


Statistics Norway publishes research showing that CO2 does not control Earth's climate change

Kent Andersen

 Kent Andersen

 Read 5 min



Average temperatures on Earth. Illustration: Robert A. Rohde / Berkeley Earth / CC BY 4.0 / Wikimedia Commons.

To everyone's surprise, Statistics Norway (SSB) published on Monday an article that undermines the accepted truth that human CO₂ emissions control current climate change and override the future climate change of nature. Through statistical analysis, the article states that it is impossible to determine that our CO₂ emissions are important in the climate context.

This breaks the ground under the deficient mathematical models and forecasts that underlie all expensive climate policy and climate goals in Norway and the EU, and which it is allegedly immoral to doubt.

The analysis (which is thus immoral, according to people like Gro Harlem Brundtland) is signed SSB scientist John K. Dagsvik and retired academic Sigmund H. Moen, and is done in collaboration with Maria ?? chiara Fortuna. All three have heavy statistical backgrounds, and together they have analyzed temperature ?? data statistically for many years.

Already in the introduction to the article, [which you can read here](#), it goes clockwise in academic terms that science is by no means settled:

- The purpose of this article is to discuss this issue more closely, namely whether it can be said to be proven whether parts of temperature the increase in the last 200 years are due to greenhouse gas emissions.

This is fully in line with the science of the Divorce Method, which digs up skepticism and the challenge of established theories.

The conclusion of the article also supports research results from a number of other scientific environments, not least [The Vitenskapelige Council of Climate Realists](#), as

with great professional chewed states that an increase of less than 0.02% CO₂ impossible can override the natural climate variations, and not least the claim that 0.01% CO₂ reduction the content of the atmosphere will create a colder and stable climate in the year 2100, as the political goal of the « climate measures» amazingly is.

The article says:

– A typical feature of observed temperature series over the past 200 years is that they consistently show long cycles and an increasing trend. A key question is whether this development is part of a cycle analogous to previous temperature variations, or whether a systematic change of temperature level has taken place during this period, as a result of human-induced emissions of CO₂. Although temperatures in recent years would prove to differ systematically from variations in earlier times, nevertheless, it is a complicated challenge to quantify how much of this change is due to CO₂ emissions.

It is highly sensational that the Norwegian public publishes such «climate denial» by researchers who have simply worked in peace. Statistics Norway is an official statistical authority, and their statistics are important in a political context.

So when SSB [contrary to previous practice](#) publishes a statistical survey proving that science has not been decided and casts serious doubt on the value of climate policy, then there is a bomb – despite it being about a so-called *the discussion paper* as SSB does not necessarily endorse officially.

A bomb from a heavy scientific environment

Chapter 3 discusses possible sources of current temperature variation, where cloud formation, currents in the oceans, the capacity of the oceans to store CO₂ and variations in the solar magnetic field are of great importance. In chapter 4, the article provides an overview of the characteristics of the climate models (, which are often in conflict with each other and have had a low hit rate for 30 years). And in chapter 5, these climate models are tested statistically – and this is where Statistics Norway has the heaviest academic environments in the country.

One might argue that John K. Dagsvik and Sigmund H. Moen is not «climatecologists», but they know statistics. And that statistic goes a long way to show that the inadequate and simplified climate models are not able to distinguish between natural temperature variations versus variations caused by human-induced CO₂ over the last 150 years.

Or to put it in their words:

– This analysis uses the same approach as Dagsvik et al. (2020). While Dagsvik et al. (2020) did not have temperature data for the last few years, we use temperature series in this article that have been updated until 2021. We find, like Dagsvik et al. (2020), that the hypothesis that the temperature process varies randomly around a constant level, (stationarity) is not rejected. This may indicate that the effect of CO₂ emissions over the past 200 years are not strong enough to cause systematic changes in temperature fluctuations.

An extremely expensive policy of urgency built on shaky foundations

Norway has spent, uses and will spend hundreds, perhaps thousands, of billions to reach their self-imposed «climate goal» adopted in 2015 – without wanting to succeed, he said, since the goals are impossible to achieve. Climate policy employs tens of thousands of people in the public and private sectors, and the authorities are transferring hundreds of billions of kroner to private profiteers who will develop «climate measures» such as wind power, solar power, hydrogen and batteries, etc, at the same time, people will be banned from buying fuel cars from 2025.

These are pervasive, revolutionary and extremist policies, carried out in express

service, completely without risk assessments or budgetary control. And the only thing that underlies them are mathematical computer models, designed by a few people in very narrow environments, and, who, on failing grounds, claim that they understand Earth's climate and thus can also calculate Earth's future climate if we cut CO₂ and if we *not* do it.

This is the entire thin foundation of EU climate policy. And the article SSB has published, shows that it is wrong.

This should again mean that all climate policy is set for more research, because there is a risk of destroying both the economy, nature, power supply and business life with climate measures to absolutely no avail: Climate change will continue no matter what we do. However, that will not happen.

What is going to happen is that the SSB article is going to be hidden and forgotten faster than you can say «climate economy». Probably, Faktisk.no quickly comes on track with its lead-heavy research environment (*punted intended*) to put out the fire. For no one should be allowed to destroy the enormous, corrupt monetary moth that climate policy in reality is. It's about careers, prestige and trillions of crowns.

However, it is good to see that Statistics Norway still makes room for real science. It gives hope. The next time someone says

«vitenskapen is proven», one can thus answer that «SSB has published research proving that it is wrong».

Buy «**Uncertain science**» by Steven E. Koonin as [paperbook](#) and as [e-book](#).



Vitenskapelige data vitner hverken om klimakrise, hyppigere katastrofer eller dårligere livsgrunnlag.



Steven E. Koonin er en av USAs fremste og høyest betrodde vitenskapsmenn.



Start dagen med Document – bli abonnent!



Ordinært abonnement



Premium-abonnement



VIP-abonnement

We at Document want to facilitate an interesting and a debate on the issues we write about. Please read our [guidelines for debate practice](#) before you participate.