

SCEPTICS WORDS 2 - CREDIBILITY OF THE IPCC AND ITS MODELS

The idea of claiming that a scientific hypothesis is correct solely because someone asserts there is a consensus among scientists that the hypothesis is correct, is nonsense. The whole concept of such a consensus is an anathema to the scientific methodology¹. It smells more like the methodology of a lynch mob or, indeed, a popularity contest. The crowd all agree “he is guilty”, so it must be right – “hang him”. And so another factoid is borne.

This foolishness of deifying the concept of consensus has gained momentum recently, as post modernism has spread through the tertiary education sector. Post modernists do not believe in ‘*facts*’ as most would understand the word, believing that it is impossible to be objective and identify anything as ‘*facts*’. Having dismissed the concept of ‘*facts*’, the same people disingenuously retain the everyday word, and believe that a fact is anything that a group of people, operating in a political environment, all agree is a fact – the rebirth of the concept of a consensus.

For example, one hundred people can decide that Captain Cook did not arrive in Australia in 1788, but did arrive in 1888. Once there is agreement, this becomes a ‘*post modernist fact*’. Obviously, there are more than one hundred people in the world, so another one hundred people could establish another ‘*post modernist fact*’ that Cook arrived in 1688. Post modernists are untroubled by such an event, declaring that both ‘*post modernist facts*’ are correct and, more importantly, neither can be shown to be incorrect. Apart from the idea of having as many ‘*post modernist facts*’ as you like about any situation, this philosophy also believes that anytime the political climate changes, all these facts can also change.

As there can be no right or wrong facts, arguments by post modernists focus on denigrating the person who disagrees with their ‘*post modernist fact*’ without ever addressing the topic under discussion. Consequently their tools of debate are ridicule, fear, coercion, bullying and anything else that may force a person to join their group to shore up their very own ‘*post modernist fact*’. With this background, you may now understand why Greens never discuss an issue, but will always try to shut down a debate (The science is settled.), and if this does not work, they personally attack anyone who challenges their all-important “consensus”.

Most laymen are unaware of this post modernist ‘gobbledegook’, and interpret the words ‘consensus’ and ‘facts’ as defined in most dictionaries. Consequently, sceptics are unwillingly drawn into the irrational debate on consensus providing the numbers of sceptics who disagree that there is a consensus amongst scientists on global warming. The numbers both for and against mean nothing, but they are supplied here in these handouts for those who are influenced in this way. However, more importantly, these handouts not only provide you with the meaningless numbers, but also present some of the words and ideas of the sceptics.

Items have been chosen for this Handout to introduce you to some of the criticisms of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), its processes, its “science”, its political role, and the effects all this has on its models.

Item 2-1

Open Letter to the Secretary-General of the United Nations

December 13, 2007

His Excellency Ban Ki-Moon

Secretary-General, United Nations

New York, NY

United States of America

Dear Mr. Secretary-General,

Re: UN climate conference taking the World in entirely the wrong direction

It is not possible to stop climate change, a natural phenomenon that has affected humanity through the ages. Geological, archaeological, oral and written histories all attest to the dramatic challenges posed to past societies from unanticipated changes in temperature, precipitation, winds and other climatic variables. We therefore need to equip nations to become resilient to the full range of these natural phenomena by promoting economic growth and wealth generation.

The United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has issued increasingly alarming conclusions about the climatic influences of human-produced carbon dioxide (CO₂), a non-polluting gas that is essential to plant photosynthesis. While we understand the evidence that has led them to view CO₂ emissions as harmful, the IPCC's conclusions are quite inadequate as justification for implementing policies that will markedly diminish future prosperity. In particular, it is not established that it is possible to significantly alter global climate through cuts in human greenhouse gas emissions. On top of which, because attempts to cut emissions will slow development, the current UN approach of CO₂ reduction is likely to increase human suffering from future climate change rather than to decrease it.

The IPCC Summaries for Policy Makers are the most widely read IPCC reports amongst politicians and non-scientists and are the basis for most climate change policy formulation. Yet these Summaries are prepared by a relatively small core writing team with the final drafts approved line-by-line by government representatives. The great majority of IPCC contributors and reviewers, and the tens of thousands of other scientists who are qualified to comment on these matters, are not involved in the preparation of these documents. The Summaries therefore cannot properly be represented as a consensus view among experts.

Contrary to the impression left by the IPCC Summary reports:

- Recent observations of phenomena such as glacial retreats, sea-level rise and the migration of temperature-sensitive species are not evidence for abnormal climate change, for none of these changes has been shown to lie outside the bounds of known natural variability.
- The average rate of warming of 0.1 - 0.2 degrees Celsius per decade recorded by satellites during the late 20th century falls within known natural rates of warming and cooling over the last 10,000 years.
- Leading scientists, including some senior IPCC representatives, acknowledge that today's computer models cannot predict climate. Consistent with this, and despite computer projections of temperature rises, there has been no net global warming since 1998. That the current temperature plateau follows a late 20th century period of warming is consistent with the continuation today of natural multi-decadal or millennial climate cycling.

In stark contrast to the often repeated assertion that the science of climate change is 'settled', significant new peer-reviewed research has cast even more doubt on the hypothesis of dangerous human-caused global warming. But because IPCC working groups were generally instructed to consider work published only through May 2005, these important findings are not included in their reports; i.e., the IPCC assessment reports are already materially outdated.

The UN climate conference in Bali has been planned to take the world along a path of severe CO₂ restrictions, ignoring the lessons apparent from the failure of the Kyoto Protocol, the chaotic nature of the European CO₂ trading market, and the ineffectiveness of other costly initiatives to curb greenhouse gas emissions. Balanced cost/benefit analyses provide no support for the introduction of global measures to cap and reduce energy consumption for the purpose of restricting CO₂ emissions. Furthermore, it is irrational to apply the 'precautionary principle' because many scientists recognize that both climatic coolings and warmings are realistic possibilities over the medium-term future.

The current UN focus on "fighting climate change", as illustrated in the November 27th UN Development Programme's Human Development Report, is distracting governments from adapting to the threat of inevitable natural climate changes, whatever forms they may take. National and international planning for such changes is needed, with a focus on helping our most vulnerable citizens adapt to conditions that lie ahead. Attempts to prevent global climate change from occurring are ultimately futile, and constitute a tragic misallocation of resources that would be better spent on humanity's real and pressing problems.

Yours faithfully,

Copy to: Heads of State of countries of the signatory persons.

List of those who signed this open letter:

Don Aitkin, PhD, Professor, social scientist, retired Vice-Chancellor and President, University of Canberra, Australia

Syun-Ichi Akasofu, PhD, Professor of Physics, Emeritus and Founding Director, International Arctic Research Center of the University of Alaska Fairbanks, U.S.

William J.R. Alexander, PhD, Professor Emeritus, Dept. of Civil and Biosystems Engineering, University of Pretoria, South Africa; Member, UN Scientific and Technical Committee on Natural Disasters, 1994-2000

Bjarne Andresen, PhD, physicist, Professor, The Niels Bohr Institute, University of Copenhagen, Denmark

Geoff L. Austin, PhD, FNZIP, FRSNZ, Professor, Dept. of Physics, University of Auckland, New Zealand

Timothy F. Ball, PhD, environmental consultant, former climatology professor, University of Winnipeg, Canada

Franco Battaglia, PhD, Professor of Environmental Chemistry, University of Modena, Italy

Ernst-Georg Beck, Dipl. Biol., Biologist, Merian-Schule Freiburg, Germany

Sonja A. Boehmer-Christiansen, PhD, Reader, Dept. of Geography, Hull University, UK; Editor, Energy & Environment journal

Chris C. Borel, PhD, remote sensing scientist, U.S.

Reid A. Bryson, Ph.D. D.Sc. D.Engr., UNEP Global 500 Laureate; Senior Scientist, Center for Climatic Research; Emeritus Professor of Meteorology, of Geography, and of Environmental Studies, University of Wisconsin, U.S.

Dan Carruthers, M.Sc., wildlife biology consultant specializing in animal ecology in Arctic and Subarctic regions, Alberta, Canada

Robert M. Carter, PhD, Professor, Marine Geophysical Laboratory, James Cook University, Townsville, Australia

Ian D. Clark, PhD, Professor, isotope hydrogeology and paleoclimatology, Dept. of Earth Sciences, University of Ottawa, Canada

Richard S. Courtney, PhD, climate and atmospheric science consultant, IPCC expert reviewer, U.K.

Willem de Lange, PhD, Dept. of Earth and Ocean Sciences, School of Science and Engineering, Waikato University, New Zealand

David Deming, PhD (Geophysics), Associate Professor, College of Arts and Sciences, University of Oklahoma, U.S.

Freeman J. Dyson, PhD, Emeritus Professor of Physics, Institute for Advanced Studies, Princeton, N.J., U.S.

Don J. Easterbrook, PhD, Emeritus Professor of Geology, Western Washington University, U.S.

Lance Endersbee, Emeritus Professor, former Dean of Engineering and Pro-Vice Chancellor of Monash University, Australia

Hans Erren, Doctorandus, geophysicist and climate specialist, Sittard, The Netherlands

Robert H. Essenhigh, PhD, E.G. Bailey Professor of Energy Conversion, Dept. of Mechanical Engineering, The Ohio State University, U.S.

Christopher Essex, PhD, Professor of Applied Mathematics and Associate Director of the Program in Theoretical Physics, University of Western Ontario, Canada

David Evans, PhD, mathematician, carbon accountant, computer and electrical engineer and head of 'Science Speak', Australia

William Evans, PhD, Editor, American Midland Naturalist; Dept. of Biological Sciences, University of Notre Dame, U.S.

Stewart Franks, PhD, Associate Professor, Hydroclimatologist, University of Newcastle, Australia

R. W. Gauldie, PhD, Research Professor, Hawai'i Institute of Geophysics and Planetology, School of Ocean Earth Sciences and Technology, University of Hawai'i at Manoa

Lee C. Gerhard, PhD, Senior Scientist Emeritus, University of Kansas; former director and state geologist, Kansas Geological Survey, U.S.

Gerhard Gerlich, Professor for Mathematical and Theoretical Physics, Institut für Mathematische Physik der TU Braunschweig, Germany

Albrecht Glatzle, PhD, sc.agr., Agro-Biologist and Gerente ejecutivo, INTTAS, Paraguay

Fred Goldberg, PhD, Adj Professor, Royal Institute of Technology, Mechanical Engineering, Stockholm, Sweden

Vincent Gray, PhD, expert reviewer for the IPCC and author of 'The Greenhouse Delusion: A Critique of Climate Change 2001,' Wellington, New Zealand

William M. Gray, Professor Emeritus, Dept. of Atmospheric Science, Colorado State University and Head of the Tropical Meteorology Project, U.S.

Howard Hayden, PhD, Emeritus Professor of Physics, University of Connecticut, U.S.

Louis Hissink M.Sc. M.A.I.G., Editor AIG News and Consulting Geologist, Perth, Western Australia

Craig D. Idso, PhD, Chairman, Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, Arizona, U.S.

Sherwood B. Idso, PhD, President, Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, AZ, USA

Andrei Illarionov, PhD, Senior Fellow, Center for Global Liberty and Prosperity, U.S.; founder and director of the Institute of Economic Analysis, Russia

Zbigniew Jaworowski, PhD, physicist, Chairman - Scientific Council of Central Laboratory for Radiological Protection, Warsaw, Poland

Jon Jenkins, PhD, MD, computer modelling - virology, Sydney, NSW, Australia

Wibjorn Karlen, PhD, Emeritus Professor, Dept. of Physical Geography and Quaternary Geology, Stockholm University, Sweden

Olavi Kärner, Ph.D., Research Associate, Dept. of Atmospheric Physics, Institute of Astrophysics and Atmospheric Physics, Toravere, Estonia

Joel M. Kauffman, PhD, Emeritus Professor of Chemistry, University of the Sciences in Philadelphia, U.S.

David Kear, PhD, FRSNZ, CMG, geologist, former Director-General of NZ Dept. of Scientific & Industrial Research, New Zealand

Madhav Khandekar, PhD, former Research Scientist Environment Canada; Editor "Climate Research" (03-05); Editorial Board Member "Natural Hazards, IPCC Expert Reviewer 2007

William Kininmonth M.Sc., M.Admin., former head of Australia's National Climate Centre and a consultant to the World Meteorological organization's Commission for Climatology

Jan J.H. Kop, M.Sc. Ceng FICE (Civil Engineer Fellow of the Institution of Civil Engineers), Emeritus Professor of Public Health Engineering, Technical University Delft, The Netherlands

Professor R.W.J. Kouffeld, Emeritus Professor, Energy Conversion, Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands

Salomon Kroonenberg, PhD, Professor, Dept. of Geotechnology, Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands

Hans H.J. Labohm, PhD, economist, former advisor to the executive board, Clingendael Institute (The Netherlands Institute of International Relations), The Netherlands

The Rt. Hon. Lord Lawson of Blaby, economist; Chairman of the Central Europe Trust; former Chancellor of the Exchequer, U.K.

Douglas Leahey, PhD, meteorologist and air-quality consultant, Calgary, Canada

David R. Legates, PhD, Director, Center for Climatic Research, University of Delaware, U.S.

Marcel Leroux, PhD, Professor Emeritus of Climatology, University of Lyon, France; former director of Laboratory of Climatology, Risks and Environment, CNRS

Bryan Leyland, International Climate Science Coalition, consultant - power engineer, Auckland, New Zealand

William Lindqvist, PhD, consulting geologist and company director, Tiburon, California, U.S.

Richard S. Lindzen, PhD, Alfred P. Sloan Professor of Meteorology, Dept. of Earth, Atmospheric and Planetary Sciences, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, U.S.

A.J. Tom van Loon, PhD, Professor of Geology (Quaternary Geology), Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznan, Poland; former President of the European Association of Science Editors

Anthony R. Lupo, PhD, Associate Professor of Atmospheric Science, Dept. of Soil, Environmental, and Atmospheric Science, University of Missouri-Columbia, U.S.

Richard Mackey, PhD, Statistician, Australia

Horst Malberg, PhD, Professor for Meteorology and Climatology, Institut für Meteorologie, Berlin, Germany

John Maunder, PhD, Climatologist, former President of the Commission for Climatology of the World Meteorological Organization (89-97), New Zealand

Alister McFarquhar, PhD, international economist, Downing College, Cambridge, U.K.

Ross McKittrick, PhD, Associate Professor, Dept. of Economics, University of Guelph, Canada

John McLean, Climate Data Analyst, computer scientist, Melbourne, Australia

Owen McShane, B. Arch., Master of City and Regional Planning (UC Berkeley), economist and policy analyst, joint founder of the International Climate Science Coalition, Director - Centre for Resource Management Studies, New Zealand

Fred Michel, PhD, Director, Institute of Environmental Sciences and Associate Professor of Earth Sciences, Carleton University, Canada

Frank Milne, PhD, Professor, Dept. of Economics, Queen's University, Canada

Asmunn Moene, PhD, former head of the Forecasting Centre, Meteorological Institute, Norway

Alan Moran, PhD, Energy Economist, Director of the IPA's Deregulation Unit, Australia

Nils-Axel Morner, PhD, Emeritus Professor of Paleogeophysics & Geodynamics, Stockholm University, Sweden

Lubos Motl, PhD, physicist, former Harvard string theorist, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

John Nicol, PhD, physicist, James Cook University, Australia

Mr. David Nowell, M.Sc., Fellow of the Royal Meteorological Society, former chairman of the NATO Meteorological Group, Ottawa, Canada

James J. O'Brien, PhD, Professor Emeritus, Meteorology and Oceanography, Florida State University, U.S.

Cliff Ollier, PhD, Professor Emeritus (Geology), Research Fellow, University of Western Australia

Garth W. Paltridge, PhD, atmospheric physicist, Emeritus Professor and former Director of the Institute of Antarctic and Southern Ocean Studies, University of Tasmania, Australia

R. Timothy Patterson, PhD, Professor, Dept. of Earth Sciences (paleoclimatology), Carleton University, Canada

Al Pekarek, PhD, Associate Professor of Geology, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences Dept., St. Cloud State University, Minnesota, U.S.

Ian Plimer, PhD, Professor of Geology, School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Adelaide and Emeritus Professor of Earth Sciences, University of Melbourne, Australia

Brian Pratt, PhD, Professor of Geology, Sedimentology, University of Saskatchewan, Canada

Harry N.A. Priem, PhD, Emeritus Professor of Planetary Geology and Isotope Geophysics, Utrecht University; former director of the Netherlands Institute for Isotope Geosciences

Renato Angelo Ricci, PhD, Honorary President of the Italian Physics Society and Emeritus Professor of Physics, University of Padova, Italy

Alex Robson, PhD, Economics, Australian National University

Colonel F.P.M. Rombouts, Branch Chief - Safety, Quality and Environment, Royal Netherlands Air Force

R.G. Roper, PhD, Professor Emeritus of Atmospheric Sciences, School of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, Georgia Institute of Technology, U.S.

Arthur Rorsch, PhD, Emeritus Professor, Molecular Genetics, Leiden University, The Netherlands

Rob Scagel, M.Sc., forest microclimate specialist, principal consultant, Pacific Phytometric Consultants, B.C., Canada

Tom V. Segalstad, PhD, (Geology/Geochemistry), Head of the Geological Museum and Associate Professor of Resource and Environmental Geology, University of Oslo, Norway

Gary D. Sharp, PhD, Center for Climate/Ocean Resources Study, Salinas, CA, U.S.

S. Fred Singer, PhD, Professor Emeritus of Environmental Sciences, University of Virginia and former director, U.S. Weather Satellite Service

L. Graham Smith, PhD, Associate Professor, Dept. of Geography, University of Western Ontario, Canada

Roy W. Spencer, PhD, climatologist, Principal Research Scientist, Earth System Science Center, The University of Alabama, Huntsville, U.S.

Walter Starck, PhD (marine science), marine biologist (specialization in coral reefs and fisheries with 1000 dives from northern Cape York to the Capricorn group), author, photographer, Townsville, Australia

Peter Stilbs, TeknD, Professor of Physical Chemistry, Research Leader, School of Chemical Science and Engineering, KTH (Royal Institute of Technology), Stockholm, Sweden

Hendrik Tennekes, PhD, former Director of Research, Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute

Dick Thoenes, PhD, Emeritus Professor of Chemical Engineering, Eindhoven University of Technology, The Netherlands

Brian G Valentine, PhD, PE (Chem.), Technology Manager - Industrial Energy Efficiency, Adjunct Associate Professor of Engineering Science, University of Maryland at College Park; Dept of Energy, Washington, DC, U.S.

Gerrit J. van der Lingen, PhD, geologist and paleoclimatologist, climate change consultant, Geoscience Research and Investigations, New Zealand

Len Walker, PhD, power engineering, Pict Energy, Melbourne, Australia

Edward J. Wegman, Bernard J. Dunn Professor, Department of Statistics and Department Computational and Data Sciences, George Mason University, Virginia, U.S.

Stephan Wilksch, PhD, Professor for Innovation and Technology Management, Production Management and Logistics, University of Technology and Economics Berlin, Germany

Boris Winterhalter, PhD, senior marine researcher (retired), Geological Survey of Finland, former professor in marine geology, University of Helsinki, Finland

David E. Wojick, PhD, P.Eng., UN IPCC Expert Reviewer, energy consultant, Virginia, U.S.

Raphael Wust, PhD, Lecturer, Marine Geology/Sedimentology, James Cook University, Australia

A. Zichichi, PhD, President of the World Federation of Scientists, Geneva, Switzerland; Emeritus Professor of Advanced Physics, University of Bologna, Italy.

Item 2-2**UNSOUND SCIENCE BY THE IPCC**

75 Silverstream Road, Crofton Downs. Wellington, New Zealand 3065 Email
vinmary.gray@paradise.net.nz

The paper has 21 pages and this is only a partial excerpt (N.B. Sir Humphrey is alive and well).

1. INTRODUCTION

Despite persistent efforts, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has never succeeded in the task set to it by the Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC), of supplying sound scientific evidence for the belief that human emissions of greenhouse gases are harming the climate. The evidence that has been supplied is based on unsound scientific methods and mathematics. This paper is an attempt to summarise some of it.

7.1 VALIDATION VERSUS EVALUATION

The First IPCC Report (Houghton et al 1990) had a Chapter "Validation of Models". When I pointed out that no model has ever been validated they changed the word "validated" to "evaluated" no less than fifty times in the next draft

Computer models use a range of scientific "laws" and parameters to simulate the climate system. Computer engineers use a process called "validation" before the model can be considered suitable for use. This procedure requires not only an ability of a model to simulate past behaviour of a system, but it must also be shown capable of future prediction to a required level of accuracy over the expected range

No computer model of the climate has ever been validated in this sense. There is no discussion in any IPCC Report as to how such a process should be carried out.

Instead, models are "evaluated". This process falls far short of "validation". In many cases it consists merely of an opinion that the parameters and equations in the model are generally acceptable. They draw from the opinions of those who have a financial interest in the models, a series of levels of "confidence" to which spurious levels of "probability" are applied.

"Simulation" which may involve adjustment of the often inaccurately known parameters of the model to a climate sequence is also considered a successful "evaluation".

7.2 SCENARIOS

Forecasting future climate would require a combination of a properly validated climate model with a "scenario" of future behaviour of the climate. The IPCC has developed several series of "Emissions Scenarios" which they combine with their "evaluated" models to provide future estimates of the behaviour of the climate.

They have, however, resolutely refused to check whether any of their scenarios actually comply with the future climate as it evolves. They even deny that this is possible:

"Since scenarios deal with the future they cannot be compared with observations" (Houghton et al 1995)

A study I made in 1998 (Gray 1998) showed that none of the early scenarios agreed with emerging reality and the later scenarios were no better (Gray 2002). They include a "projection" that the world coal industry production will increase 12.2 times by 2100, and another that the per capita income of South Africa will be four times greater than that of the USA by that date (Castles and Henderson 2003)

7.3 PREDICTIONS AND PROJECTIONS

Forecasting requires the combination of a properly validated model with a plausible and frequently updated system of futures scenarios.

"Scenarios are not predictions of the future and should not be used as such" (Houghton et al 1992).

They have, as a result, refused to make any "predictions" throughout their reports. Instead they make "projections", defined as follows (Solomon et al 2007. Glossary):

"Projections are distinguished from predictions in order to emphasize that projections involve assumptions concerning, for example, future socioeconomic and technological developments that may or may not be realised, and are therefore subject to substantial uncertainty"

So here is an admission of the substantial uncertainty of all their "projections", which is compounded by the fact that they do not attempt to check whether any of them correspond with the actual emerging behaviour of the climate.

7.4 THE OPINIONS OF EXPERTS

Having produced "projections" of the climate, based on "evaluated" models combined with unchecked "scenarios", the IPCC was faced with the problem of "evaluating" these "projections" in a situation where they were unable to make "predictions" or "forecasts".

Since there was no scientific way to do this they decided to rely entirely on the "opinions" of the "experts" who produced the models, most of whom have a financial interest in their success.

In order to render this system of what is essentially expert guesswork, they have erected a system of levels of "likelihood" for the various outcomes of their "projections". Each level is assigned a numerical "probability", which has no scientific or statistical significance.

8 THE SINKING OF TUVALU

The sinking of the island of Tuvalu beneath the ocean, and other Pacific islands became an early environmentalist slogan. Unfortunately local measurement showed that it was not happening, so a research study was set up in 1991 at Flinders University, Adelaide with the firm order that Tuvalu must be made to sink. They replaced the tide-gauges of 12 Pacific Islands with the most modern equipment and they instructed them to show a steady rise. These were all in operation in 1994 and have now been going for 13 years

The project is a miserable failure. All the 12 stations show no tendency for their sea level to rise in 13 years. But the authors have found a way out. There was a hurricane in the Pacific in 1988 which caused a depression in all of the tide-gauges. When they run a linear regression, it shows an overall steady rise. The only trouble is that there was no sea level rise at all since 1999, and Tuvalu itself actually rose in 2005. But the belief is so strong nobody seems to care about actual facts like these (Hall 2006).

9 CONCLUSION

These examples show that the IPCC depends on unsound and mathematically unacceptable methods to compile its "evidence" that human-induced greenhouse gas emissions are harming the climate.

The best statement of the reality of our current knowledge of the climate was made in Chapter 1, of Houghton et al 2001.

"The fact that the global mean temperature has increased since the late 19th century and that other trends have been observed does not necessarily mean that an anthropogenic effect on the climate has been identified. Climate has always varied on all time-scales, so the observed change may be natural".

The authors of this true statement have been punished in "Climate Change 2007 (Solomon et al 2007), as the entire first Chapter has been replaced with a "Historical Overview of Climate Change Science" which is little more than a publicity document for the IPCC.

The IPCC never makes "forecasts". But this does not seem to worry the politicians and the general public who do not understand that the gut feelings of people financially dependent on a model are the only basis for these "projections". They cheerfully convert them in to certain forecasts, sufficient to consign the world to an economically damaging assault on energy supply.

Item 2-3

US Senator Inhofe on the UN IPCC process:

The UN allowed a Greenpeace activist to co-author a key economic report in 2007. Left unreported by most of the media was the fact that Bill Hare, who worked for Greenpeace, was a lead co-author of a key economic report in the IPCC's 4th Assessment. Not surprisingly, the Greenpeace co-authored report predicted a gloomy future for our planet unless we follow the UN's policy prescriptions.

The UN IPCC's own guidelines explicitly state that the scientific reports have to be "change[d]" to "ensure consistency with" the politically motivated Summary for Policymakers. In addition, the IPCC more closely resembles a political party's convention platform battle - not a scientific process.

During an IPCC Summary for Policymakers process, political delegates and international bureaucrats squabble over the specific wording of a phrase or assertion. Alabama State Climatologist Dr. John Christy of the University of Alabama in Huntsville, served as a UN IPCC lead author in 2001 for the 3rd assessment report and detailed how he personally witnessed UN scientists attempting to distort the science for political purposes. "I was at the table with three Europeans, and we were having lunch. And they were talking about their role as lead authors. And they were talking about how they were trying to make the report so dramatic that the United States would just have to sign that Kyoto Protocol," Christy told CNN on May 2, 2007.

Former Colorado State Climatologist Roger Pielke Sr. also detailed the corruption of the UN IPCC process on September 1, 2007: "The same individuals who are doing primary research in the role of humans on the climate system are then permitted to lead the [IPCC] assessment! There should be an outcry on this obvious conflict of interest, but to date either few recognize this conflict, or see that since the recommendations of the IPCC fit their policy and political agenda, they chose to ignore this conflict.

In either case, scientific rigor has been sacrificed and poor policy and political decisions will inevitably follow," Pielke explained. He added: "We need recognition among the scientific community, the media, and policymakers that the IPCC process is obviously a real conflict of interest, and this has resulted in a significantly flawed report." Politics appears to be the fuel that runs the UN IPCC process from the

scientists to the bureaucrats to the delegates and all the way to many of the world leaders involved in it. And another key to the motivation of the UN was explained by former French President Jacques Chirac in 2000: Chirac said Kyoto represents "the first component of an authentic global governance."

A speech given by Senator Inhofe in the US Senate 2008

Item 2-4

Dr. Tom V. Segalstad expressed skepticism of climate fears in 2007. A July 7, 2007 article in Canada's Financial Post read, "In the real world, as measurable by science, CO₂ in the atmosphere and in the ocean reach a stable balance when the oceans contain 50 times as much CO₂ as the atmosphere.

'The IPCC postulates an atmospheric doubling of CO₂, meaning that the oceans would need to receive 50 times more CO₂ to obtain chemical equilibrium,' explains Prof. Segalstad. 'This total of 51 times the present amount of carbon in atmospheric CO₂ exceeds the known reserves of fossil carbon-- it represents more carbon than exists in all the coal, gas, and oil that we can exploit anywhere in the world.'

The article continued, "Also in the real world, Prof. Segalstad's isotope mass balance calculations -- a standard technique in science -- show that if CO₂ in the atmosphere had a lifetime of 50 to 200 years, as claimed by IPCC scientists, the atmosphere would necessarily have half of its current CO₂ mass. Because this is a nonsensical outcome, the IPCC model postulates that half of the CO₂ must be hiding somewhere, in 'a missing sink.' Many studies have sought this missing sink -- a Holy Grail of climate science research-- without success.

'It is a search for a mythical CO₂ sink to explain an immeasurable CO₂ lifetime to fit a hypothetical CO₂ computer model that purports to show that an impossible amount of fossil fuel burning is heating the atmosphere,' Prof. Segalstad concludes. 'It is all a fiction.'

Geologist/Geochemist Dr. Tom V. Segalstad, a professor and head of the Geological Museum at the University of Oslo and formerly an expert reviewer with the UN IPCC

Item 2-5

Meteorologist Hajo Smit of Holland reversed his views of man-made global warming. "After the range of very warm years and the 'advent' Al Gore, I became a reluctant climate change believer for about 6 months," Smit wrote EPW on April 11, 2008. Smit credited Gore with ultimately turning him into a skeptic. Gore "prompted

me to start delving into the science again and I quickly found myself solidly in the skeptic camp,” Smit wrote.

In addition, Smit also critiqued the climate models that predict future catastrophe. “I am troubled by the practices I had seen at work in GCM (global climate models), the whole field seemed highly suspicious to me.” “During my full year working at the Department of Atmospheric Sciences of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, I became suspicious about the way modeling science is done. Odd arbitrary parameterizations seemed the rule rather than the exception,” Smit explained. The “practice of simplifying models so that accurate measurements can be used to calibrate them, seemed to be abandoned by GCM groups in favour of a childish delight in presenting colorful computer printouts of when and where which temperature changes will occur.

Climate models can at best be useful for explaining climate changes after the fact,” Smith wrote. “The vast amount of new research since my graduation points to clear cut solar-climate coupling and to a very strong natural variability of climate on all historical time scales. Currently I hardly believe anymore that there is any relevant relationship between human CO₂-emissions and climate change,” he added.

Meteorologist Hajo Smit, a former member of the Dutch IPCC committee and a snow forecaster for Dutch winter sports, who holds a masters degree in environmental science and has presented his research on soil moisture’s role in global climate models at National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR).

Item 2-6

Professor Dr. Don Aitkin expressed his skepticism of a man-made climate crisis in an April 2008 speech. “Is the warming unprecedented? Probably not. There is abundant historical and proxy evidence for both hotter and cooler periods in human history. Is it our fault? Again, maybe.

The correlation of increasing warmth with increasing carbon dioxide concentrations is particularly weak; that with solar energy and with ocean movements is much stronger.” Aitkin said. “Are we likely to see rising sea-levels? Not in our lifetimes or those of our grandchildren. It is not even clear that sea-levels have risen at all. As so often in this domain, there is conflicting evidence. The melting of polar or sea ice has no direct effect.

How reliable are the computer models on which possible future climates are based? Not very. All will agree that the task of modeling climate is vast, because of the estimates that have to be made and the rubbery quality of much of the data,” Aitkin explained. “Why is there such insistence that AGW has occurred and needs drastic solutions? This is a puzzle, but my short answer is that the IPCC has been

built on the AGW proposition and of course keeps plugging it, whatever the data say. The IPCC has considerable clout. Most people shy off inspecting the evidence because it looks like science and must therefore be hard. The media have been captured by AGW (it makes for great stories), the environmental movement and the Greens love it, and business is reluctant to get involved,” Aitkin added.

Professor Dr. Don Aitkin of the University of Canberra is a former foundation Chairman of the Australian Research Council, a member of the Australian Science and Technology Council, and founder and past chairman of the Australian Mathematics Trust.

Item 2-7

Dr. Frederick Seitz, declared his man-made global warming skepticism once again in 2008, shortly before his death. Seitz wrote the foreword in February 2008 to a report titled “Nature, Not Human Activity, Rules the Climate” by a team of international skeptical scientists released in March 2008.

The IPCC “is pre-programmed to produce reports to support the hypotheses of anthropogenic warming and the control of greenhouse gases, as envisioned in the Global Climate Treaty.” Seitz wrote that the 1990 IPCC Summary “completely ignored satellite data, since they showed no warming. The 1995 IPCC report was notorious for the significant alterations made to the text after it was approved by the scientists — in order to convey the impression of a human influence. The 2001 IPCC report claimed the twentieth century showed ‘unusual warming’ based on the now-discredited hockey stick graph. The latest IPCC report, published in 2007, completely devalues the climate contributions from changes in solar activities, which are likely to dominate any human influence.”

“It is one thing to impose drastic measures and harsh economic penalties when an environmental problem is clear-cut and severe,” Seitz wrote. “It is foolish to do so when the problem is largely hypothetical and not substantiated by observations. As NIPCC shows by offering an independent, non-governmental ‘second opinion’ on the ‘global warming’ issue, we do not currently have any convincing evidence or observations of significant climate change from other than natural causes,” Seitz wrote.

Dr. Frederick Seitz, renowned physicist and former president of the National Academy of Sciences, the American Physical Society, and president emeritus of Rockefeller University.

Item 2-8

Jerome J. Schmitt questioned the validity of computer climate model predictions of man-made global warming. "While mankind cannot experiment on the global climate, these models can be used retroactively to see how well they 'model' the past. The UN's 2001 Climate Change report distorted the historical record by eliminating the Medieval Warm Period in the famous 'Hockey Stick Curve' which, by many accounts, unreasonably accentuated temperature rise in the 20th century. Such distortion of the historical data undercuts the credibility of the models themselves, since this is the only 'experimental data' available for testing the fidelity of the models to the actual climate," Schmitt wrote on February 28, 2007.

Schmitt detailed the multitude of inputs that he believes makes climate models unreliable. "Let's list some of the factors that must be included (by no means an exhaustive list): Solar flux; Gravity; Pressure; Temperature; Density; Humidity; Earth's rotation; Surface temperature; Currents in the Ocean (e.g., Gulf Stream); Greenhouse gases; CO2 dissolved in the oceans; Polar ice caps; Infrared radiation; Cosmic rays (ionizing radiation); Earth's magnetic field; Evaporation; Precipitation; Cloud formation; Reflection from clouds; Reflection from snow; Volcanoes; Soot formation; Trace compounds; And many, many others.

Even if mathematics could be developed to accurately model each of these factors, the combined model would be infinitely complex requiring some simplifications. Simplifications in turn amount to judgment calls by the modeler. Can we ignore the effects of trace compounds? Well, we were told that trace amounts of chlorofluoro compounds had profound effects on the ozone layer, necessitating the banning of their use in refrigerators and as aerosol spray propellants. Can we ignore cosmic rays? Well, they cause ions (electrically charged molecules) which affect the ozone layer and also catalyze formation of rain-drops and soot particles. As with all models, it is perilous to ignore factors in the absence of complete experimental data which might otherwise have significant effect," he wrote.

"Unless we know how the greenhouse-limiting properties of precipitation systems change with warming, we don't know how much of our current warmth is due to mankind, and we can't estimate how much future warming there will be, either," he added. "In my view, we should adopt the private sector's practice of placing extremely limited reliance on numerical models for major investment decisions in the absence of confirming test data, that is, climate data which can be easily collected just by waiting," he concluded.

Jerome J. Schmitt is a Yale University-educated engineer who studied fluid mechanics and gas dynamics, who served as Vice President for Research and Development at MicroCoating Technologies.

Item 2-9

Dr. Donald DuBois is very skeptical of climate computer models predicting doom. "I know something about how misleading models can be, and the fact that their underlying assumptions can completely predetermine the results of the model. If the major climate models that are having a major impact on public policy were documented and put in the public domain, other qualified professionals around the world would be interested in looking into the validity of these models," DuBois wrote to EPW on May 17, 2007.

"Right now, climate science is a black box that is highly questionable with unstated assumptions and model inputs. It is especially urgent that these models come out in the open considering how much climate change legislation could cost the United States and the world economies. Ross McKittrick's difficulty in getting the information from [Michael] Mann on his famous 'hockey stick' [temperature] curve is a case in point which should be a scandal not worth repeating. The cost of documenting the models and making them available would be a trifle; the cost of not doing so could be astronomical," DuBois wrote.

"I headed up a project to model computer networks (to see how they will perform before they are built) for NASA's International Space Station (including the ground stations around the globe). If I had suggested a \$250 million network for the ISS and said that I was basing this recommendation on my modeling but the models were not available for inspection, I would have been laughed out of the auditorium in Houston."

Computer modeler Dr. Donald DuBois, who holds a PhD in Philosophy of Science, has spent most of his career modeling computer networks for NASA's International Space Station, GE Space Systems, the Air Force, and the Navy.

Item 2-10

Holland also wrote a 2006 critique of the Stern Review for World Economics. Holland, who is a member of the Institution of Engineering and Technology, critiqued modern climate science methods and the UN IPCC process.

"[Climate science] is by all measures as important a field of research as medicine, and ought to operate to standards at least as high, but it does not. On the contrary, it is steeped in bias, concealment and spin," Holland, wrote in his November paper for Energy & Environment. "Strong and well-founded scientific disagreement remains," he wrote. Holland took the IPCC to task. "The IPCC's governing principles are interpreted loosely, for example the strong scientific and statistical disagreements expressed by reviewers are not adequately, if at all, recorded in IPCC reports. Unpublished papers supporting IPCC orthodoxy are

included even though their supporting data and methodology are not available. The use of non-disclosure agreements runs entirely counter to the IPCC's role," he wrote.

Engineer David Holland authored a November 2007 study titled "Bias and Concealment in the IPCC Process: The 'Hockey-Stick' Affair and its Implications" which was published in the scientific journal Energy & Environment.

Item 2-11

David Henderson derided the UN IPCC process in a presentation in Brussels on April 18, 2007. "I believe that there is a problem of unwarranted trust in the IPCC process and in the role of the Panel itself, a problem which the Stern Review shows no awareness of. In peer-reviewed work that the IPCC has drawn on, the authors concerned have failed to make due disclosure of data, sources and procedures, and the IPCC has not required them to do so," Henderson said.

Noting that he believed the IPCC "has acquired what is effectively a monopoly position," Henderson said the IPCC was "far from being a model of rigor, inclusiveness, and impartiality." "To begin with, the very idea of creating a single would-be authoritative fount of wisdom is itself open to doubt. Even if the IPCC process were indisputably and consistently rigorous, objective and professionally watertight, it is imprudent for governments to place virtually exclusive reliance, in matters of extraordinary complexity where huge uncertainties prevail, on a single source of analysis and advice and a single process of inquiry.

Viewed in this light, the very notion of setting consensus as an aim appears as questionable if not ill-judged," he said. Henderson also dismissed the Stern Review as "a heavily biased, exercise in speculative alarmism" and urged governments to "think again" about the focus on CO₂ reductions. "Rather than pursuing as a matter of urgency ambitious and costly targets for curbing CO₂ emissions, [governments] should take prompt steps to ensure that they and their citizens are more fully and more objectively informed and advised," he said.

Economist David Henderson, a Professor at the Westminster Business School and former Chief economist for the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development.

Item 2-12

In an essay published on December 5, 2007 in the National Post, Dr. Ross McKittrick describes new research that shows the IPCC surface temperature record is exaggerated.

"The data come from thermometers around the world, but between the thermometer readings and the final, famous, warming ramp, a lot of statistical modelling aims at removing known sources of exaggeration in the warming trend. In a new article in the December 2007 issue of the peer-reviewed Journal of Geophysical Research, Climatologist Dr. Patrick Michaels and McKittrick concluded that the temperature manipulations for the steep post-1980 period are inadequate, and the [IPCC] graph is an exaggeration.

McKittrick believes that the United Nations agency promoting the global temperature graph has made "false claims about the quality of its data." McKittrick reports in this new, peer-reviewed study that data contamination problems "account for about half the surface warming measured over land since 1980."

Dr. Ross McKittrick, Associate Professor of Environmental Economics at the University of Guelph. McKittrick, a UN IPCC expert reviewer, and one of the debunkers of the IPCC 'hockey stick' graph, is co-author of the prize-winning best-seller "Taken By Storm: The Troubled Science, Policy and Politics of Global Warming."

Item 2-13

Dr. Robert Higgs rejected the notion of a "consensus" on man-made global warming and dismissed the UN IPCC's scientific credentials.

"The United Nations (and its committees and the bureaus it oversees) is no more a scientific organization than the U.S. Congress (and its committees and the bureaus it oversees). When decisions and pronouncements come forth from these political organizations, it makes sense to treat them as essentially political in origin and purpose," Higgs wrote on May 7, 2007.

"I have thirty-nine years of professional experience -- twenty-six as a university professor, including fifteen at a major research university, and then thirteen as a researcher, writer, and editor -- in close contact with scientists of various sorts, including some in the biological and physical sciences and many in the social sciences and demography. I have served as a peer reviewer for more than thirty professional journals and as a reviewer of research proposals for the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health," Higgs wrote.

He then explained how the peer-review process has many flaws. "Personal vendettas, ideological conflicts, professional jealousies, methodological disagreements, sheer self-promotion, and a great deal of plain incompetence and irresponsibility are no strangers to the scientific world; indeed, that world is rife with these all-too-human attributes. In no event can peer review ensure that research is correct in its procedures or its conclusions. The history of every science is a chronicle of one mistake after another," Higgs wrote.

Economist Dr. Robert Higgs, a Senior Fellow for the Independent Institute and who has been a visiting scholar at Oxford University, Stanford University, and a fellow for the National Science Foundation.

Item 2-14

Bob Foster denounced the UN IPCC reports. "Belief in the mythical stability of past climate has, as its equally-implausible corollary, belief that 'doing the right thing' about greenhouse gas emissions can ensure a stable future climate," Foster wrote in a May 22, 2005 article.

"IPCC's hypothesis of a people-driven climate is said to represent the consensus of 2,500 of the world's top climate scientists; and it has been embraced unquestioningly by Australia's governments, Federal and State. The Mediaeval Warm Period and Little Ice Age have been abolished; and IPCC ostentatiously promotes the 'Mann Hockeystick' - a thousand-year temperature graph purporting to show a stable pre-industrial climate (handle), disturbed only now by humans burning fossil fuels (blade)," Foster wrote.

"The Kyoto Protocol is but King Canute's first step toward impoverishing the world for no attainable purpose. But an alternative hypothesis offers two natural drivers for our ever-changing climate. Both have an underlying solar/planetary pace-maker, although via very different mechanisms. Humans can't control the Sun and planets - or climate," he added.

Geologist Bob Foster, director of the Lavoisier Group in Australia.

Item 2-15

Ollier dismissed fears of Greenland and Antarctic ice melts in an October 21, 2007 report entitled "The Greenland-Antartica Melting Problem Does Not Exist." Ollier debunked fears of a meltdown promoted by NASA's James Hansen. "Hansen is a modeller, and his scenario for the collapse of the ice sheets is based on a false model," Ollier wrote. "Hansen has a model of an ice sheet sliding along an inclined plane, lubricated by meltwater, which is itself increasing because of global warming. The same model is adopted in many copy-cat papers. Christoffersen and Hambrey (2006) and Bamber et al. (2007).

A popular article based on the same flawed model appeared in the June 2007 issue of National Geographic, and the idea is present in textbooks such as The Great Ice Age (2000) by R.C.L. Wilson et al.," Ollier explained. "Hansen's model, unfortunately, includes neither the main form of the Greenland and Antarctic Ice Sheets, nor an understanding of how glaciers flow. The predicted behaviour of the

ice sheets is based on melting and accumulation rates at the present day, and on the concept of an ice sheet sliding down an inclined plane on a base lubricated by meltwater, which is itself increasing because of global warming. The idea of a glacier sliding downhill on a base lubricated by meltwater seemed a good idea when first presented by de Saussure in 1779, but a lot has been learned since then," he added.

"It is not enough to think that present climate over a few decades can affect the flow of ice sheets. Ice sheets do not simply grow and melt in response to average global temperature. Anyone with this naïve view would have difficulty in explaining why glaciation has been present in the southern hemisphere for about 30 million years, and in the northern hemisphere for only 3 million years," Ollier continued. "Some of the present-day claims that ice sheets 'collapse' are based on false concepts. Ice sheets do not melt from the surface down - only at the edges. Once the edges are lost, further loss depends on the rate of flow of the ice. The rate of flow of an ice sheet does not depend on the present climate, but on the amount of ice already accumulated, and that will keep it flowing for a very long time. It is possible that any increase in temperature will cause increased snowfall thereby nourishing the growth of the ice sheet, not diminishing it," he wrote.

"The global warming doomsday writers claim the Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets are melting catastrophically, and will cause a sudden rise in sea level of 5 or more metres. This ignores the mechanism of glacier flow which is by creep. Glaciers are not melting from the surface down, nor are they sliding down an inclined plane lubricated by meltwater. The existence of ice over 3 km thick preserving details of past snowfall and atmospheres, used to decipher past temperature and CO2 levels, shows that the ice sheets have accumulated for hundreds of thousands of years without melting. Variations in melting around the edges of ice sheets are no indication that they are collapsing. Indeed 'collapse' is impossible," he concluded.

Geologist Dr. Cliff Ollier, a Research Fellow at the University of Western Australia, has worked internationally as a geologist, geomorphologist, and soil scientist, and has authored ten books and over 300 publications.

Item 2-16

Erich Roeckner laments the lack of climate computer model reliability. "Clouds are still our biggest headache," Roeckner conceded, according to a May 7, 2007 article in DER SPIEGEL

According to the article, "Even the most powerful computer models are still too imprecise to simulate the details. However, the clouds alone will determine whether temperatures will increase by one degree more or less than the average predicted by the models. This is a significant element of uncertainty. Roeckner is a conscientious

man and a veteran of climate research, so he, of all people, should know the limits of simulation programs. Roeckner, who constantly expects surprises, neatly sums up the problem when he says, 'No model will ever be as complex as nature.'

The Der Spiegel article continued, "'According to our computer model, neither the number nor intensity of storms is increasing,' says Jochem Marotzke, director of the Hamburg-based Max Planck Institute for Meteorology, one of the world's leading climate research centers. 'Only the boundaries of low-pressure zones are changing slightly, meaning that weather is becoming more severe in Scandinavia and less so in the Mediterranean.'"

Roeckner also questioned some of the computer "scenarios" used by the UN IPCC to predict the future impacts of global warming. "Some emissions scenarios are perhaps already demonstrably wrong," Roeckner said according to January 26, 2006 interview in the journal Nature. "It is possible that all of them are wrong."

Veteran climate researcher, Erich Roeckner of the Max Planck Institute for Meteorology.

Item 2-17

John McLean revealed very few scientists are actively involved in the UN's peer-review process. According to McLean's analysis, "The IPCC would have us believe that its reports are diligently reviewed by many hundreds of scientists and that these reviewers endorse the contents of the report. Analyses of reviewer comments show a very different and disturbing story." The paper continued, "In [the IPCC's] Chapter 9, the key science chapter, the IPCC concludes that 'it is very highly likely that greenhouse gas forcing has been the dominant cause of the observed global warming over the last 50 years.' The IPCC leads us to believe that this statement is very much supported by the majority of reviewers. The reality is that there is surprisingly little explicit support for this key notion.

Among the 23 independent reviewers just 4 explicitly endorsed the chapter with its hypothesis, and one other endorsed only a specific section. Moreover, only 62 of the IPCC's 308 reviewers commented on this chapter at all." The analysis concluded, "The IPCC reports appear to be largely based on a consensus of scientific papers, but those papers are the product of research for which the funding is strongly influenced by previous IPCC reports. This makes the claim of a human influence self-perpetuating and for a corruption of the normal scientific process."

Australian climate data analyst John McLean authored a September 2007 study which found the UN IPCC peer-review process is "an illusion." A September 2007 analysis of the IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) scientific review process entitled "Peer Review? What Peer Review?"

Item 2-18

Stephen McIntyre exposed a NASA temperature data error in 2007 which led to 1934 -- not the previously hyped 1998 -- being declared the hottest in U.S. history since records began. Revised NASA temperature data now reveals four of the top ten hottest years in the U.S. were in the 1930's while only three of the hottest years occurred in the last decade. [Note: 80% of man-made CO2 emissions occurred after 1940.]

"NASA has yet to own up fully to its historic error in misinterpreting US surface temperatures to conform to the Global Warming hypothesis, as discovered by Stephen McIntyre at ClimateAudit.org," reported an August 17, 2007 article in American Thinker.

McIntyre has also harshly critiqued the UN IPCC process. "So the purpose of the three-month delay between the publication of the (IPCC) Summary for Policy-Makers and the release of the actual WG1 (Working Group 1 report) is to enable them to make any 'necessary' adjustments to the technical report to match the policy summary. Unbelievable. Can you imagine what securities commissions would say if business promoters issued a big promotion and then the promoters made the 'necessary' adjustments to the qualifying reports and financial statements so that they matched the promotion. Words fail me," McIntyre explained January 2007.

Climate data analyst Stephen McIntyre of ClimateAudit.org, one of the individuals responsible for debunking the infamous "Hockey Stick" temperature graph.

Item 2-19

Canadian climatologist Dr. Timothy Ball called fears of man-made global warming "the greatest deception in the history of science" in a February 5, 2007 op-ed in Canada Free Press.

"Believe it or not, Global Warming is not due to human contribution of Carbon Dioxide (CO2). This, in fact, is the greatest deception in the history of science. We are wasting time, energy and trillions of dollars while creating unnecessary fear and consternation over an issue with no scientific justification," Ball wrote. "The world has warmed since 1680, the nadir of a cool period called the Little Ice Age (LIA) that has generally continued to the present. These climate changes are well within natural variability and explained quite easily by changes in the sun. But there is nothing unusual going on," Ball explained.

"As [MIT's Richard] Lindzen said many years ago, 'the consensus was reached before the research had even begun.' Now, any scientist who dares to question the prevailing wisdom is marginalized and called a skeptic, when in fact they are simply being good scientists. This has reached frightening levels with these scientists now being called climate change denier with all the holocaust connotations of that word. The normal scientific method is effectively being thwarted," Ball concluded.

Ball also explained that one of the reasons climate models are failing is because they overestimate the warming effect of CO₂ in the atmosphere. Ball described how CO₂'s warming impact diminishes. "Even if CO₂ concentration doubles or triples, the effect on temperature would be minimal. The relationship between temperature and CO₂ is like painting a window black to block sunlight. The first coat blocks most of the light. Second and third coats reduce very little more. Current CO₂ levels are like the first coat of black paint," Ball explained in a June 6, 2007 article in Canada Free Press.

Canadian climatologist Dr. Timothy Ball, formerly of the University of Winnipeg, who earned his PhD from the University of London.

Item 2-20

Madhav Khandekar, slammed the UN IPCC process.

"To my dismay, IPCC authors ignored all my comments and suggestions for major changes in the FOD (First Order Draft) and sent me the SOD (Second Order Draft) with essentially the same text as the FOD. None of the authors of the chapter bothered to directly communicate with me (or with other expert reviewers with whom I communicate on a regular basis) on many issues that were raised in my review. This is not an acceptable scientific review process," Khandekar wrote in a May 28, 2007 letter to the editor of Canada's The Hill Times.

"Adherents of the IPCC science like to insist that the debate over climate change science is over and it is now time for action. I urge [those IPCC supporters] to browse through recent issues of major international journals in climate and related science. Hardly a week goes by without a significant paper being published questioning the science," Khandekar added. "The science of climate change is continuously evolving. The IPCC and its authors have closed their minds and eyes to this evolving science which points to solar variability as the prime driver of earth's climate and not the human-added greenhouse gases," he concluded.

Khandekar also further critiqued the UN's IPCC process in a February 13, 2007 interview in the Winnipeg Sun. "I think the IPCC science is a bit too simplistic," he explained. "IPCC scientists did not thoroughly analyze why the Earth's surface temperature -- land and ocean combined -- has increased only modestly in the past

30 years," Khandekar said. "We have not fully explored why the climate changes from one state to another. It is too premature to say," he concluded

IPCC 2007 Expert Reviewer Madhav Khandekar, a Ph.D meteorologist, a scientist with the Natural Resources Stewardship Project who has over 45 years experience in climatology, meteorology and oceanography, and who has published nearly 100 papers, reports, book reviews and a book on Ocean Wave Analysis and Modeling.

Item 2-21

Albert F. Jacobs critiqued the Associated Press for hyping climate fears in 2007.

"Basic to the IPCC case for sea level rise and for the alarmists' hype is the hypothesis that increasing levels of carbon dioxide will cause increasing amounts of global warming. It should be stressed that this assumption of truth is no more than a hypothesis, which is increasingly being attacked and on which any meaningful discussion has been thwarted by the IPCC's political masters," Jacobs wrote to EPW on September 23, 2007.

"As far as CO₂ is concerned, basic physics has always been clear about the limitations of higher concentrations of gas to absorb equivalent amounts of heat radiation. 'Doubling of CO₂' does none of the things the IPCC's computer says it does. And that's all separate from the fact that water vapour is a much greater 'greenhouse' driver than carbon dioxide in any case," Jacobs added.

Canadian Geologist Albert F. Jacobs, co-founder of the group Friends of Science.

Item 2-22

Dr. Hendrik Tennekes took climate modelers to task for their projections of future planetary doom in a February 28, 2007 post on Climate Science. "I am of the opinion that most scientists engaged in the design, development, and tuning of climate models are in fact software engineers. They are unlicensed, hence unqualified to sell their products to society. In all regular engineering professions, there exists a licensing authority. If such an authority existed in climate research, I contend, the vast majority of climate modelers would vainly attempt certification. Also, they would be unable to obtain insurance against professional liability," Tennekes said.

Tennekes also unleashed on the promoters of climate fears in a January 31, 2007 article. "I worry about the arrogance of scientists who claim they can help

solve the climate problem, provided their research receives massive increases in funding", he wrote. "I am angry about the Climate Doomsday hype that politicians and scientists engage in. I am angry at Al Gore, I am angry at the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists for resetting its Doomsday clock, I am angry at Lord Martin Rees for using the full weight of the Royal Society in support of the Doomsday hype, I am angry at Paul Crutzen for his speculations about yet another technological fix, I am angry at the staff of IPCC for their preoccupation with carbon dioxide emissions, and I am angry at Jim Hansen for his efforts to sell a Greenland Ice Sheet Meltdown Catastrophe," he explained.

Tennekes has also blasted Gore and the UN in the Dutch De Volkskrant newspaper on March 28, 2007. "I find the Doomsday picture Al Gore is painting - a six-meter sea level rise, fifteen times the IPCC number - entirely without merit," Tennekes wrote. "I protest vigorously the idea that the climate reacts like a home heating system to a changed setting of the thermostat: just turn the dial, and the desired temperature will soon be reached. We cannot run the climate as we wish," Tennekes said. "Whatever the IPCC staff thinks, it is not at all inconceivable that decreasing solar activity will lead to some cooling ten years from now," he concluded.

Atmospheric scientist Dr. Hendrik Tennekes, a scientific pioneer in the development of numerical weather prediction and former director of research at The Netherlands' Royal National Meteorological Institute.

Item 2-23

Dr. Philip Lloyd, **a UN IPCC co-coordinating lead author** on the Technical Report on Carbon Capture & Storage rejects man-made climate fears. "I have grave difficulties in finding any but the most circumstantial evidence for any human impact on the climate," Lloyd wrote to EPW on January 18, 2008.

"The quantity of CO₂ we produce is insignificant in terms of the natural circulation between air, water and soil. I have tried numerous tests for radiative effects, and all have failed. I have tried to develop an isotopic method for identifying stable C¹² (from fossil fuels) and merely ended up understanding the difference between the major plant chemistries and their differing ability to use the different isotopes.

I have studied the ice core record, in detail, and am concerned that those who claim to have a model of our climate future haven't a clue about the forces driving our climate past," Lloyd wrote. "I am particularly concerned that the rigor of science seems to have been sacrificed on an altar of fundraising. I am doing a detailed assessment of the IPCC reports and the Summaries for Policy Makers, identifying the way in which the Summaries have distorted the science. I have found examples

of a Summary saying precisely the opposite of what the scientists said," he concluded.

Nuclear Physicist and Chemical Engineer Dr. Philip Lloyd, a UN IPCC co-coordinating lead author on the Technical Report on Carbon Capture & Storage, was in charge of South Africa's Chamber of Mines' Metallurgy Laboratory and was a former professor at University of Witwatersrand Lloyd has served as President of the South African Institution of Chemical Engineers, the Federation of Societies of Professional Engineers, and the Associated Scientific and Technical Societies of Southern Africa.

Item 2-24

Dr. James P. Koermer dismissed man-made global warming fears. "Global warming hysteria is based to a large extent on the unproven predictions of climate models. These numerical models are based on many simplified approximations of very complicated physical processes and phenomena," Koermer wrote to EPW on December 3, 2007.

"My biggest concern is their [computer models'] lack of ability to adequately handle water vapor and clouds, which are much more important as climate factors than anthropogenic contributors. Until we can realistically simulate types of clouds, their optical thicknesses, and their altitudes, which we have a difficult time doing for short-term weather forecasts, I can't have much faith in climate models," Koermer wrote.

"Another major reason that I remain skeptical is based on what I know about past climate changes that occurred before man walked on earth. I am more amazed with how relatively stable climate has been over the past 15,000 or so years, versus the large changes that frequently appeared to take place prior to that time. I also can't ignore some of the recent evidence presented by some very well respected astrophysicists on solar variability. Most meteorologists including me have always been taught to treat the sun's output as a constant--now I am not so sure and I am intrigued by their preliminary findings relating to climate," he concluded.

Atmospheric scientist Dr. James P. Koermer, a Professor of Meteorology and the director of the Meteorological Institute at Plymouth State University.

Item 2-25

Dr. Antonio Zichichi questioned man-made global warming fears. According to an April 27, 2007 article at Zenit.org, Zichichi "pointed out that human activity has less than 10% impact on the environment."

The article noted that Zichichi "showed that the mathematical models used by the [UN's] IPCC do not correspond to the criteria of the scientific method. He said the IPCC used 'the method of 'forcing' to arrive at their conclusions that human activity produces meteorological variations." Zichichi said that based upon actual scientific fact "it is not possible to exclude the idea that climate changes can be due to natural causes," and he added that it is plausible that "man is not to blame."

According to the article, "He also reminded those present that 500,000 years ago the Earth lost the North and South Poles four times. The poles disappeared and reformed four times, he said. Zichichi said that in the end he is not convinced that global warming is caused by the increase of emissions of 'greenhouse gases' produced through human activity. Climate changes, he said, depend in a significant way on the fluctuation of cosmic rays." Zichichi also signed a December 2007 open letter to the United Nations stating in part "Significant new peer-reviewed research has cast even more doubt on the hypothesis of dangerous human-caused global warming."

Internationally renowned scientist Dr. Antonio Zichichi, president of the World Federation of Scientists and a retired Professor of Advanced Physics at the University of Bologna in Italy.

Item 2-26

A December 2007 study recalculated and halved the global average surface temperature trend between 1980 - 2002. The analysis appeared in the Journal of Geophysical Research and was authored by Climatologist Dr. Patrick Michaels and Dr. Ross McKittrick, associate professor at the University of Guelph.

The study concluded that the temperature manipulations for the steep post-1980 period are inadequate, and the [UN IPCC] graph is an exaggeration. McKittrick believes that the United Nations agency promoting the global temperature graph has made "false claims about the quality of its data." McKittrick reports in this new, peer-reviewed study that data contamination problems "account for about half the surface warming measured over land since 1980."

Item 2-27

The abstract of the paper reads in part, "(a) there are no common physical laws between the warming phenomenon in glass houses and the fictitious atmospheric greenhouse effects; (b) there are no calculations to determine an average surface temperature of a planet; (c) the frequently mentioned difference of 33 C is a meaningless number calculated wrongly; (d) the formulas of cavity radiation are used inappropriately; (e) the assumption of a radiative balance is

unphysical; (f) thermal conductivity and friction must not be set to zero, the atmospheric greenhouse conjecture is falsified."

Gerlich and Tscheuschner's study concluded, "The horror visions of a rising sea levels, melting pole caps and developing deserts in North America and in Europe are fictitious consequences of fictitious physical mechanisms, as they cannot be seen even in the climate model computations. The emergence of hurricanes and tornados cannot be predicted by climate models, because all of these deviations are ruled out.

The main strategy of modern CO₂-greenhouse gas defenders seems to hide themselves behind more and more pseudo explanations, which are not part of the academic education or even of the physics training."

Physicist Dr. Gerhard Gerlich, of the Institute of Mathematical Physics at the Technical University Carolo-Wilhelmina in Braunschweig in Germany, and Dr. Ralf D. Tscheuschner co-authored a July 7, 2007 paper titled "Falsification of the Atmospheric CO₂ Greenhouse Effects Within the Frame of Physics."

Item 2-28

Denis G. Rancourt believes the global warming campaigns do a disservice to the environmental movement. "Promoting the global warming myth trains people to accept unverified, remote, and abstract dangers in the place of true problems that they can discover for themselves by becoming directly engaged in their workplace and by doing their own research and observations.

It trains people to think lifestyle choices (in relation to CO₂ emission) rather than to think activism in the sense of exerting an influence to change societal structures," Rancourt wrote in a February 27, 2007 blog post. Rancourt believes that global warming "will not become humankind's greatest threat until the sun has its next hiccup in a billion years or more (in the very unlikely scenario that we are still around,)" and noted that even if CO₂ emissions were a grave threat, "government action and political will cannot measurably or significantly ameliorate global climate in the present world."

Rancourt believes environmentalists have been duped into promoting global warming as a crisis. "I argue that by far the most destructive force on the planet is power-driven financiers and profit-driven corporations and their cartels backed by military might; and that the global warming myth is a red herring that contributes to hiding this truth. In my opinion, activists who, using any justification, feed the global warming myth have effectively been co-opted, or at best neutralized," Rancourt wrote.

Rancourt also questioned the whole concept of a global average temperature, noting, "Averaging problems aside, many tenuous approximations must be made in order to arrive at any of the reported final global average temperature curves." He further explained: "This means that determining an average of a quantity (Earth surface temperature) that is everywhere different and continuously changing with time at every point, using measurements at discrete times and places (weather stations), is virtually impossible; in that the resulting number is highly sensitive to the chosen extrapolation method(s) needed to calculate (or rather approximate) the average." "The estimates are uncertain and can change the calculated global warming by as much as 0.5 C, thereby removing the originally reported effect entirely," he added.

Finally, Rancourt asserted that in a warm world, life prospers. "There is no known case of a sustained warming alone having negatively impacted an entire population," he said, adding, "As a general rule, all life on Earth does better when it's hotter: Compare ecological diversity and biotic density (or biomass) at the poles and at the equator." Rancourt added, "Global warming is strictly an imaginary problem of the First World middle class."

Dr. Denis G. Rancourt, Professor of Physics and an Environmental Science researcher at the University of Ottawa.

Item 2-29

Climatologist Dr. John Christy, a **UN IPCC lead author** in 2001 for the 3rd assessment report, detailed how he witnessed scientists distorting the science.

"I was at the table with three Europeans, and we were having lunch. And they were talking about their role as lead authors. And they were talking about how they were trying to make the report so dramatic that the United States would just have to sign that Kyoto Protocol," Christy told CNN on May 2, 2007.

"One of the statements in the [IPCC Summary for Policymakers] SPM was the statement that, if you boil it down, it says we are 90 percent certain that most of the warming in the last 50 years was due to human effects. I don't agree with that. I think things are much more ambiguous," Christy said.

Christy also dismissed Gore's warning of a 20 foot sea level rise to due future global warming. "To come up with 20 feet is really grasping at straws, I think, but it does make a dramatic image. It makes a startling announcement," Christy said. Christy dismissed fears of man-made climate doom. "I don't see a catastrophe developing from our emissions into the air of what should be correctly identified as 'plant food,'" Christy wrote in a February 6, 2007 article.

"The climate cannot be predictably managed with such [emission reduction] proposals given the uncertainty of natural variations. For example, to make a 10 percent dent in CO2 would require 1000 nuclear power plants and this would still not make a measurable difference on whatever the climate will do anyway," Christy explained. "I'm full of optimism about the continued growth of wealth and health around the world. This wealth will create cleaner environments even in countries where persistent poverty has destroyed too much habitat and fouled too many rivers," he concluded.

Alabama State Climatologist Dr. John Christy of the University of Alabama in Huntsville and NASA, served as a UN IPCC lead author in 2001 for the 3rd assessment report.

Item 2-30

Dr. Bob Carter discredits the UN IPCC.

"Many distinguished scientists refuse to participate in the IPCC process, and others have resigned from it, because in the end the advice that the panel provides to governments is political and not scientific. Although at least -\$50 billion has been spent on climate research, the science arguments for a dangerous human influence on global warming have, if anything, become weaker since the establishment of the IPCC in 1988," Carter wrote in an April 11, 2007 op-ed in the UK Telegraph.

Carter, who has had over 100 papers published refereed scientific journals, continued, "For more than 90 per cent of recent geological time, the cores show that the earth has been colder than today. We modern humans are lucky to live towards the end of the most recent of the intermittent, and welcome, warm interludes. It is a 10,000 year-long period called the Holo-cene, during which our civilizations have evolved and flourished. Similar cores through polar ice reveal, contrary to received wisdom, that past temperature changes were followed - not preceded, but followed - by changes in the atmospheric content of carbon dioxide.

Yet the public now believes strongly that increasing human carbon dioxide emissions will cause runaway warming; it is surely a strange cause of climate change that naturally postdates its supposed effect?" he added. "So the evidence for dangerous global warming forced by human carbon dioxide emissions is extremely weak. That the satellite temperature record shows no substantial warming since 1978, and that even the ground-based thermometer statistic records no warming since 1998, indicates that a key line of circumstantial evidence for human-caused change (the parallel rise in the late 20th century of both atmospheric carbon dioxide and surface temperature) is now negated," Carter concluded.

Carter also wrote a June 18, 2007 op-ed detailing even more skepticism on climate fears. "Lower atmosphere satellite-based temperature measurements, if

corrected for non-greenhouse influences such as El Niño events and large volcanic eruptions, show little if any global warming since 1979, a period over which atmospheric CO₂ has increased by 55 ppm (17 per cent)," Carter wrote. "There are strong indications from solar studies that Earth's current temperature stasis will be followed by climatic cooling over the next few decades," he added.

Paleoclimate scientist Dr. Bob Carter of Australia's James Cook University and former chairman of the earth science panel of the Australian Research Council.

Item 2-31

Dr. Christopher W. Landsea who served as a **UN IPCC as both an author and a reviewer** noted that recent hurricane activity is not linked to man-made factors.

According to a February 23, 2007 article in Myrtle Beach Online, Landsea explained that "the 1926-1935 period was worse for hurricanes than the past 10 years and 1900-1905 was almost as bad." Landsea asserted that it is therefore not true that there is a current trend of more and stronger hurricanes. "It's not a trend, it's a cycle: 20-45 years quiet, 20-45 years busy," Landsea said. He did say that a warming world would only make hurricanes "5 percent stronger 100 years from now. We can't measure it if it's that small." The article said Landsea blamed Gore's An Inconvenient Truth, for "persuad[ing] some people that global warming is contributing to hurricane frequency and strength."

Landsea, who was both an author and a reviewer for the IPCC's 2nd Assessment Report in 1995 and the 3rd Assessment Report in 2001, resigned from the 4th Assessment Report after b charging the UN with playing politics with Hurricane science. "I am withdrawing because I have come to view the part of the IPCC to which my expertise is relevant as having become politicized. In addition, when I have raised my concerns to the IPCC leadership, their response was simply to dismiss my concerns," Landsea wrote in a January 17, 2005 public letter.

"My view is that when people identify themselves as being associated with the IPCC and then make pronouncements far outside current scientific understandings that this will harm the credibility of climate change science and will in the longer term diminish our role in public policy," he continued. "I personally cannot in good faith continue to contribute to a process that I view as both being motivated by pre-conceived agendas and being scientifically unsound," Landsea added.

Atmospheric scientist and hurricane expert Dr. Christopher W. Landsea NOAA's National Hurricane Center who served as a UN IPCC as both an author and a reviewer and has published numerous peer-reviewed research.