In Other Voices in the Union, Jim Goetsch wanted some answers to his 5 questions, before he would consider changing his mind on climate change.

1.   Where is the government funding for scientists to prove that man is not the cause for global warming? If I were a scientist would I try to prove something for which there is no government-funding?

Funding from any ethical source is not given to prove or disprove a pre-determined conclusion, but to find evidence or the absence of evidence. However, if someone wanted to “prove that man is not the cause for global warming” they need only apply to the fossil fuel companies for funding. <https://ecowatch.com/2015/12/08/fail-disclose-fossil-fuel-funding/>

For example, the Berkeley Earth project (<http://berkeleyearth.org/>) was funded by the Koch Brothers to investigate climate change. (The conclusion was that the Earth is warming at an unprecedented rate and humans are the cause.)

 2.   When will the global warming models actually give us a short-term estimate that we can check for accuracy in 5 to 10 years? And what about the faked and “adjusted” temperature data that the IPCC was found guilty of publishing several years ago?

The models give us short and long term predictions now. The accuracy is determined by “hindcasting,” a standard method of validating the accuracy of the models. See <https://www.skepticalscience.com/climate-models.htm>

The IPCC was *not* found guilty of publishing faked or adjusted temperature data. Adjustments were made to correct for biases in measurement, but those adjustments resulted in more conservative warming predictions (i.e., the predicted temperature increase was *lowered* by the adjustments).

3.   Why shouldn’t we allow the global climate to become warmer to feed more people and make life more pleasant for people in colder climes? What temperature should we maintain, if man could control global warming?

If the average global temperature makes it warmer in colder climes, the warmer climes will become uninhabitable. It is likely that global warming will reduce the amount of food available, since plants and animals cannot adapt quickly enough. See <https://www.skepticalscience.com/global-warming-positives-negatives.htm> and <https://www.skepticalscience.com/Can-animals-and-plants-adapt-to-global-warming.htm>

What temperature should we maintain? To maintain a climate supporting current life on Earth, we need to reduce CO2, and therefore the temperature, to limits of approximately the pre-industrial age.

4.   What will happen if we don’t allow enough CO2 in the atmosphere to allow our food to grow? And if the earth becomes too cold, how do we increase the CO2 in the atmosphere - kill the plants that absorb it?

There’s no chance we can reduce CO2 below the level that allows plants to grow, even if we wanted to. What we want to do is restore the natural balance, not eliminate one of the factors maintaining it. If not for green-house gases, the Earth would be a frozen and lifeless ball of ice.

5.   How do we reduce the total CO2 emissions around the world when some of the largest and fastest growing economies are given a pass for the next 10-20 years? Can a single smoker eliminate the smoke in a bar by stopping his own smoking but not the smoking of others?

We’re already doing it. The amount of CO2 emitted last year showed a reduction, primarily due to China’s efforts.  See<http://www.npr.org/2015/12/07/458543432/small-surprising-dip-in-worlds-carbon-emissions-traced-to-china>

By the way, “reducing” and “eliminating” are two different things.