APPROACH

My approach to the subject this evening will be to focus on and emphasize the scientific evidence relating to climate change; and to let you speculate as to what this evidence means.

Scientific evidence consists primarily of three categories:

1. Verified observations by reputable scientists.

2. Verified experiments by reputable scientists.

   In the past, the results of these observations and experiments were published in peer-reviewed scientific journals. Today, they are more likely to be published in peer-reviewed online forums.

3. Logical deductions from these observations and experiments. These logical conclusions include natural laws, and the basic equations and formulae of the various scientific disciplines—insofar as these have been verified by scientific testing.

Unlike Law, Science does **not** give expert opinion the status of evidence. It is merely opinion—no matter how prestigious the holder of that opinion might be. It is the evidence itself that counts, not the opinions based on it.

After all, science progresses by proving experts wrong. Every textbook, every scientific article written today contains statements that the weight of future evidence will continue to support, and statements that the weight of future evidence will have shown to be false. We just don't know yet which is which. Scientific reputations will be made by the young scholars who discover the differences first.

The refusal to accept expert opinion is the essence of science. England's Royal Society is the oldest scientific organization on earth (1660). The Royal Society has a Latin motto: "Nullius in verba". The accepted translation is: "Don't take anyone's word for it". That motto still guides science today.