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The change in global climate can be largely accredited to human activities. Since the advent of industrial revolution, the gas emissions from greenhouses have largely and steadily been increasing. During the late 1970s, a relentless increase in carbon emissions surfaced and the use of fossil fuels along has chiefly contributed to an unprecedented change in temperature. The average temperature are 0.8 degrees higher as compared to the temperature levels in the pre-industrial levels. Being increasingly conspicuous, the effects of climate change are statistically evident as well. According to a recently published report from NASA, the warmest five years in the history of this planet have passed since 2014. The main indicators of this statistic were the deadly and adverse heatwaves in many regions of Asia and Europe. Many glaciers and ice shelfs are already at a threat of collapse and disappearance as a consequence of increasing global temperatures and carbon emissions. The G-7 held in France, during 2017 primarily discussed the wildfires in the Amazon and Arctic. It is predicted that between 2030 and 2050, temperature is going to increase with a significant 1.5 degrees’ hike, amounting to global warming. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change released a special short on the issue and advocated that a collective effort would be required to slow down the worsening of this situation.

Since the early 1970s, there has been a lot of research in the fields of climate sciences. Two noteworthy names in this regard are Dr. Richard Lindzen and Dr. James Hansen. The former is associated with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the latter serves in NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies. Dr. Hansen has demonstrated increasing concerns about the adversities and potential threats posed by the global warming which is a direct outcome of human activities. Widely regarded as one of the most prominent climate scientists in the contemporary world, he has also efficaciously pointed out the consistent failures of our concerted efforts in an attempt to address this issue. These two doctors have significantly worked for the propagation of righteous understanding regarding this issue and both have opposite perspectives on the matter. Dr. Lindzen believes that climate is not that sensitive to the changes as has been portrayed by the popular belief. Dr. Hansen constantly exhibits through his work and writings that groups of human population are running out of time while trying to address the issue whereas, on the contrary, Dr. Lindzen is striving to pacify people and signifies that this is not something to get worried about.

There is an option which enables he general public to compare the authenticity of the two perspectives from these two scientists by reflecting upon the dynamics of their research and predictions, and by gauging their accuracy in their respective beliefs. In 1988, Dr. Hansen presented his seminal work in U.S. Congress, a carefully curated climate model which exhibited the intensity of global warming under three different situations in the next thirty years. In the three scenarios, the level of greenhouse gas emissions was demonstrated differently. On the other hand, Dr. Lindzen has not attempted to predict anything about global temperature with such meticulous detail, however, shortly after Dr. Hansen’s presentation, he gave an effective talk at MIT. This talk can be reconstructed in the contemporary world and its implications can be seen to match with Dr. Lindzen’s initial claims consistently. Dr. Lindzen was of the opinion that it is the planet’s natural internal and inherent variability which swamps any warming signals by the greenhouse gas emissions.

The hot debate on global warming, which has been surfacing since the last decade in all the horizons of academic disciplines is structured on two different viewpoints by two distinct states of mind. On the one side, there are scientists, climate experts, politicians, and general activists who predict a long-term and potentially dangerous warming of global surface temperatures. On the other side, there are groups who majorly care about their lucrative opportunities only and merely predict small yet beneficial changes (Nolte).

A real imminent danger entails that the greenhouse effect may trigger unexpected climate changes on a global scale. It is also predicted that these changes will be the precursor for consequences which will be devastating in nature regarding the safety of human population. Proper examination of this global threat is not done by worldwide programs which aim to probe into the underpinnings of climate change which can largely be accredited to humans. There is a need for the development of large-scale, thoroughly comprehensive spectrum of programs which can enhance the general ability to think about the issue and work for it.

The global climate change debate and associated controversy engages the public over the occurrence, intensity, causes and consequences, and actions for mitigating the possible risks regarding global warming (Shwom). The scientific literature in climatic studies leads to a consensual point that in recent years, there has been an unprecedented intense increase in surface temperatures on a global scale. The extant theories and literature also imparts that much of this increasing trend is a result of constant emissions of greenhouse and carbon gases which are largely induced by human activities. There is no scientific perspective, either on a national or an international standing, that opposes this viewpoint. On the other side of this global debate about climate change controversy, there are some member organizations and some individual standpoints that allude to the non-existence of this phenomenon. Members in extractive industries, for instance, mining, oil and gas extraction, quarrying, and dredging mainly support and actively proclaim this stance for obvious reasons. These members and their associated organizations that share a same agenda for lucrative opportunities strive hard in the pursuit of convincing the general public about the non-existence of climate change. The underpinnings of these attempts indicate towards the instilling of doubt among the largely pervasive scientific consensus, and according to popular belief, these members also persuade people that if climate change is happening, humans and their activities are not responsible for it. Another interesting thing regarding the global climate change controversy is that these disputes between the two groups find more recognition in print, social, and electronic media rather than in literature as a scientific topic of inquiry and the prevalence of this matter is chiefly concentrated in United States of America than in any other state.

There has been a resolve of various questions regarding the controversy by the scientists and climate experts whereby they have decisively opined in the favor of scientific consensus. Scientists and climate change experts have shed light on the global warming trend with great care and accuracy. Additionally, they have also pointed to the human activities for this relentless rise in global temperature due to an unprecedented level of carbon emissions and greenhouse gas emissions in the history of mankind. The disputes and disagreement in opinions among the general public also greatly reflect the scientific debate and signify the climate sensitivity as the result of human activity. These public disputes are instrumental in predicting the climate change at regional and global scales and tend to warn extractive industries about the grave consequences of global warming. In United States, global warming is also a foundational factor and issue of political debate which is widespread among various congressional districts. It also causes split among many political parties. Some issues associated with this controversy have an innate potential to be settled within the boundaries of scientific community but then it does not favor the agenda of various political parties. The responsibility attributed to humans regarding global warming most often finds itself in the realm of politics. The debates which consider human beings as the responsible agents for triggering global warming continue to remain the main subject of attempts that are economically or politically motivated to out-maneuver those who assert their opinion differently. Different bodies in academics and the scientific community have classified these attempts to downplay the counter arguments as a popularly known ideological phenomenon, namely, climate change denial.

Moreover, those standpoints and bodies who actively oppose the mainstream and widely recognized scientific positions have also been questioned. Particularly, there has been a meticulous scrutiny regarding their sources of funding as well. Mostly it turns out that those people and member organizations who actively disown and disregard this highly sensitive matter, are funded by the extracting industries. Particularly in the United States, the scientists who are actively involved in the research efforts in the field of climatic sciences, have frequently reported that state authorities and oil and gas industries relentless pressurize them in the pursuit of suppressing or destroying their work and efforts. They also claimed that powerful bodies urged them to hide powerful scientific data and clear instructions were given to them about not discussing the implications of this data with the general public. Additionally, the fossil fuels lobby has also been overtly identified as a political and financial strong body which is striving day and night to discredit the mainstream scientific consensus on the global climate change.
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