

Shir Halfon

AP Language and Composition

Dr. Gingrich

Period 5

18 February 2019

Warming Warning

The inconsolable, dismal fact of our wretched status quo being that global warming can be considered by many to be a “topic of great controversy” to the slightest degree unravels before the eyes of each and every member of society how much work we have ahead of us. The true and only fact-based fact of the matter, and the reality most of civilization is long overdue a rude awakening of, is best put in the sorrowful words strung together by American scientist James Hansen in articulation of what those who are correct to believe will be the casual factor of humanity’s impending extinction when he remarks, “Global warming isn’t a prediction. It is happening.” In this rather small utterance, Hansen manages to accurately encapsulate the concept most modern-day scientists not only ascribe to, but also push for with that concept being that global warming, along with the theories of evolution and gravity, is so undeniable it simply cannot exist as a controversial query up for debate.

First, it is of priority that the objective facts that make up the core of the topic of global warming, or what is more broadly known as climate change, be examined. The primary difference between the two, global warming and climate change, is that global warming refers to the rise of the Earth’s climate to more hot temperatures, while climate change can be when the Earth heats up or cools down over many decades. Focusing in on and specifying solely global

warming from the mix of climate phenomenon does not make it any easier or more difficult to either prove or disprove its prevalence, so, for starters, the scientific consensus on the issue is that [97%](#) of scientists agree in both the warming trends that can be seen in recent data and the cause of it being too attributable to human activity to overlook. Historically, in less than the last 7,000 centuries, there has empirically been [seven distinctive cycles](#) of global environmental occurrences scientists commonly refer to as “glacial advance and retreat,” which can be chalked up to glaciers either melting or forming depending on the height of global temperatures and which are best explained by the experts to be as a result of natural alterations of the amount of sunlight energy Earth receives from the sun due to its ever-changing orbit and celestial positioning. In 2016, the estimate of the usage of carbon dioxide emissions and release of said harmful gases into the atmosphere globally amounted to 36.2 metric tons, and in the past 100 years, Earth’s average temperature rose by a quantity somewhere between [0.4 and 0.8 degrees](#) Celsius throughout all corners of the globe. While this climate change summary for the past century is an eye-opener on its own, over 1,000 scientists from multiple countries internationally predict that the temperatures will continue to rise between [2.5 and 10 degrees](#) Fahrenheit. Such factual content and what can be considered evidence for or against the global warming inquiry can be accredited to a multitude of technological advances, such as our large collection of satellites orbiting Earth. Some of the unnerving environmental patterns occurring on our Earth that are frequently argued as [effects of global warming](#) include the rise of sea levels, melting of glaciers, early blossoming of trees, increased magnitude of ocean waves, intensification of hurricanes, and increase in heat waves and droughts. More specifically, current reputable forecasts put sea levels at an average one to four feet higher by 2100 and the Arctic as an iceless region by the mid-century. As of now, despite many possible and discussed solutions to global

warming, not enough is being done seeing as [Sweden](#) is the country with the most achievements in climate protection even though other countries, such as China, the biggest producer of carbon emissions that travel into the atmosphere, are in the position to make a more impactful effort.

The background facts can be narrowed down towards one side of the debate, the side that arrives at a justifiable rationale that can be reasonably concluded from those facts. Upon acknowledgement of this element of persuasion, it is clear that the not only most logical, but also most possible to be backed up with available evidence is the standpoint that global warming is very real and human-induced. The best way to prove any environmental phenomenon, such as global warming, is always to provide an in-depth explication of the [process](#) by which the environmental change occurs, which, in this case, would be none other than an exceedingly thorough illustration of how greenhouse gas emissions react in the Earth's atmosphere to warm up our planet to dilapidating, runaway levels. The abhorrent cycle begins with the release of greenhouse gases, such as carbon dioxide, into the ozone layer of the atmosphere from human-run factories, human-driven automotive vehicles, and other instances of the burning of fossil fuels. The warming repercussion is seen when the ozone layer is deteriorated by this overflow of destructive gases and can, thus, perform a substandard job of protecting Earth's surface from the sun's hazardous radiation, which is made up of a host of cancer-causing [electromagnetic rays](#) that range from infrared to ultraviolet waves. In addition to this consequence of these senseless, ignorant human activities, these gases have the capability of absorbing the sunlight that bounces off Earth's surface and holding it hostage in Earth's atmosphere, making the climate far hotter and initiating the greenhouse effect, the equivalent of a doomsday scenario. Likewise, ocean acidification, melting ice sheets, hotter oceans, and extreme weather events and natural disasters

are treated by many as irrefutable [pieces of evidence](#) of a warming humans share answerability for.

On the other hand, or, rather, the other the other side of the debate, those who consider themselves non-believers in the heavily hypothesized, experimented, and analyzed scientific theory of global warming lamentably have the [counter-argument](#) that recent global warming patterns can be encumbered as the eighth climate change cycle in Earth's history without any indication that there is a difference between it and previous ones to aid in the assertion that humans have contributed to it being brought about this time around. There is a couple of compelling difference in these climate cycles, however, that the mere 3% of scientists who refuse the theory of global warming have been quick to discount, including, but not limited to, that the influx of climate statistics has demonstrated that the rise in global temperatures has been far more abrupt rather than a gradual occurrence and that the production and emission of carbon dioxide, a heat-trapping gas, has not been above the [300 parts per million](#) line in centuries prior to 1950. Moreover, many may choose to admit that global warming is real issue yet contend that it is not one that humanity should be overly concerned with seeing as it is unlikely to reach a magnitude high enough to lead us to extinction. This claim underestimates the prospect of a worldwide [extinction](#) by up to ten times less than its actual probability because it is a short-sighted remark that fails to take into account the concept of co-extinctions in which certain biomes become unable to sustain its usual plant and animal life, bringing about a biodiversity crisis where the consumers, humans and larger animals, die off as a result of resource depletion.

Certainly, it is rather daunting that we currently live in what has gone from a stable, habitable planet to nothing less than an oversized oven. The aspect of the quandary of greater concern, however, is that we humans are the ones in control of the switch, turning up the heat.

With all this in mind, it is not particularly troublesome to understand why one cannot "believe" in global warming in the same way one cannot "believe" in gravity; they are equally indisputable, scientific facts that arguing against would be foolish. Otherwise, the generations of tomorrow will find themselves paying their lives for what the generations of today did not act on because they believed people would only start dying from it long after they themselves have already passed away. Regarding a response to this extinction-risking matter and its potential solutions, it is try or die for all of humanity.

Mentor Texts

While the argumentation of science skeptics is oftentimes contradictory and unable to withstand the scientific method, I can effectively compare my argumentation to that of other editorials similar in nature for the purpose of analyzing in which ways I strategically utilized stylistic elements that can be likewise found in the other works. The first source from which much of the style of my paper was derived is The Guardian US, a daily newspaper founded in 1821 and published by Guardian Media Group that discusses topics ranging from politics to sports. For example, my syntax and that of The Guardian's global warming editorial regarding the issue of the rate of release of greenhouse gases currently increasing exponentially despite needing carbon emissions to drop by 45% by 2030 are comparable in that I also speak with such immense urgency about the formidable risk at hand, using diction such as "impending" and "inconsolable" when discussing the same prodigious demand to resolve the matter before it reaches it an irreversible level of severity. Another example would be the seemingly identical structure of The Guardian's editorial about the grandest species extinction being attributable to rapid climate change with my own because both my paper and the article start off with giving the facts and background information, that being on the issue of global warming as a whole in mine and on the "largest extinction event in Earth's history" in theirs, and then the argument being made, which was that global warming is existent in mine and that it was the cause of the wiping out of 96% of all marine life in theirs. Furthermore, in the argumentation of The Chicago Tribune's editorial on global warming, a strikingly similar use of the argument that not as much as what can be done to amend the dire circumstances in which we have been subjected to existing under is being taken advantage of is seen when the editorial states in its very last sentence "...to think more positively: It's not too late to act" because the argument that Sweden

being the country most ahead of the climate change protection venture is proving to be insufficient in the status quo made in this editorial gets a corresponding point across.

<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2018/dec/12/the-guardian-view-on-global-warming-time-is-running-out>

<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2018/dec/06/global-warming-extinction-report-the-great-dying>

<https://www.chicagotribune.com/news/opinion/editorials/ct-edit-climate-change-report-trump-20181126-story.html>