ignores the impacts on an individual's quality of life when not drastically reducing the fossil fuels. Climate change will lead to a much greater decrease in an individual's quality of life, as the environmental resources are the sole foundation to all of humanities livelihoods, this argument ignores this great more substantial threat to individuals and chooses to only focus on household income as the sole factor contributing to the quality of life. P5 <i>Oversimplification</i> —ignores the benefits of climate policy.</p>
	<p>The greatest risk of current carbon withdrawal policies is that they will fail to achieve any useful result while imposing major costs on the world s economy. <i>The economic repercussions will fall most heavily on the poor at home and abroad. Starving the world of energy is all too likely to produce a world of more starving people.</i> The risks of climate change are speculative; those of climate change policy are all too real. Once this is realized, it is likely that few policymakers here or abroad will rush to join the global warming bandwagon. The road to Hell, we all realize, is often paved with good intentions. The global warming debate illustrates that maxim very well; even a baby step on this destructive path should be avoided.</p>	<p>P1: Climate action will starve the world of energy. P2: Energy starvation will lead to food starvation. C: Climate action will hurt the poor the most.</p>	Deductive	Invalid	<p>P3: Fossil fuels give the world energy which helps keep people fed. P4: Fossil fuel use doesn't have any negative impacts on people. P2: The cost of climate action is greater than the cost of climate impacts.</p>					
	<p>Let me be crystal clear, and speak directly to Hansen and other global warming alarmists. <i>Any one of you who pushes for more expensive energy is hurting and impoverishing and killing the poor today . Whether through taxes or cap-and-trade or renewable subsidies or blocking drilling or any other way, increasing energy costs represent a highly regressive tax of the worst kind. And there is no escape at the bottom end, quite the opposite. The poorer you are, the harder it bites.</i></p>	<p>P1: Climate action will increase energy costs P2: The increased costs will hurt the poor the most. C: Climate action will hurt the poor.</p>	Deductive	Invalid	<p>P3: Fossil fuels give the world energy which helps keep people fed. P4: Fossil fuel use doesn't have any negative impacts on people. P2: The cost of climate action is greater than the cost of climate impacts.</p>					

Claim	Exemplar text (italicized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 4: Climate solutions don't work.										
4.1.3. Policy harms the environment	In late June, the American Bird Conservancy (ABC) took President Obama up on his "so sue me" challenge and filed a lawsuit over his administration's modification of the 1940 Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act that now allows wind energy producers a 30- year permit to kill the majestic birds. According to ABC spokesman Bob Johns, <i>"the Obama Administration has gone too far with incentives for the wind industry."</i> <i>The Washington Times</i> quotes Johns: <i>"Since the 1980s, wind turbines have killed an estimated 2,000 to 3,000 eagles, but the industry has paid only one fine."</i>	P1: Incentives help wind turbines. P2: Wind turbines kill birds. C: Incentivising the wind industry harms the environment.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: Wind turbines killing birds is more harmful to the environment than climate change.	2				
	A 2009 article in MacLife magazine acknowledges that, while "solar-powered gadgets have become de rigueur in our attempts to shrink our carbon footprint," there is a rarely discussed "dark side" to solar energy. <i>Many solar panels are made with cadmium, a highly toxic carcinogen, and when these panels are decommissioned after about 20 years there will be a huge accumulation of "e-waste."</i> <i>Manufacturing polysilicon (a key component in sun-capturing wafers) generates four tons of toxic silicon tetrachloride for every ton of product and Chinese firms that produce the bulk of this material and rare earth metals for solar panels and wind turbines have been dumping their wastes on farmlands and wildlife habitats.</i>	P1: Solar panels produce toxic "e-waste". C: Solar panels are bad for the environment.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: Toxins from solar panels are more harmful to the environment than climate change.					
	<i>Electric cars are likewise "environment friendly" only in the minds of renewable zealots. They require multiple large batteries that typically last up to three years and cost about \$8,000 apiece, not including disposal costs, Diane Bacher points out in eHow. Battery disposal involves putting their hazardous metal wastes in special landfills, and the mass production of electric car batteries will create large volumes of hazardous wastes, while placing as much demand on the power grid as traditional vehicle equipment manufacturing, Bacher notes. Increased use of electric vehicles would put enormous strain on power grids that rely increasingly on intermittent wind and solar energy and less on coal, natural gas and nuclear.</i>	P1: Electric car battery disposal produces hazardous waste. P2: Mass producing electric cars will equate to an increase in hazardous waste. C: Electric cars are bad for the environment.	Deductive	Invalid	P3. The hazardous waste will be more harmful to the environment than the effects of not mitigating climate change.					

Claim	Exemplar text (italicized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 4: Climate solutions don't work.										
4.1.5. Limits freedoms	<i>"The Clean Power Plan is an illegitimate exercise in executive authority,"</i> added William Yeatman, CEI senior fellow. <i>"It is an affront to federalism; it usurps the states' long-held, exclusive authority to oversee retail electricity markets. If finalized, the rule would fundamentally overhaul the electric industry without the permission of Congress or the American people."</i>	P1: A climate policy usurps states' authority to oversee electricity markets. C: Climate policy reduces people's freedom.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: Failing to act on climate change will have no impact on people's freedom. P3: Regulations only have negative impacts on people.	4	P1: Climate policy limits the choices available to people and communities. C: Climate policy reduces people's freedom.	P2: Failing to act on climate change will have no impact on people's freedom. P3: Regulations only have negative impacts on people.	P1: Questionable P2: Misleading P3: Misleading	P2 <i>Oversimplification</i> —the longer we take to regulate carbon emissions, the worse climate impacts will be which will affect consumer choices/freedoms as more resources become scarcer. E.g., food shortages, high fuel prices. etc. P3 <i>Cherry picking</i> —focuses only on negative impacts of regulation while ignoring the regulations are designed to be safeguards to protect people's health and wellbeing. Just as laws designed to protect people from violent assault aren't meant to restrict freedoms but to give people freedom from harm, similarly environmental regulations are designed to give people freedom from environmental harm.
	Clean Power Plan: In June 2014, the EPA proposed a rule to control greenhouse gases from existing power plants, known as the Clean Power Plan. The unprecedented rule would regulate the entire electric industry, rather than on a source-by-source basis as had been EPA's practice for 40 years. As such, the proposed Clean Power Plan would grossly expand EPA's authority into the states' traditional authorities. For 80 years, States have overseen retail electricity markets shielded from federal intrusion. The Clean Power Plan would radically alter this arrangement, which dates from the New Deal, such that <i>state authority would now fall under the thumb of EPA approval. In addition to posing grave federalism concerns</i> , the rule would be the most expensive regulation ever imposed on the power sector, costing between \$41 billion and \$73 billion per year.	P1: A climate policy usurps states' authority to oversee electricity markets. C: Climate policy reduces people's freedom.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: Failing to act on climate change will have no impact on people's freedom. P3: Regulations only have negative impacts on people.					
	<i>People will see their choices limited to the few options presented them.</i> The terms "property rights" and "individual liberty" were nowhere to be heard at Habitat III. Instead, participants were told that "decarbonization" is imperative if the planet is to be saved. And if that means packing people into compact housing like so many sardines in a tin can, so be it.	P1: Climate policy limits the choices available to people. C: Climate policy reduces people's freedom.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: Failing to act on climate change will have no impact on people's freedom. P3: Regulations only have negative impacts on people.					
	But of course who can reasonably claim that the American economy or public health is better off since the Obama regulatory machine gun started firing? Moreover, <i>we have far more than enough regulation to ensure the safety of the public health and our economy needs far less regulation in order to return to growth</i> .	P1: We have enough regulation to ensure public health. P2: The economy needs less regulation for growth C: Climate policy will negatively impact the economy.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: Climate policy can only have a negative impact on economic growth.					

Claim	Exemplar text (italicized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 4: Climate solutions don't work.										
4.2.1. Green jobs don't work	<i>The administration has handed out \$2.4 billion in grants to the EV sector, as well as nearly \$2.6 billion in loans. None of those bets has paid off. Car buyers are staying away from all-electric vehicles in droves. And yet, for some reason, Romney avoided the subject in the debate.</i>	P1: Lots of money has been invested in EV sector. P2: Car buyers are staying away from EV vehicles. C: Green jobs won't work.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: The cost of electric vehicles outweighs the benefits.	3	P1: Green jobs are a small proportion of overall jobs and growing slowly. C: Green jobs won't work.	P2: The growth rate of green jobs will remain the same over time. P3: Economic factors are all that matter when considering green jobs.	P1: Misleading P2: Misleading P3: Misleading	P1 <i>Impossible expectations</i> —exponential growth always shows slow growth in the early stages. Demanding otherwise is an unrealistic expectation. P2 <i>Slothful induction</i> —it's false to assume that the current growth rate will stay the same. With more development and investment in a sector or with steady growth, green jobs will show accelerating growth in the future. P3 <i>Oversimplification</i> —transitioning to renewables is not solely about creating jobs. It is also about securing the environment upon which all jobs depend on.
	Recognizing that "employment" is one of the primary drivers of global warming, California has been among the first to act. And things are turning around! <i>Green jobs compose less than one percent of California's economy. That's right, less than one percent. From 1995 to 2008, California added only 42,000 new green jobs. At that rate of growth, it would take 89 years for green jobs to replace all of the other jobs California has lost in the current economic downturn.</i> The project is being watched closely in Washington, where by all indications, the California example is set to go nationwide.	P1: The growth rate of green jobs is slow C: Green jobs won't work.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: The growth rate of green jobs will remain the same over time. P3: If the growth rate of green jobs is slow, there is no point transitioning to a green economy.					
	<i>Even if we are willing to assume very large multipliers from renewable power, its impact on employment will be trivial, whether taken as a fraction of all energy, clean economy jobs, or the entire labor force.</i>	P1: Even if the renewable energy sector grows, it will have a trivial impact on jobs. C: Green jobs won't work.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: The number of green jobs will remain the same over time. P3: If green jobs don't grow, there is no point transitioning to a green economy.					

Claim	Exemplar text (italicized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 4: Climate solutions don't work.										
4.2.3. Policy impact is negligible	In fact, as I told several members of the the editorial board in person a few weeks ago, and as first posted here at MasterResource, <i>the global impact even assuming a perfect Waxman-Markey bill (a 83% emission reduction by 2050) would be less than one-tenth of one degree Fahrenheit in that year</i> . And that analysis, and the bills estimated substantial costs, have not been refuted . Pending further review, in fact, Waxman-Markey badly flunks conventional economic cost/benefit analysis.	P1: Policy will reduce emissions by an insignificant amount. C: We shouldn't have the policy.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: If a single policy doesn't solve the problem then it is not worth implementing.	3	P1: A single policy would have a negligible impact. C: We should not have the policy.	P2: If a single policy doesn't solve the problem, then it is not worth implementing.	P1: True P2: Misleading	P2 <i>Impossible expectations</i> —a single policy cannot single handedly solve climate change. We need a suite of policies from all countries in the world in order to solve climate change.
	Third, why rush? Kyoto apologists warn that we must take action now, lest the buildup of greenhouse gases wreak irreversible havoc on nature s delicate balances. Yet precisely <i>because carbon dioxide emissions may linger in the atmosphere for a century or longer, it makes no practical difference in the long run whether carbon withdrawal policies are implemented now or a decade or more from now. Indeed, according to climate modeler Thomas Wigley, delaying action until 2020 would yield only 0.2oC additional warming in the year 2100.16 That s too small a difference to affect any discernible human or environmental interest.</i>	P1: CO2 lingers in the atmosphere for a century. P2: Delaying action will make no practical difference to reduce warming. C: We shouldn't have the policy.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: If a single policy doesn't solve the problem then it is not worth implementing.					
	Ahem. I think Mr. Kerry might have gone off-script with those remarks, but I'm glad he did. It was a refreshing bit of honesty because <i>the United States could indeed cut its emissions by 100 percent and make virtually no dent in global-warming levels</i> . According to climate experts Paul Knappenberger and Patrick Michaels, <i>the climate regulations the Obama administration are imposing on the energy sector will reduce warming by 2100 by 0.018 degrees Celsius.</i>	P1: Imposing climate regulations on the energy sector will reduce global warming by an insignificant amount. C: We shouldn't have the policy.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: If a single policy doesn't solve the problem then it is not worth implementing.					

Claim	Exemplar text (italicized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 4: Climate solutions don't work.										
4.2.5. Better to adapt	So, while we really dont know which storm had higher winds, we do know that <i>more affluent societies are much less affected by even the strongest storms</i> . As Indur Goklany, (who writes frequently for Cato) has pointed out, if left to develop, <i>the entire world will be much more resilient to climate change than it would be if the ineffective policies to stop it slowed economic growth</i> .	P1: Societal wealth increases resilience to climate change. P2: Regulatory policy impacts societal wealth by slowing down economic growth. C: If we regulate now, we will be less equipped to adapt to climate change in the future.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: adapting to climate change is a far better solution than mitigating against climate change.	3	P1: Climate action reduces wealth. P2: Wealth increases resilience to climate action. C: It is better to adapt to climate change than to mitigate it.	P3: Failing to mitigate climate change won't have an impact on our wealth or ability to adapt to climate change.	P1: Misleading P2: True P3: Misleading	P1 <i>Cherry picking</i> —only looks at negative economic impacts of climate action while ignoring economic benefits. P3 <i>Slothful induction</i> —ignores that failing to mitigate against climate change will also make adapting to climate change more difficult as well as cause economic damage.
	Even under the worst case scenario warming, when the usual method of comparing the cost and benefit of policy is used, <i>it is more cost effective to deal with any problems that occur than to pay to try to stop them</i> .	P1: Adaptation policy is more cost effective than mitigation policy. C: We should use adaptive rather than mitigative solutions.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: cost does not increase with risk.					
	For the foreseeable future, people will be wealthier and their well-being higher than is the case for present generations both in the developed and developing worlds and with or without climate change. <i>The well-being of future inhabitants in today's developing world would exceed that of the inhabitants of today's developed world under all but the poorest scenario. Future generations should, moreover, have greater access to human capital and technology to address whatever problems they might face, including climate change. Hence the argument that we should shift resources from dealing with the real and urgent problems confronting present generations to solving potential problems of tomorrow's wealthier and better positioned generations is unpersuasive at best and verging on immoral at worst.</i>	P1: Today's generations should not have to deal with future generations problems when future generations will be more well off to deal with them. P2: Resources need to be put towards solving today's problems. C: We should adapt in the future and not mitigate today.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: Climate change only impacts future generations.					

Claim	Exemplar text (italized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 4: Climate solutions don't work.										
4.2.6. China's emissions	Americans increasingly understand that <i>even sending US carbon dioxide emissions back to 1870 levels, as congressional climate bills would do, will not reduce global atmospheric CO2 levels, because emissions from China, India and other nations will rapidly offset our painful reductions</i> . Those countries have made it clear that they will not sacrifice improved living standards for assertions that we can stabilize global temperatures by keeping atmospheric CO2 levels below 0.035-0.045% (350-450 ppm).	P1: Developing nations will not reduce emissions. P2: Reducing America's emissions won't reduce global emissions significantly. C: Climate action in America is pointless.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: One country shouldn't reduce emissions if their action alone won't reduce global emissions.	3	P1: Developing countries are not doing enough to share the burden of reducing global emissions. P2: One country cutting emissions will make a negligible difference to global emissions. C: One country reducing emissions is pointless.	P3: One country shouldn't reduce emissions if their action alone won't reduce global emissions. P4: All countries are the same so they should be held to the same emission reduction standards.	P1: Misleading P2: True P3: Misleading P4: Misleading	P1 <i>Oversimplification</i> —developed countries lecturing developing countries is a complex issue as developing countries have a right to attain the same standard of living as developed countries, who historically have been emitting CO2 at greater rates. P3 <i>Impossible expectations</i> —it's unrealistic to expect one country to singlehandedly solve climate change. It requires all the world's countries working together to substantially reduce global emissions. P4 <i>Oversimplification</i> —not all countries are the same. Each have different resources, societal challenges, and historical emissions.
	Moreover, even if CO2 does drive climate change, <i>slashing US greenhouse gas emissions would bring no benefits, since China, India and other developing nations will not be reducing their enormous emissions.</i>	P1: Developing nations will not reduce emissions. P2: Reducing America's emissions won't reduce global emissions significantly. C: Climate action in America is pointless.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: One country shouldn't reduce emissions if their action alone won't reduce global emissions.					
	<i>The problem is that the basic approach is unworkable. International negotiations have centered on placing the economic burden of addressing climate change on a few dozen developed countries while asking nothing from more than 150 developing countries. But the primary source of greenhouse gas emissions is increasingly the developing world. Any approach to effectively address increasing emissions of greenhouse gases must capture emissions from developed and developing countries.</i>	P1: Primary source of emissions come from the developing world. P2: The economic burden for climate action fallen on developed countries. C: Both developed and developing countries need to have equal amount of financial burden.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: Only a country's current emission rates matters, not historical emissions.					

Claim	Exemplar text (italicized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 4: Climate solutions don't work.										
4.3.1. Policy is too difficult	Any global emissions reduction treaty would be akin to a super-OPEC, which in its own way for its own purposes has long sought to curb energy use. From time to time, largely when war or national policy has disrupted energy markets, OPEC succeeded somewhat in restricting global energy consumption. Mostly, however, OPEC has failed. <i>Although OPEC members would all benefit from actual curtailment of energy output, their self-interest encourages each to produce more energy.</i> Consequently, while all OPEC members express support for the energy curtailment program, most individually expand output. <i>Non-OPEC countries have no clear and direct common interest in reducing energy use, or in coordinating energy reduction policies. Thus, one would expect even less success with a Kyoto style agreement.</i>	P1: Individual OPEC countries don't curb energy output out of self-interest. P2: Non-OPEC countries don't curb energy use. C: An emission reduction treaty will not succeed.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: Countries will never agree on policy.	2	P1: Solving climate change will be difficult and expensive. P2: Making the technical transition or getting global agreement will be difficult. C: Solving climate change is too difficult.	P3: Because emission reduction and political agreement is difficult, it can't be done.	P1: True P2: True P3: Misleading	P3 <i>Hasty generalization</i> —assumes that because it's been difficult obtaining global agreements in the past, it won't happen now. <i>Circular reasoning</i> —fatalistic pessimism about global agreement has the danger of becoming a self-fulfilling prophecy, making it more difficult to achieve global agreement.
	There's a second problem with mitigation, one that is an inevitable result of our international system of sovereign states. Climate change is a global matter. No one country, or even continent, can control global greenhouse gas output. <i>Stopping climate change would cost trillions. These costs, in turn, would be shared primarily by 35 or so wealthy states. Here's the problem: There's absolutely no precedent for international burden-sharing of this magnitude, short of world war. And climate change, by its nature, can never achieve the alarm of a global battle. Historically speaking, then, climate change mitigation is an impossibility.</i>	P1: Climate action will cost trillions. P2: Wealthier states will have the burden of paying for more. P3: There's no historical precedent for such a costly policy. C: Climate action is impossible.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: Countries will never agree on policy.					
	One business as usual scenario showed that global emissions would need to be reduced by about 20 percent below 2000 levels by mid-century to preserve the option of hitting the target. <i>In a second case, in which demand for energy and land grow more rapidly, the reductions by 2050 would need to be much steeper: 50 percent. The researchers concluded that achieving such reductions is barely feasible with known energy sources.</i>	P1: To avoid climate change, we need to reduce emissions drastically. P2: Drastic emission reduction is difficult. C: Achieving this reduction is not feasible.	Deductive	Valid	P3: Because drastic emission reduction is difficult, it can't be done.					
	Leading CSIRO soil carbon researcher Michael Battaglia told The Australian yesterday the Coalitions <i>85 million tonne abatement target seems to be ambitious and that a more plausible target would be five million to 20 million tonnes a year in that timeframe.</i>	P1: To avoid climate change, we need to reduce emissions drastically. P2: Drastic emission reduction is difficult. C: Achieving this reduction is not feasible.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: Because drastic emission reduction is difficult, it can't be done.					

Claim	Exemplar text (italicized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 4: Climate solutions don't work.										
4.3.2. Low public support	But here's the good news: Despite almost mind-numbing repetition of "the debate is over" and "don't believe climate deniers," <i>the American public is unconvinced that man-made global warming merits the policies this administration is pushing. Republicans in Congress are unified on the climate change topic, acknowledging that while there may be some human impact on climate, it does not justify the sweeping taxes, regulations, and subsidies supported by the current administration. They will block cap and trade, carbon taxes, and international treaties.</i>	P1: Much of the public aren't convinced about the need for climate action. C: Political action on climate change is too hard.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: Without public support, climate policy is impossible.	2	P1: Much of the public aren't convinced about the need for climate action. C: Political action on climate change is too hard.	P2: Without public support, climate policy is impossible. P3: Current levels of public support for climate action will stay the same in the future.	P1: Misleading P2: True P3: Misleading	P1 <i>Cherry picking</i> —while some of the public might be confused about various aspects of climate change, there is strong and growing public support for climate solutions. P3 <i>Slothful induction</i> —public support for climate action is trending towards greater support.
	The results of a Pew Research Center poll in June revealed that <i>35% of Americans say there is not enough solid evidence to suggest mankind is warming the Earth while another 18% says the world has warmed due to natural patterns, not human activity. Pew found that liberals remain convinced that humans are to blame, but the bottom line is that 53% disputed the Presidents claims.</i>	P1: Much of the public aren't convinced about the need for climate action. C: Political action on climate change is too hard.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: Without public support, climate policy is impossible.					
	Besides the commercial aspect, there is also the issue of wider public credibility. <i>There have been signs of scepticism all along. In a 2009 Gallup poll, a record number of people41 per centelect to say that global warming was an exaggerated threat. This slackening of public support is in sync with a coordinated political movement that is seeking to re-examine the entire issue of global warming from scratch. The movement is led by increasingly vocal Republicans in the US Senate and packs considerable political power.</i>	P1: Much of the public aren't convinced about climate change. P2: Public skepticism is a political movement with political influence. C: Political action on climate change is too hard.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: Without public support, climate policy is impossible.					

Claim	Exemplar text (italicized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 4: Climate solutions don't work.										
4.4.1. Clean energy unreliable	The results may disappoint my fellow solar enthusiasts because it suggests that <i>only 13% of our electric energy will come from solar. Distributed solar enthusiasts (who favor photovoltaic solar panels on rooftops) will be further disappointed because half of that 13% will come from water-sucking centralized concentrated solar thermal power plants, many located in desert ecosystems, leaving only about 6% for solar panels on rooftops, of which many will probably not be on rooftops but in centralized power plants, probably displacing ecosystems or crops.</i>	P1: Solar thermal power needs lots of water. C: Clean energy is harmful.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: The negatives of thermal solar outweigh the benefits.	3	P1: Clean energy has costs on the economy and the environment. C: Clean energy is harmful.	P2: The negatives of clean energy outweigh the benefits.	P1: True P2: Misleading	P2 <i>Cherry picking</i> —failing to mitigate climate change with clean energy will have negative impacts that outweigh any negative costs of clean energy.
	<i>Ethanol produces a large water footprint</i> : According to Environmental Science & Technology magazine, the amount of ethanol needed to fuel a vehicle for one mile is 50 gallons, a high number when you tally what's used for an entire crop. Of course, the water use comes almost entirely during the agricultural cycle. <i>With the expansion of irrigated agriculture in dry Western areas, many are concerned about the potential impact that would come with a major demand for ethanol.</i>	P1: Ethanol produces a large water footprint. P2: Ethanol will put a concerning amount of pressure on water resources in dry areas. C: Clean energy is harmful.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: The negatives of thermal solar outweigh the benefits.					
	Predictably, rent seekers flocked to the market, with new wind and run of river small hydro projects. <i>The combination of additional electric supply and poor economic conditions in major U.S. markets has led to a collapse in the export price for BC's electricity. BC Hydro is purchasing expensive clean energy and selling it at loss into the export market.</i>	P1: A surplus of clean energy has collapsed the export price of BC's electricity. P2: The low price means expensive clean energy is being sold at a loss. C: Clean energy has harmful economic impacts.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: The negatives of clean energy outweigh the benefits.					
	WIND It's hard to disagree with Mr. Hamm's assessment that Barack Obama has the energy story in America wrong. <i>The government floods green energy niche market that supplies 2.5% of our energy needs with billions of dollars of subsidies a year. "Wind isn't commercially feasible with natural gas prices below \$6" per thousand cubic feet, notes Mr. Hamm. Right now its price is below \$4. This may explain the administration's hostility to the fossil-fuel renaissance.</i>	P1: Fossil fuel energy is cheaper than clean energy. P2: Clean energy needs subsidies to survive. C: Clean energy is not commercially feasible.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: Clean energy being commercially feasible is the key determinate for clean energy being viable.					

Claim	Exemplar text (italicized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 4: Climate solutions don't work.										
4.5.1. Fossil fuels are plentiful	Many believe that America has only a small fraction of the world's oil resources and that supplies will soon be exhausted. In fact, <i>America has an abundance of energy resources. Though not all reserves are recoverable with today's technology, recent estimates project that the United States has over five times as much oil as Saudi Arabia. In fact, when American, Canadian, and Mexican reserves are combined, North American oil reserves total nearly 1.8 trillion barrels of recoverable oil.</i>	P1: There is an abundance of fossil fuel resources. C: We should keep using fossil fuel.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: If we have fossil fuels, we should use them rather than other sources.	2	P1: There is an abundance of fossil fuel resources. C: We should keep using fossil fuel.	P2: If we have fossil fuels, we should use them rather than other sources.	P1: True P2: Misleading	P2 <i>Slothful induction</i> —ignores the environmental impacts that comes with burning the remaining fossil fuel reservoirs. Even if fossil fuels are not on the brink of running out, there are other reasons we should not use all the remaining fossil fuel reserves. Just because we have fossil fuel doesn't mean we should burn it. <i>Slothful induction</i> —ignores the benefits of clean energy which not only mitigate climate impacts but are also becoming more affordable and viable.
	The bottom line is that <i>we still need coal, and all those who dream of doing away with it will not be able to escape the reality that coal will continue to provide much of our electricity for the foreseeable future</i> . So we need to be implementing policies that improve air quality without destroying coal and millions of good American jobs, and imposing skyrocketing electricity costs on every American.	P1: There is an abundance of fossil fuel resources. P2: We still need fossil fuels to provide energy for the foreseeable future. C: We should keep using fossil fuel.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: If we have fossil fuels, we should use them rather than other sources.					
Claim	Exemplar text (italicized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 4: Climate solutions don't work.										
4.5.2. Fossil fuels are cheap	The biggest factor, though, in America's success in cutting emissions has been the shale gale. <i>A tsunami of natural-gas production has been unleashed in recent years thanks to continuing improvements in extended-reach horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing. Domestic natural-gas production was up 4.7 percent last year, to a record 65.7 billion cubic feet per day. That increase in production has led to cheaper natural gas, and that cheap gas is displacing coal at the power plant.</i> (Increasingly, it's also displacing oil as motor fuel, but that's another story.)	P1: An increase in production makes natural gas cheaper. C: We should use natural gas energy.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: Cheaper costs is more important than other factors like climate change impacts.	2	P1: Fossil fuels are the cheapest form of energy. C: We should use fossil fuel energy.	P2: Cheaper costs is more important than other factors like climate change impacts.	P1: Misleading P2: Misleading	P1 <i>Slothful induction</i> —ignores that renewables are reducing in cost and in many cases, are becoming competitive or even cheaper than fossil fuels. P2 <i>Oversimplification</i> —ignores that there is more to energy sources than just cost. They also have costs through climate impacts that must be considered.
	Americas chemical companies use ethane, a natural gas liquid derived from shale gas, as a feedstock in numerous applications. <i>Its relatively low price gives U.S. manufacturers an advantage over many competitors around the world that rely on naphtha, a more expensive, oil-based feedstock. Growth in domestic shale gas production is helping to reduce U.S. natural gas prices and create a more stable supply of natural gas and ethane.</i>	P1: Natural gas is the cheapest energy source. P2: Using a cheaper energy source gives manufacturers an advantage. C: We should use natural gas energy.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: Outcompeting other countries is more important than climate action.					
	<i>First, fracking has real potential to drive energy bills down. Labours mismanagement of the economy means that many people are struggling with the cost of living today. Where we can act to relieve the pressure, we must. Its simple gas and electric bills can go down when our home-grown energy supply goes up. Were not turning our back on low carbon energy, but these sources arent enough. We need a mix. Latest estimates suggest that theres about 1,300 trillion cubic feet of shale gas lying underneath Britain at the moment and that study only covers 11 counties. To put that in context, even if we extract just a tenth of that figure, that is still the equivalent of 51 years gas supply.</i>	P1: Natural gas lowers energy costs. C: Lower energy costs benefits livelihoods. C: We should use natural gas energy.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: Improving peoples livelihoods in the short term is the only thing that matters.					

Claim	Exemplar text (italized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 5: Climate science and movement is unreliable.										
5.1.1. No consensus	<i>There isnt enough data to say with any certainty what will happen to sea levels around the world this century, and there is no scientific consensus to suggest that the rate of the seas rise will accelerate dangerously.</i>	P1: There's not enough evidence to know what will happen with sea level rise. C: There's no scientific consensus on dangerous sea level rise.	Deductive	Valid		2	P1: There's not enough evidence to know what's happen with climate. C: There's no scientific consensus on climate change.		P1: Misleading.	P1 <i>Slothful induction</i> —ignores the many lines of evidence that give us a strong confidence in our understanding of climate change. <i>Impossible expectations</i> —often these arguments demand an impossible standard of scientific proof in order to establish that there's a scientific consensus on an issue.
	"Similarly, in the case of our NAS report, far too much attention was paid to the hastily prepared summary rather than to the body of the report. The summary claimed that greenhouse gases are accumulating in Earth's atmosphere because of human activities, causing surface air temperatures and subsurface ocean temperatures to rise. Yet, <i>the full text noted that 20 years was too short a period for estimating long term trends, a crucial point that the summary neglected to mention. Our primary conclusion was that despite some knowledge and agreement, the science is by no means settled.</i> "	P1: There's not enough evidence to know what's happen with climate. C: There's no scientific consensus on climate change.	Deductive	Valid						
Claim	Exemplar text (italized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 5: Climate science and movement is unreliable.										
5.1.2. Proxies are unreliable	<i>"The problem with tree rings appears to be that their variations reflect more than year-to-year climate differences (temperature and/or precipitation). As the trees age, tree-ring production changes and introduces a spurious trend in the tree-ring series. This aging effect differs among tree species, as well as within species, depending on the trees' growing conditions (soil type, elevation, slope aspect, etc.). It becomes difficult to separate trends due to aging from those due to climate.</i>	P1: Proxy data is affected by other factors as well as climate factors. C: Tree ring proxies are unreliable.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: Scientists don't know how to adjust for other non-climate factors.	1	P1: Proxy data is affected by non-climate factors and measuring limitations. C: Climate proxies are unreliable.	P2: Scientists don't know how to adjust for limitations and other factors.	P1: True P2: Misleading	P2 <i>Misrepresentation</i> —adjusting measurements is a standard scientific process and necessary to ensure observations accurately reflect reality.
	One problem, McIntyre writes, is that Rahmstorfs and Manns results are not based onproxies for Atlantic current velocity, but on a network consisting of iffy proxy series which are statistically indistinguishable from white noise . McIntyre comments: Its hard to understand why anyone would seriously believe (let alone publish in peer reviewed literature) that Atlantic ocean currents could be reconstructed by such dreck...	P1: Proxies are indistinguishable from white noise. C: Proxies are unreliable. (sub-sub-claim).	Deductive	Invalid						
	Verification of the forced component of twentieth-century climate trends simulated in model experiments depends on the existence of accurate estimates of these trends in observations. <i>Given the limited sampling in both space and time of the observations and proxy records, these verifications must be handled carefully. In particular, knowledge of the spatial patterns and magnitudes of climate trends over the oceans is hampered by the uneven and changing distribution of commercial shipping routes and other observational inputs as well as different approaches to merging analyses of the observations (Rayner et al. 2011).</i>	P1: Proxy data is limited in both space and time as well as affected by changing methodologies. C: Climate proxies are unreliable.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: Scientists don't know how to adjust for limitations.					

Claim	Exemplar text (italicized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 5: Climate science and movement is unreliable.										
5.1.3. Temp is unreliable	Recent examinations by analysts Paul Homewood, Tony Heller and others confirm that <i>a wide variety of official temperature datasets have been excessively manipulated by climate "scientists" - to the point where policymakers can no longer be sure if climate records can be trusted.</i>	P1: Scientists have manipulated temperature data. C: The temperature record is unreliable.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: Manipulation of temperature data makes them unreliable.	3				
	Most surface temperature measurements have been made over land, and primarily in inhabited regions. <i>Measurements for the ocean, which covers three-quarters of the area of the globe, are sparse. Measurements from a single station are sometimes used to represent an area as large as a million square miles. Temperature records also have other biases that require correction. One important bias arises from the fact that recording sites in and near cities are subject to the urban-heat-island effect. These sites were originally in rural areas, but as more people moved in and the surrounding areas were developed, the local temperature may have increased for reasons unrelated to changes in atmospheric greenhouse gases.</i>	P1: Temperature measurements are sparse. P2: Where measurements are made, they're subject to the urban heat island effect. C: The temperature record is unreliable.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: Scientists don't know how to adjust for limitations.					
	Problems with surface measurements are notorious. Recording stations are sparse, even nonexistent in vital global locations, most particularly throughout the Southern Hemisphere and in remote polar regions. After 1970 the number of reporting stations dropped suddenly and drastically. (Stations at airports have seemed to be unaffected, and may even have increased in number.) And as John noted, urban heat islands have developed over time, not to mention problems resulting from faulty placements of temperature recording instruments which have to be "corrected" by applying subjective "homogenizing" (tuning) procedures.	P1: Temperature measurements are sparse. P2: Where measurements are made, they're subject to the urban heat island effect. C: The temperature record is unreliable.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: Scientists don't know how to adjust for limitations.					

P2
Slothful induction —ignores comparisons to monitors outside of the cities, the difference being too minor to influence the overall climate change trend
Red Herring —draws attention to heat island effect impacting data to distract from other indicators and evidence for global warming.

Claim	Exemplar text (italicized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 5: Climate science and movement is unreliable.										
5.1.4. Models are unreliable	Pat Michaels is in San Francisco this week attending the annual meeting of the American Geophysical Union (AGU) and presenting a poster detailing <i>the widening mismatch between observations of the earths temperature and climate model projections of its behavior</i> . Since most global warming concern (including that behind regulatory action) stems from the projections of climate models as to how the earths temperature will evolve as we emit greenhouse gases into the atmosphere (as a result of burning fossil fuels to produce energy), it is important to keep a tab on how the model projections are faring when compared with reality. That they are faring not very well should be more widely knownPat will spread the word while there.	P1: Climate model predictions don't match observations. C: Climate models are unreliable.	Deductive	Invalid						P1 <i>Cherry picking</i> —comparisons between observations and climate models typically are over small periods. They often employ misleading techniques like selecting baselines to maximise the visual discrepancy.
	<i>It is impossible to present reliable future projections from a collection of climate models which generally cannot simulate observed change. As a consequence, we recommend that unless/until the collection of climate models can be demonstrated to accurately capture observed characteristics of known climate changes, policymakers should avoid basing any decisions upon projections made from them.</i> Further, those policies which have already be established using projections from these climate models should be revisited. Assessments which suffer from the inclusion of unreliable climate model projections include those produced by the IPCC and the U.S. Global Climate Change Research Program (including their most recent National Climate Assessment). Policies which are based upon such assessments include those established by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency pertaining to the regulation of greenhouse gas emissions under the Clean Air Act.	P1: Climate model predictions don't match observations. P2: Climate models are unreliable. C: Climate models shouldn't inform policy.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: If there's a discrepancy between models and observations, the models must be wrong.	3	P1: Climate model predictions don't match observations. C: Climate models are unreliable.	P2: If there's a discrepancy between models and observations, the models must be wrong.	P1: Misleading P2: Misleading	<i>Impossible expectation</i> —climate models projections are averaged over time to reflect long-term externally-forced changes, smoothing out short-term variability like ocean cycles or volcanic eruptions. It's impossible to expect that the two will exactly match. P2 <i>Oversimplification</i> —it's incorrect to assume that a discrepancy between model and observation is always due to model error. There have been historical cases where past discrepancies where due to observational error such as the mid-20th Century cooling due to changes in sea surface measurement techniques.

Claim	Exemplar text (italicized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 5: Climate science and movement is unreliable.										
5.2.1. Climate is a religion	It is difficult to explain the whole climate-change panic <i>except in religious terms. There has arisen among some in the environmental community what can only be understood as a cult of Earth worshipit is against energy, against mining, against land use, against industry, and against industrial society</i> . Climate change is a useful tool in that fear of catastrophe can be used to compel economically destructive actions that would otherwise be unacceptable. It is not just carbon-based energy they hate, but nuclear as well, which indicates the true nature of the faith. Alternatives such as wind and solar can never be effective, but they are useful as Judas goats.	P1: Environmentalists worship Earth in the same way that religions worship god. C: Environmentalism is a religion.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: A movement that has any traits in common with a religion is a religion.	2	P1: The climate change movement have some trait in common with religion. C: The climate change movement is a religion and unscientific.	P2: A movement that has any traits in common with a religion is a religion.	P1: Misleading P2: Misleading	P2 <i>Misrepresentation</i> —comparisons between the climate change movement and religion are typically superficial and rhetorical in nature. P3 <i>False equivalence</i> —comparing climate change to religion is a false comparison. Climate science is evidence-based while religion is faith-based.
	Without embarrassment, Vice President Al Gore went to the climate change meeting in Kyoto, Japan, last winter and said that "we have reached a fundamentally new stage in the development of human civilization." This new stage is a crisis stage, and its "spiritual roots" are "pridefulness and a failure to understand and respect our connections to God's earth and to each other." Gore was talking about the emission of greenhouse gas. <i>Worrying about it is the latest religion. But as Paul Gigot of the Wall Street Journal said, the scary part is that Gore really believes this stuff. This is a religion most decidedly not separated from the state, and therein lies both the danger and the opportunity. Fanatics are dangerous because nothing deters them. At the same time, Gore is so much the true believer that his fanaticism could put his political future at risk.</i>	P1: People that believe in climate change are fanatics. P2: Fanatics cannot be detered by anything. C: The climate movement is a religion.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: A movement that has any traits in common with a religion is a religion.					
Super claim 5: Climate science and movement is unreliable.										
Claim	Exemplar text (italicized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 5: Climate science and movement is unreliable.										
5.2.2. Media is alarmist	With these words last December 14, <i>the New Zealand Herald editorial writer signalled his slant. Its a bias towards the official line on global warming. The Herald joins the chorus of activists baying for Western compensation for the third world to answer the allegations of injury by climate.</i>	P1: Media portrayal of climate change supports the mainstream view. C: The media are biased and cannot be trusted.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: If the media supports the mainstream view on climate change, they must be biased.	3	P1: Media portrayal of climate change supports the mainstream view. C: The media are biased and cannot be trusted.	P2: If the media supports the mainstream view on climate change, they must be biased.	P1: True P2: Misleading	P2 <i>Ad hominem</i> —personally attacks the media rather than addresses their arguments. <i>Misrepresentation</i> —Supporting the mainstream view on climate change is not biased but a reflection of the evidence-based scientific consensus.
	Marc started by making his point that <i>many news stories about global warming science apply uneven labels to the advocates vs. the skeptics of catastrophic global warming theory, and that some more marginal media outlets have gone much farther, explicitly comparing climate skeptics to Holocaust deniers</i> . Despite Marc mentioning it repeatedly, no one on the panel would comment on whether they thought such an outrageous comparison was justified.	P1: Media portrayal of climate change supports climate advocates and is negative towards skeptics. C: The media are biased and cannot be trusted.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: If the media supports the mainstream view on climate change, they must be biased.					
	In its August 13 issue, <i>the New York Times has continued its tradition of peddling bogus global warming scare stories during the late summer silly season. This time the threat isn't anything dramatic like the North Pole melting. "Heat waves come on subtly, raising summer temperatures just a little higher than normal and then receding," opined the Times. "But they kill more people in the United States than all other natural disasters combined."</i>	P1: Media portrayal of climate change supports the mainstream view. C: The media are biased and cannot be trusted.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: If the media supports the mainstream view on climate change, they must be biased.					

Claim	Exemplar text (italized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 5: Climate science and movement is unreliable.										
5.2.3. Politicians are biased	"The full IPCC report, most of which is written by scientists about specific scientific topics in their areas of expertise, is an admirable description of research activities in climate science. It is not, however, directed at policy. The SPM is, of course, but it is also a very different document. <i>It represents a consensus of government representatives, rather than of scientists. As a consequence, the SPM has a strong tendency to disguise uncertainty, and conjures up some scary scenarios for which there is no evidence.</i>	P1: Governments downplay scientific uncertainty and conjure up scary, unsubstantiated scenarios. C: Governments are biased and untrustworthy.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: Only climate scientists can produce trustworthy reports on climate change.	2	P1: Governments and politicians support the mainstream view on climate change. C: Governments are biased and untrustworthy.	P2: If governments or politicians support the mainstream view on climate change, they must be biased.	P1: True P2: Misleading	P2 <i>Ad hominem</i> — personally attacks governments and politicians rather than addresses their arguments/policies. <i>Misrepresentation</i> — supporting the mainstream view on climate change is not showing bias but a reflection of the evidence-based scientific consensus.
	<i>An English judge previously ruled that Gore's book is partisan, biased, and contains many factual errors, even though he shared Gore's belief that man is causing global warming.</i>	P1: A judge ruled that Al Gore's book was biased and partisan with factual errors. C: Al Gore is biased and untrustworthy.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: If Al Gore supports the mainstream view on climate change, he must be biased.					
	Most often reoccurring in data 1) Climate research. <i>The US government spends \$2.5 billion per year on research that focuses on carbon dioxide, ignores powerful natural forces that have always driven climate change, and generates numerous reports and press releases warning of record high temperatures, melting icecaps, rising seas, stronger storms, more droughts and other "unprecedented" crises. The claims are erroneous and deceitful.</i>	P1: The government spends large sums of money on research supporting the mainstream view on climate change. C: Governments are biased and untrustworthy.	Deductive	Invalid	P2: If the government supports the mainstream view on climate change, they must be biased.					
Claim	Exemplar text (italized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 5: Climate science and movement is unreliable.										
5.2.4. Environmentalists are biased	In summary, the WWF report Worlds Top 10 Rivers at Risk which is making news today, is about 20 years out of date at least with respect to the Murray River. Indeed while numbers of native fish have on average, probably declined since European settlement, with a crash in Murray Cod populations in the early 1960s, there is evidence to suggest numbers of native fish, including the Murray Cod, are now on the increase while invasive species are on the decline. <i>So the WWF has got it all the wrong way around. Then again, they are perhaps more interested in hand-waving than river ecology.</i>	P1: Environmentalists got ecology science wrong as they're not committed to science. C: Environmentalists are biased and unreliable.	Deductive	Valid		2	P1: Environmentalists get science wrong as they're not committed to science. C: Environmentalists are biased and unreliable.		P1: Misleading	P1 <i>Ad hominem</i> — personally attacks environmentalists rather than addresses their arguments/policies.
	<i>Radical environmentalists even tried to blame global warming for the devastating 2011 tsunamia tragedy caused by a 9.0 offshore earthquake. To suggest that auto emissions cause tectonic plates to shift sounds like quite a stretch, but global warming zeal apparently has no limits.</i>	P1: In their zeal, environmentalists falsely tried to blame the tsunami on global warming. C: Environmentalists are biased and unreliable.	Deductive	Valid						

Claim	Exemplar text (italicized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 5: Climate science and movement is unreliable.										
5.2.5. Scientists are biased	There is little doubt that some players in the climate game not a lot, but enough to have severely damaged the reputation of climate scientists in general have stepped across the boundary into postmodern science. The Climategate scandal of 2009, wherein thousands of emails were leaked from the Climate Research Unit of the University of East Anglia in England, showed that certain senior members of the research community were, and presumably still are, <i>quite capable of deliberately selecting data in order to overstate the evidence for dangerous climate change. The emails showed as well that these senior members were quite happy to discuss ways and means of controlling the research journals so as to deny publication of any material that goes against the orthodox dogma. The ways and means included the sacking of recalcitrant editors.</i>	P1: Climate scientists selectively pick data to exaggerate climate impacts. C: Climate scientists are biased and unreliable.	Deductive	Valid		2	P1: Scientists act in biased or unethical ways. C: Scientists and their science can't be trusted		P1: Misleading	P1 <i>Ad hominem</i> —personally attacks scientists rather than addresses their arguments/research.
	Though it has its limits, the peer-review process is meant to provide checks and balances, to weed out bad and misleading work, and to bring some measure of objectivity to scientific research. At its best, it can do that. But <i>when the same few people review and approve each other's work, you invariably get conflicts of interest. This weakens the case for the supposed consensus, and becomes, instead, another reason to be suspicious.</i> Nerds who follow the climate debate blogosphere have known for years about the cliquish nature of publishing and peer review in climate science (see here, for example).	P1: A small group of scientists peer-review each others' work. C: Climate science is weakened and suspicious.	Deductive	Valid						
	In my view this comment exemplifies a problematic attitude not only in climate science but in the social sciences as well. <i>The good cause which allegedly motivates much of the research puts the researcher in a special position. It allows them to dispense with essential standards of professional conduct. It is perhaps not remarkable that we see a leading figure in the philosophy of science defend questionable practices which have been modelled (not by accident I suppose) after the famous climategate affair.</i>	P1: Climate scientist don't follow professional standards of conduct. C: Climate scientists are biased and unreliable.	Deductive	Valid						
	Were just hardworking scientists doing their best to address the impossible expectations of the policy makers? Well, many of them were. <i>However, at the heart of the IPCC is a cadre of scientists whose careers have been made by the IPCC. These scientists have used the IPCC to jump the normal meritocracy process by which scientists achieve influence over the politics of science and policy. Not only has this brought some relatively unknown, inexperienced and possibly dubious people into positions of influence, but these people become vested in protecting the IPCC, which has become central to their own career and legitimizes playing power politics with their expertise.</i>	P1: Scientists that are inexperienced gain influential positions via the IPCC. P2: Scientists are motivated to protect the IPCC. C: Climate science is biased and unreliable.	Deductive	Invalid	P3: If scientists gain influence for working with the IPCC, this is similar to buying unwavering loyalty, increasing scientific bias					

Claim	Exemplar text (italized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 5: Climate science and movement is unreliable.										
5.3.1. Policy is a conspiracy	Multiple large corporations are now working with Obama and Democrats to pass the infamous 'cap & trade' legislation, which will result in the the consumer and small businesses absorbing the trillions of dollars of direct/indirect costs it will generate. <i>These big corporations are working behind the scenes for their own benefit, without regard to their customers or suppliers.</i> Any consumer or small company that does not want more of their hard-earned dollars going to "skyrocketing" energy costs, and gigantic CO2 taxes, passed down from the large corporations, should avoid the services and products from these corporations, as much as possible. Below the fold is a list of corporations to avoid when at all possible:	P1: Corporations are working behind the scenes to pass climate policy. C: Climate policy is part of a conspiracy.	Deductive	Valid		2	P1: Governing bodies and corporations act secretly on climate policy. C: Climate policy is part of a conspiracy.	P2: Secret actions by governing bodies and corporations must be for nefarious motives.	P1: Misleading P2: Misleading	P1 <i>Conspiracy theory</i> —assumes that there is secret plotting behind climate policy. P2 <i>Conspiracy theory</i> —assumes that bodies involved in climate policy act with nefarious intent.
	In September, Horner and CEI filed a lawsuit against the EPA, asking the U.S. District Court to order them to produce records regarding secondary, non-public email accounts for EPA administrators, <i>the existence of which accounts Plaintiff discovered in an Agency document obtained under a previous request which the EPA says were known only to a few EPA staff members, usually only high-level senior staff. Given the strenuous efforts EPA has taken to hide these emails, and what we have learned to date, it is more than fair to assume this is more than petulant retaliation, but hiding something awfully damning.</i>	P1: The EPA is hiding incriminating information. C: Climate policy is part of a conspiracy.	Deductive	Valid						

Claim	Exemplar text (italicized text is relevant to claim)	Single argument structure (bold text are dominant arguments)	Deductive/ inductive	Validity	Single hidden premise (bold text are dominant arguments)	Type	General argument structure	General hidden premise.	Premise analysis	Fallacy explanation
Super claim 5: Climate science and movement is unreliable.										
5.3.2. Science is a conspiracy	<p>Guest essay by Professor Philip Lloyd People have the nasty habit of giving their opponents names. Those who are convinced that humans are wrecking the world by burning fossil fuels call those who dont believe them denialists. It implies that they are close to the Holocaust deniers, and so are clearly beyond the pale. I have come to the conclusion that they are wrong. <i>The true denialists are those who believe in global warming, and who will go to any lengths to deny the evidence against that position.</i> For instance, the final draft of the Fifth Assessment Report of IPCCs Working Group 1 concerns itself with observations of the climate and how it might change in future. Within minutes of it being released, <i>skeptics had noted that a key figure, which compared predicted temperatures to measurements, had been drastically altered after the second draft had been approved.</i></p>	<p>P1: Climate scientist manipulated data. C: There is a conspiracy among scientists to deceive the public.</p>	Deductive	Valid		2	P1: Scientists have committed a range of conspiratorial actions to defend the mainstream view and suppress dissenting views. C: There is a conspiracy among scientists to deceive the public.		P1: Misleading	P1 <i>Conspiracy theory</i> —assumes that there is secret plotting behind climate science and that scientists act with nefarious intent.
	<p>Professor Mann is currently under investigation by Penn State University because of activities related to a <i>closed circle of climate scientists who appear to have been engaged in agenda-driven science</i> . Emails and documents mysteriously released from the previously-prestigious Climate Research Unit at the University of East Anglia in the United Kingdom <i>revealed discussions of manipulation and destruction of research data, as well as efforts to interfere with the peer review process to stifle opposing views. The motivation underlying these efforts appears to be a coordinated strategy to support the belief that mankinds activities are causing global warming.</i></p>	<p>P1: Scientists coordinated to manipulate data and stifle opposing views. C: There is a conspiracy among scientists to deceive the public.</p>	Deductive	Valid						
	<p>Warmists were on a treadmill defending the hypothesis. <i>Over 6000 leaked emails from the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) delineate the challenges and political rather than scientific responses. It required three major activities. A steady flow of material that appeared to provide proof; rejection of evidence that contradicted the hypothesis; and efforts to silence critics and control research and publications.</i></p>	<p>P1: Scientists faked proof, rejected contradictory evidence, and silenced critics to defend the mainstream view. C: There is a conspiracy among scientists to deceive the public.</p>	Deductive	Valid						
	<p>The climate change industry, along with people like Al Gore have slammed skeptics for not publishing in the peer reviewed literature. What the Climategate documents reveal is that <i>this small group of scientists, who often peer-review each other's work as well as skeptical articles, have discussed ways of keeping findings they don't like out of the peer-reviewed literature as well as the IPCC reports, even if it required trying to oust editors, boycotting certain journals, or to reclassifying a prestigious journal that publishes skeptical articles as a fringe journal unworthy of consideration. They also discuss their specific intention to exclude contrary findings from the IPCC reports, even if they "have to redefine what the peer-reviewed literature is!"</i></p>	<p>P1: Scientists have used unethical means to stop skeptical findings from getting published. C: There is a conspiracy among scientists to deceive the public.</p>	Deductive	Valid						