



## Norwegian Agency: Man-Made CO<sub>2</sub> “Not Sufficiently Strong” to Cause “Systematic Changes” in Weather

A study from a Norwegian government agency has declared that mankind’s emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> are not strong enough to cause the widespread global warming that climate hysterics claim. Statistisk sentralbyrå, Norway’s statistics bureau, has published a paper this month that appears to contradict the climate cult’s conclusion that mankind’s emissions of carbon dioxide and other trace atmospheric gasses are leading to out-of-control global warming.

Researchers John K. Dagsvik and Sigmund H. Moen published the [paper](#) this month, and their abstract makes clear that, in their opinion, the supposedly vast amount of CO<sub>2</sub> that mankind has pumped into the atmosphere during the industrial age is insignificant when it comes to affecting the world’s temperature.

“Weather and temperatures vary in ways that are difficult to explain and predict precisely. In this article we review data on temperature variations in the past as well possible reasons for these variations,” the study’s abstract begins. “Subsequently, we review key properties of global climate models and statistical analyses conducted by others on the ability of the global climate models to track historical temperatures. These tests show that standard climate models are rejected by time series data on global temperatures. Finally, we update and extend previous statistical analysis of temperature data (Dagsvik et al., 2020). Using theoretical arguments and statistical tests we find, as in Dagsvik et al. (2020), that the effect of man-made CO<sub>2</sub> emissions does not appear to be strong enough to cause systematic changes in the temperature fluctuations during the last 200 years.”

The authors point out what many have been saying for years. Any observed warming may simply be natural, a rebound from a period known as the Little Ice Age. The researchers acknowledge that long-term temperature readings consistently show an upward trend, but they question whether that trend directly corresponds to mankind’s CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

Warming periods of the past — the Medieval Warm Period, for example — are often ignored by those who have a vested interest in anthropogenic climate change being true. But the study’s authors argue that such history is completely germane to the global-warming debate.

Citing recent historic temperature reconstructions from Greenland, the authors report that “a new method that utilizes argon and nitrogen isotopic ratios from occluded air bubbles ... indicate that warmer temperatures were the norm in the earlier part of the past 4,000 years, including century-long intervals nearly 1°C warmer than the decade (2001-2010).”



Jian Fan/iStock/Getty Images Plus



Written by [James Murphy](#) on October 12, 2023

---

The study also points out that the recent warming trend appears to predate man's ability to be responsible for it.

"Temperature reconstructions indicate that there is a 'warming' trend that seems to have been going on for as long as approximately 400 years. Prior to the last 250 years or so, such a trend could only be due to natural causes," the official Norwegian government report states.

And even if the current upward trend in temperatures is different from historical trends, it's not necessarily the fault of mankind's emissions.

"Even if the temperatures in recent years should turn out to deviate systematically from the variations in earlier times, it is still a complicated challenge to quantify how much of this the change due to emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>," the study says.

The paper acknowledges the so-called consensus among the scientific community on climate change.

"At present, there is apparently a high degree of consensus among many climate researchers that the temperature increase of the last decades is systematic (and partly man-made). This is certainly the impression conveyed by the mass media."

But it also points out that climate scientists are not always forthcoming with their data. In truth, they appear to actively hide data at times.

"For non-experts, it is very difficult to obtain a comprehensive picture of the research in this field, and it is almost impossible to obtain an overview and understanding of the scientific basis for such a consensus," the study states.

Ultimately, Dagsvik and Moen conclude that a natural cause of global warming — as opposed to a man-made cause — is likely, and that CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are statistically insignificant when it comes to causing serious warming.

"We find ... that the hypothesis that the temperature process varies randomly around a constant level (stationarity) is not rejected. This may indicate that the effect of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in the last 200 years is not strong enough to cause systematic changes in the temperature fluctuations."

One can hear the objections from the climate cult already. "Dagsvik and Moen are not climate scientists," they'll say. "Therefore their research cannot be taken seriously."

No, these researchers are not climate scientists, but they are statisticians. And, typically, statistics are incapable of lying. Many climate scientists, on the other hand, are perfectly comfortable with lies and half-truths.



## Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

### What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.