

SCEPTICS WORDS 3 -

LACK OF CONSENSUS

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 lack of reality, and concept of a scientific consensus on global warming. Groups of scientists have stated their concerns in open letters and similar

documents to show that there are many who disagree with the perceived wisdom of man-made global warming.

Item 3-1

A 2006 open letter to Prime Minister Stephen Harper [Canadian Prime Minister]:

Dear Prime Minister:

As accredited experts in climate and related scientific disciplines, we are writing to propose that balanced, comprehensive public-consultation sessions be held so as to examine the scientific foundation of the federal government's climate-change plans. This would be entirely consistent with your recent commitment to conduct a review of the Kyoto Protocol. Although many of us made the same suggestion to then-prime ministers Martin and Chretien, neither responded, and, to date, no formal, independent climate-science review has been conducted in Canada. Much of the billions of dollars earmarked for implementation of the protocol in Canada will be squandered without a proper assessment of recent developments in climate science.

Observational evidence does not support today's computer climate models, so there is little reason to trust model predictions of the future. Yet this is precisely what the United Nations did in creating and promoting Kyoto and still does in the alarmist forecasts on which Canada's climate policies are based. Even if the climate models were realistic, the environmental impact of Canada delaying implementation of Kyoto or other greenhouse-gas reduction schemes, pending completion of consultations, would be insignificant. Directing your government to convene balanced, open hearings as soon as possible would be a most prudent and responsible course of action.

While the confident pronouncements of scientifically unqualified environmental groups may provide for sensational headlines, they are no basis for mature policy formulation. The study of global climate change is, as you have said, an "emerging science," one that is perhaps the most complex ever tackled. It may be many years yet before we properly understand the Earth's climate system. Nevertheless, significant advances have been made since the protocol was created, many of which are taking us away from a concern about increasing greenhouse gases. If, back in the mid-1990s, we knew what we know today about climate, Kyoto would almost certainly not exist, because we would have concluded it was not necessary.

We appreciate the difficulty any government has formulating sensible science-based policy when the loudest voices always seem to be pushing in the opposite direction. However, by convening open, unbiased consultations, Canadians will be permitted to hear from experts on both sides of the debate in the climate-science

community. When the public comes to understand that there is no "consensus" among climate scientists about the relative importance of the various causes of global climate change, the government will be in a far better position to develop plans that reflect reality and so benefit both the environment and the economy.

"Climate change is real" is a meaningless phrase used repeatedly by activists to convince the public that a climate catastrophe is looming and humanity is the cause. Neither of these fears is justified. Global climate changes all the time due to natural causes and the human impact still remains impossible to distinguish from this natural "noise." The new Canadian government's commitment to reducing air, land and water pollution is commendable, but allocating funds to "stopping climate change" would be irrational. We need to continue intensive research into the real causes of climate change and help our most vulnerable citizens adapt to whatever nature throws at us next.

We believe the Canadian public and government decision-makers need and deserve to hear the whole story concerning this very complex issue. It was only 30 years ago that many of today's global-warming alarmists were telling us that the world was in the midst of a global-cooling catastrophe. But the science continued to evolve, and still does, even though so many choose to ignore it when it does not fit with predetermined political agendas.

We hope that you will examine our proposal carefully and we stand willing and able to furnish you with more information on this crucially important topic.

CC: The Honourable Rona Ambrose, Minister of the Environment, and the Honourable Gary Lunn, Minister of Natural Resources

Sincerely,

Dr. Ian D. Clark, professor, isotope hydrogeology and paleoclimatology, Dept. of Earth Sciences, University of Ottawa

Dr. Tad Murty, former senior research scientist, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, former director of Australia's National Tidal Facility and professor of earth sciences, Flinders University, Adelaide; currently adjunct professor, Departments of Civil Engineering and Earth Sciences, University of Ottawa

Dr. R. Timothy Patterson, professor, Dept. of Earth Sciences (paleoclimatology), Carleton University, Ottawa

Dr. Fred Michel, director, Institute of Environmental Science and associate professor, Dept. of Earth Sciences, Carleton University, Ottawa

Dr. Madhav Khandekar, former research scientist, Environment Canada. Member of editorial board of Climate Research and Natural Hazards

Dr. Paul Copper, FRSC, professor emeritus, Dept. of Earth Sciences, Laurentian University, Sudbury, Ont.

Dr. Ross McKittrick, associate professor, Dept. of Economics, University of Guelph, Ont.

Dr. Tim Ball, former professor of climatology, University of Winnipeg; environmental consultant

Dr. Andreas Prokoph, adjunct professor of earth sciences, University of Ottawa; consultant in statistics and geology

Mr. David Nowell, M.Sc. (Meteorology), fellow of the Royal Meteorological Society, Canadian member and past chairman of the NATO Meteorological Group, Ottawa

Dr. Christopher Essex, professor of applied mathematics and associate director of the Program in Theoretical Physics, University of Western Ontario, London, Ont.

*** Dr. Gordon E. Swaters, professor of applied mathematics, Dept. of Mathematical Sciences, and member, Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Research Group, University of Alberta (* Note: Swaters later recanted his signature on the open letter)**

Dr. L. Graham Smith, associate professor, Dept. of Geography, University of Western Ontario, London, Ont.

Dr. G. Cornelis van Kooten, professor and Canada Research Chair in environmental studies and climate change, Dept. of Economics, University of Victoria

Dr. Petr Chylek, adjunct professor, Dept. of Physics and Atmospheric Science, Dalhousie University, Halifax

Dr./Cdr. M. R. Morgan, FRMS, climate consultant, former meteorology advisor to the World Meteorological Organization. Previously research scientist in climatology at University of Exeter, U.K.

Dr. Keith D. Hage, climate consultant and professor emeritus of Meteorology, University of Alberta

Dr. David E. Wojick, P.Eng., energy consultant, Star Tannery, Va., and Sioux Lookout, Ont.

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

Dr. Douglas Leahey, meteorologist and air-quality consultant, Calgary

Paavo Siitam, M.Sc., agronomist, chemist, Cobourg, Ont.

Dr. Chris de Freitas, climate scientist, associate professor, The University of Auckland, N.Z.

Dr. Richard S. Lindzen, Alfred P. Sloan professor of meteorology, Dept. of Earth, Atmospheric and Planetary Sciences, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Dr. Freeman J. Dyson, emeritus professor of physics, Institute for Advanced Studies, Princeton, N.J.

Mr. George Taylor, Dept. of Meteorology, Oregon State University; Oregon State climatologist; past president, American Association of State Climatologists

Dr. Ian Plimer, professor of geology, School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Adelaide; emeritus professor of earth sciences, University of Melbourne, Australia

Dr. R.M. Carter, professor, Marine Geophysical Laboratory, James Cook University, Townsville, Australia

Mr. William Kininmonth, Australasian Climate Research, former Head National Climate Centre, Australian Bureau of Meteorology; former Australian delegate to World Meteorological Organization Commission for Climatology, Scientific and Technical Review

Dr. Hendrik Tennekes, former director of research, Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute

Dr. Gerrit J. van der Lingen, geologist/paleoclimatologist, Climate Change Consultant, Geoscience Research and Investigations, New Zealand

Dr. Patrick J. Michaels, professor of environmental sciences, University of Virginia

Dr. Nils-Axel Morner, emeritus professor of paleogeophysics & geodynamics, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden

Dr. Gary D. Sharp, Center for Climate/Ocean Resources Study, Salinas, Calif.

Dr. Roy W. Spencer, principal research scientist, Earth System Science Center, The University of Alabama, Huntsville

Dr. Al Pekarek, associate professor of geology, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences Dept., St. Cloud State University, St. Cloud, Minn.

Dr. Marcel Leroux, professor emeritus of climatology, University of Lyon, France; former director of Laboratory of Climatology, Risks and Environment, CNRS

Dr. Paul Reiter, professor, Institute Pasteur, Unit of Insects and Infectious Diseases, Paris, France Expert reviewer, IPCC Working group II, chapter 8 (human health)

Dr. Zbigniew Jaworowski, physicist and chairman, Scientific Council of Central Laboratory for Radiological Protection, Warsaw, Poland

Dr. Sonja Boehmer-Christiansen, reader, Dept. of Geography, University of Hull, U.K.; editor, Energy & Environment

Dr. Hans H.J. Labohm, former advisor to the executive board, Clingendael Institute (The Netherlands Institute of International Relations) and an economist who has focused on climate change

Dr. Lee C. Gerhard, senior scientist emeritus, University of Kansas, past director and state geologist, Kansas Geological Survey

Dr. Asmunn Moene, past head of the Forecasting Centre, Meteorological Institute, Norway

Dr. August H. Auer, past professor of atmospheric science, University of Wyoming; previously chief meteorologist, Meteorological Service (MetService) of New Zealand

Dr. Vincent Gray, expert reviewer for the IPCC and author of The Greenhouse Delusion: A Critique of 'Climate Change 2001,' Wellington, N.Z.

Dr. Howard Hayden, emeritus professor of physics, University of Connecticut

Dr Benny Peiser, professor of social anthropology, Faculty of Science, Liverpool John Moores University, U.K.

Dr. Jack Barrett, chemist and spectroscopist, formerly with Imperial College London, U.K.

Dr. William J.R. Alexander, professor emeritus, Dept. of Civil and Biosystems Engineering, University of Pretoria, South Africa. Member, United Nations Scientific and Technical Committee on Natural Disasters, 1994-2000

Dr. S. Fred Singer, professor emeritus of environmental sciences, University of Virginia; former director, U.S. Weather Satellite Service

Dr. Harry N.A. Priem, emeritus professor of planetary geology and isotope geophysics, Utrecht University; former director of the Netherlands Institute for

Isotope Geosciences; past president of the Royal Netherlands Geological & Mining Society

Dr. Robert H. Essenhigh, E.G. Bailey professor of energy conversion, Dept. of Mechanical Engineering, The Ohio State University

Dr. Sallie Baliunas, astrophysicist and climate researcher, Boston, Mass.

Douglas Hoyt, senior scientist at Raytheon (retired) and co-author of the book The Role of the Sun in Climate Change; previously with NCAR, NOAA, and the World Radiation Center, Davos, Switzerland

Dipl.-Ing. Peter Dietze, independent energy advisor and scientific climate and carbon modeller, official IPCC reviewer, Bavaria, Germany

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

Dr. Wibjorn Karlen, emeritus professor, Dept. of Physical Geography and Quaternary Geology, Stockholm University, Sweden

Dr. Hugh W. Ellsaesser, physicist/meteorologist, previously with the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Calif.; atmospheric consultant.

Dr. Art Robinson, founder, Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine, Cave Junction, Ore.

Dr. Arthur Rorsch, emeritus professor of molecular genetics, Leiden University, the Netherlands; past board member, Netherlands organization for applied research (TNO) in environmental, food and public health

Dr. Alister McFarquhar, Downing College, Cambridge, U.K.; international economist

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

Item 3-2

A group of German scientists of "several scientific disciplines" formed a new group in 2007 to declare themselves climate change skeptics and issued a proclamation on September 15, 2007 titled "The Climate Manifest of Heiligenroth." The group, which included prominent scientist Ernst-George Beck who authored a groundbreaking February 2007 paper, entitled "180 Years of Atmospheric CO₂ Analysis by Chemical Methods," publicly issued six basic points of skepticism about man-made global warming. They stated that their "motivation was to initiate processes against daily campaigns of media and politics concerning climate."

Their six points are: 1) "There is not proven influence on climate by manmade emission of CO₂; 2) Scenarios on future climate change derived from computer models are speculative and contradicted by climate history; 3) There has been climate change in all times of Earth history with alternating cold and warm phases; 4) The trace gas CO₂ does not pollute the atmosphere, CO₂ is an essential resource for plant growth and therefore a precondition for life on Earth; 5) We are committing ourselves to an effective preservation of our environment and support arrangements to prevent unnecessary stress on eco systems; and 6) We strongly warn against taking action using imminent climate catastrophe as a vehicle which will not be beneficial for our environment and will cause economic damage."

The declaration was signed by the following scientists: **Biologist Ernst-Georg Beck; Engineer and energy expert Paul Bossert; Biologist Branford Helgo; Hydro biologist Edgar Gardeners; Agricultural scientist Dr. Rainer Six; Engineer Heinze Thieme. Physics Professor Hubert Becker; Rikard Bergsten Master of Science in Physics and Computer Engineering; Professor of physics Dr. Ludecke Horst-Joachim; Peter Martin, Professor of Engineering; Engineer Martin Bock; Chemical and environmental engineer Donald Clauson; Physicist Dr. Theo Eichten; Biochemist Flick Hendrikje; Agricultural scientist Dr. Glatzle Albrecht; Chemist Dr. Hauck Guenther; Professor of environmental and climate physics Dr. Detlef Hebert; Astrophysicist Dr Peter Heller; Chemist Dr. Albert Krause; Forestry scientist Dr. Christoph Leinb; Chemist Dr. Hans Penner; Mathematician Dr. Paul Matthews; Chemist Dr. Wuntke Knut; Meteorologist Klaus-pulse Eckart. Others who signed the declaration included: Dr. Herbert Backhaus; Dieter Ber; Gunter Ederer; Ferdinand Furst zu Hohenlohe-Bartenstein; Dieter Kramer; Uwe Tempel; Brigitte Bossert; Nikolaus Lentz; Werner Vermess Eisenkopf; Wilfried Heck; Heinz Hofman; Rainer Hoffman; and Werner Eisenkopf.**

Item 3-3

A team of scientists signed a June 11, 2007, Cornwall Alliance "Open Letter" debunking man-made global warming fears. Some excerpts read:

"Natural causes may account for a large part, perhaps the majority, of the global warming in both the last thirty and the last one hundred fifty years, which together constitute an episode in the natural rising and falling cycles of global average temperature. Human emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases are probably a minor and possibly an insignificant contributor to its causes,"

The scientists declared. "Reducing carbon dioxide emissions would have at most an insignificant impact on the quantity and duration of global warming and would not significantly reduce alleged harmful effects. Government-mandated carbon dioxide emissions reductions not only would not significantly curtail global warming

or reduce its harmful effects but also would cause greater harm than good to humanity—especially the poor—while offering virtually no benefit to the rest of the world’s inhabitants,” the open letter explained.

Scientists signing the “Open Letter” included: **James F. Drake, Ph.D. (Atmospheric Sciences), Project Engineer, The Aerospace Corporation, Papillon, NE; Charles Clough, M.S. (Atmospheric Science), Th.D., retired meteorologist, Bel Aire, MD; Guillermo Gonzalez, Ph.D., Department of Physics and Astronomy, Iowa State University, Ames, IA; Kent A. Chambers Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Chemistry and Environmental Science, Hardin Simmons University, Abilene, TX; Victor Goldschmidt, Emeritus Professor of Mechanical Engineering, Purdue, University, West Lafayette, IN; Gary O. Gray, Ph.D., Professor of Chemistry, Dean of the College of Science and Mathematics, Southwest Baptist University, Bolivar, MO; Ronald C. Marks, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Chemistry, North Greenville University, Tigerville, South Carolina; Michael R. Salazar, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Chemistry, Union University, Jackson, TN; and Daryl Sas, Ph.D., Professor of Biology, Geneva College, Beaver Falls, PA.**

Item 3-4

An open letter to the Secretary-General of the United Nations from one hundred scientists:

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.

Signatories were:

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

Asmund 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 3-5

Fifteen scientists in the Netherlands signed an open letter declaring "Man is not responsible for global warming" in 2007.

"The warming is mainly natural causes," read the January 11, 2007 open letter signed by the 15 scientists in De Volkskrant, Holland. "Some cite the fact that the climate is currently warming and that the level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is increasing. True - but correlation is never proof of causation. Besides, the climate cooled for much of the 20th century, from 1940 to 1975 -- even while CO₂ was increasing rapidly," the 15 scientists explained. "There are nearly two dozen large models -- each giving a different result, depending on the assumptions fed into the computer," the letter continued. "In any case, model results are never evidence; only actual observations and data count," they added.

"The current warming may well be part of the natural 1500-year cycle that has been measured in ice cores, ocean sediments, stalagmites, etc., going back nearly a million years," the scientists concluded.

The scientists who signed the open letter included:

Peter Bloemers, professor of biochemistry, University of Nijmegen; Adriaan Broere, an engineer and geophysicist, worked in satellite technology; Bas van Geel, paleo-ecology professor, University of Amsterdam; Hub Jongen, electrical engineer; Rob Kouffeld, professor of energy, TU Delft; Rob Melon, professor of molecular recognition, Utrecht University; Jan Mulderink, a chemical engineer, former research director AKZO Arnhem, former chairman for the Foundation of Sustainable Chemical Technology in Wageningen; Harry Priem, . professor of planetary and isotope geology, former director ZWO / NWO Institute for Isotope - Geophysical Research, a former chairman Royal Dutch Geological organization; Henk Schalke, former chairman of the management team IUGS-UNESCO; Olaf Schuiling, Geochemistry professor, University of Utrecht; Dick Thoenes, em. professor chemical process engineering TU Eindhoven, a former chairman Royal Dutch Chemical Society; and Jan Pieter van Wolfswinkel, a retired mechanical engineering professor, TU Delft.

Item 3-6

The UK-based Scientific Alliance, which bills itself as an "evidence-based approach" to environmental issues and has numerous scientists as members, rejected climate alarm in 2007.

"The Scientific Alliance points out that these (the UN IPCC) conclusions are derived from the output of computer models based on an imperfect understanding of the non-linear, chaotic system which is our climate," stated a May 3, 2007 press release from the group. Chemist Martin Livermore, director of the Scientific Alliance, stated in the release, "Politicians and many in the scientific community are putting their faith in the unproven hypothesis that carbon dioxide is the main driver of climate change. They ignore the fact that the formation of clouds - known to have a major influence on climate - is poorly understood. They ignore the major influence of El Niño events, responsible for the record average temperatures in 1998 but the mechanism of which we do not understand. And they ignore the lack of agreement between model predictions and observation in the upper atmosphere and much of the southern hemisphere. This is not a sound basis for the most radical global policy proposals ever seen."

The release continued, "It is clear that there has been a significant warming trend in parts of the world in the last 30 years, particularly in the northern hemisphere. But what has caused these changes, and what will happen over the next 30 years, is not well understood. To believe that we can control climate with our current level of knowledge is misguided. In the circumstances, the global community should focus its efforts on protecting vulnerable areas while helping to lift people out of the poverty which increases their vulnerability. Putting reduction of carbon dioxide emissions as top priority will do nothing for the world's poorest countries."

Scientists who are members of the Scientific Alliance include: **Professor Tom Addiscott of the University of East London, who was awarded the Royal Agricultural Society of England Research Medal, specializes in research about modelling the processes which determine losses of nitrate from the soil; Chemist Dr Jack Barrett of Imperial College has conducted research into spectroscopy and photochemical kinetics and authored several textbooks about Inorganic Chemistry and the Bacterial Oxidation of Minerals; Dr Sonja Boehmer-Christiansen has worked with emission modelers; Biochemist and microbiologist Professor Vivian Moses of King's College and University College in London; Professor Anthony Trewavas of the Institute of Molecular Plant Sciences at the University of Edinburgh who has authored over 220 papers and two books; Mathematician Mark Cantley a former adviser in the Directorate for Biotechnology, Agriculture and Food, of the Directorate-General for Research, of the European Commission; Professor Mick Fuller**

PhD is Professor of Plant Physiology at the University of Plymouth and Head of Graduate School and former Head of the Department of Agriculture and Food Studies at Plymouth; Professor Michael Laughton, DSc(Eng), FEng. Emeritus Professor of Electrical Engineering in the University of London and currently Visiting Professor in the Department of Environmental Science and Technology at Imperial College; and Chemical Engineer Professor William Wilkinson, who was the former deputy chief executive of British Nuclear Fuels and served on the UK Advisory Committee on Research and Development and the Science Research Council. <http://scientific-alliance.org/>

Item 3-7

IPCC 2007 Expert Reviewer 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 Modelling.

Item 3-8

Dr. Joel M. Kauffman rejected the notion that "the vast majority" of scientists believe in man-made global warming.

"The truth about this is the opposite; most scientists do not," Kauffman wrote on September 7, 2007. "CO2 can hardly have been the cause of warming because its level in air has been higher than it is now at least 3 times between 1812 and 1962 as shown by 90,000 direct chemical measurements (Beck, E.-G., 180 Years of Atmospheric CO2 Gas Analysis by Chemical Methods, Energy & Environment, 2007, 18(2), 259-282).

Further, there is no recent correlation between CO2 levels and atmospheric temps as you may see easily from a NOAA graph," he wrote. "With an allowance for such urban heat island effects, the global temperature rise from 1905-1940 was similar to the one from 1970-2003 (www.giss.nasa.gov). Dr. Hansen's flawed USA ground station temps from 2000-2006 needed a Y2K correction provided by the Canadian Steve McIntyre showing that 1934 was the warmest year of the last 100, not 1998 or 2006," he concluded.

Chemist Dr. Joel M. Kauffman, Emeritus Professor of Chemistry at the University of the Sciences in Philadelphia.

Item 3-9

Dr. Oliver W. Frauenfeld questions the accuracy of climate models.

"Without question, much more progress is necessary regarding our current understanding of climate and our abilities to model it. Before we can accurately understand the mid-latitudes' response to tropical forcing, the tropical forcings themselves must be identified and understood," Frauenfeld wrote in "Shattered Consensus."

Frauenfeld, a **Contributing Author to the IPCC** Working Group 1 Fourth Assessment Report, added, "Only after we identify these factors and determine how they affect one another, can we begin to produce accurate models. And only then should we rely on those models to shape policy. Until that time, climate variability will remain controversial and uncertain."

Climate scientist Dr. Oliver W. Frauenfeld, a co-author of the 2005 book Shattered Consensus: The True State of Global Warming and a research scientist at the Cooperative Institute for Research in Environmental Sciences Division of Cryospheric and Polar Processes at the University of Colorado.

Item 3-10

Senator Inhofe debunks the so-called "consensus".

The notion of a "consensus" is carefully manufactured for political, financial and ideological purposes. Key components of the manufactured "consensus" fade under scrutiny. We often hear how the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) and the American Meteorological Society (AMS) issued statements endorsing the so-called "consensus" view that man is driving global warming. But what you don't hear is that both the NAS and AMS never allowed member scientists to directly vote on these climate statements. Essentially, only two dozen or so members on the governing boards of these institutions produced the "consensus" statements. It appears that the governing boards of these organizations caved in to pressure from those promoting the politically correct view of UN and Gore-inspired science.

The Canadian Academy of Sciences reportedly endorsed a "consensus" global warming statement that was never even approved by its governing board. Rank-and-file scientists are now openly rebelling. James Spann, a certified meteorologist with the AMS, openly defied the organization when he said in January that he does "not know of a single TV meteorologist who buys into the man-made global warming hype."

There are frequently claims that the UN IPCC Summary for Policymakers is the voice of hundreds or even thousands of the world's top scientists. But such claims do not hold up to even the lightest scrutiny. According to the Associated Press, during the IPCC Summary for Policymakers meeting in April 2007, only 52 scientists participated. The April 9, 2007 AP article by Seth Borenstein reported: "Diplomats from 115 countries and 52 scientists hashed out the most comprehensive and gloomiest warning yet about the possible effects of global warming, from increased flooding, hunger, drought and diseases to the extinction of species."

Many of the so-called "hundreds" of scientists who have been affiliated with the UN as "expert reviewers" are in fact climate skeptics. Skeptics like Virginia State Climatologist Dr. Patrick Michaels, Alabama State Climatologist Dr. John Christy, New Zealand climate researcher Dr. Vincent Gray, former head of the Geological Museum at the University of Oslo, Tom V. Segalstad, and MIT's Dr. Richard Lindzen have served as IPCC "expert reviewers" but were not involved in writing the alarmist Summary for Policymakers.

Item 3-11

Veteran radical leftist columnist Alexander Cockburn, in *The Nation* in the US, on the myth of a scientific consensus.

We should never be more vigilant than at the moment a new dogma is being installed. The clique endorsing what is now dignified as "the mainstream theory" of global warming stretches all the way from radical greens through Al Gore to George W. Bush, who signed on at the end of May. The Left has been swept along, entranced by the allure of weather as revolutionary agent, naively conceiving of global warming as a crisis that will force radical social changes on capitalism.

Alas for their illusions. Capitalism is ingesting global warming as happily as a python swallowing a piglet. The press, which thrives on fear-mongering, promotes the non-existent threat as vigorously as it did the imminence of Soviet attack during the Cold War, in concert with the arms industry. There's money to be made, and so, as Talleyrand said, "Enrich yourselves!"

The marquee slogan in the new cold war on global warming is that the scientific consensus is virtually unanimous. This is utterly false. The overwhelming majority of climate computer modellers, the beneficiaries of the \$2 billion-a-year global warming grant industry, certainly believe in it but not necessarily most real climate scientists - people qualified in atmospheric physics, climatology and meteorology. Geologists are particularly sceptical.

Take Warsaw-based professor Zbigniew Jaworowski, famous for his critiques of ice-core data. He's devastating on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change rallying cry that CO₂ is higher now than it has ever been over the past 650,000 years. Or take Habibullo Abdussamatov, of St Petersburg's Pulkovo Astronomical Observatory. He says we're on a warming trend but that humans have little to do with it, the agent being a long-time change in the sun's heat. He says solar irradiance will fall within the next few years and we may face an ice age. Now read Jeffrey Glassman, applied physicist and engineer, retired from California's academic and corporate sectors, who provides an elegant demonstration of how the CO₂ solubility pump in the Earth's oceans controls atmospheric CO₂ concentrations, and how the increase in atmospheric CO₂ is the consequence of temperature increase.

The Australian, 12Jun07, Cut & Paste: "Greenhouse gas emissions do not lead to global warming"

Item 3-12

The UN Climate Change Numbers Hoax

By Tom Harris & John McLean, *The Australian* Friday, December 14, 2007

It's an assertion repeated by politicians and climate campaigners the world over – '2,500 scientists of the United Nation's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) agree that humans are causing a climate crisis'.

But it's not true. And, for the first time ever, the public can now see the extent to which they have been misled. As lies go, it's a whopper. Here's the real situation.

Like the three IPCC 'assessment reports' before it, the Fourth Assessment Report (AR4) released during 2007 (upon which the UN climate conference in Bali was based) includes the reports of the IPCC's three working groups. Working Group I (WG I) is assigned to report on the extent and possible causes of past climate change as well as future 'projections'. Its report is titled "The Physical Science Basis". The reports from working groups II and III are titled "Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability" and "Mitigation of Climate Change" respectively, and since these are based on the results of WG I, it is crucially important that the WG I report stands up to close scrutiny.

There is, of course serious debate among scientists about the actual technical content of the roughly 1,000-page WG I report, especially its politically motivated Summary for Policymakers which is often the only part read by politicians and non-scientists. The technical content can be difficult for non-scientists to follow and so most people simply assume that if that large numbers of scientists agree, they must be right.

Consensus never proves the truth of a scientific claim, but is somehow widely believed to do so for the IPCC reports, so we need to ask how many scientists really did agree with the most important IPCC conclusion, namely that humans are causing significant climate change--in other words the key parts of WG I?

The numbers of scientist reviewers involved in WG I is actually less than a quarter of the whole, a little over 600 in total. The other 1,900 reviewers assessed the other working group reports. They had nothing to say about the causes of climate change or its future trajectory. Still, 600 "scientific expert reviewers" sounds impressive. After all, they submitted their comments to the IPCC editors who assure us that "all substantive government and expert review comments received appropriate consideration." And since these experts reviewers are all listed in Annex III of the report, they must have endorsed it, right?

Wrong.

For the first time ever, the UN has released on the Web the comments of reviewers who assessed the drafts of the WG I report and the IPCC editors' responses. This release was almost certainly a result of intense pressure applied by "hockey-stick" co-debunker Steve McIntyre of Toronto and his allies. Unlike the other IPCC working groups, WG I is based in the U.S. and McIntyre had used the robust Freedom of Information legislation to request certain details when the full comments were released.

An examination of reviewers' comments on the last draft of the WG I report before final report assembly (i.e. the 'Second Order Revision' or SOR) completely

debunks the illusion of hundreds of experts diligently poring over all the chapters of the report and providing extensive feedback to the editing teams. Here's the reality.

A total of 308 reviewers commented on the SOR, but only 32 reviewers commented on more than three chapters and only five reviewers commented on all 11 chapters of the report. Only about half the reviewers commented more than one chapter. It is logical that reviewers would generally limit their comments to their areas of expertise but it's a far cry from the idea of thousands of scientists agreeing to anything.

Compounding this is the fact that IPCC editors could, and often did, ignore reviewers' comments. Some editor responses were banal and others showed inconsistencies with other comments. Reviewers had to justify their requested changes but the responding editors appear to have been under no such obligation. Reviewers were sometimes flatly told they were wrong but no reasons or reliable references were provided. In other cases reviewers tried to dilute the certainty being expressed and they often provided supporting evidence, but their comments were often flatly rejected. Some comments were rejected on the basis of a lack of space – an incredible assertion in such an important document. The attitude of the editors seemed to be that simple corrections were accepted, requests for improved clarity tolerated but the assertions and interpretations that appear in the text were to be defended against any challenge.

An example of rampant misrepresentation of IPCC reports is the frequent assertion that 'hundreds of IPCC scientists' are known to support the following statement, arguably the most important of the WG I report, namely "Greenhouse gas forcing has very likely caused most of the observed global warming over the last 50 years."

In total, only 62 scientists reviewed the chapter in which this statement appears, the critical chapter 9, "Understanding and Attributing Climate Change". Of the comments received from the 62 reviewers of this critical chapter, almost 60% of them were rejected by IPCC editors. And of the 62 expert reviewers of this chapter, 55 had serious vested interest, leaving only seven expert reviewers who appear impartial.

Two of these seven were contacted by NRSP for the purposes of this article - Dr. Vincent Gray of New Zealand and Dr. Ross McKittrick of the University of Guelph, Canada. Concerning the "Greenhouse gas forcing ..." statement above, Professor McKittrick explained "A categorical summary statement like this is not supported by the evidence in the IPCC WG I report. Evidence shown in the report suggests that other factors play a major role in climate change, and the specific effects expected from greenhouse gases have not been observed."

Dr. Gray labelled the WG I statement as “Typical IPCC doubletalk” asserting “The text of the IPCC report shows that this is decided by a guess from persons with a conflict of interest, not from a tested model.”

Determining the level of support expressed by reviewers’ comments is subjective but a slightly generous evaluation indicates that just five reviewers endorsed the crucial ninth chapter. Four had vested interests, and the other made only a single comment for the entire 11-chapter report. The claim that 2,500 independent scientist reviewers agreed with this, the most important statement of the UN climate reports released this year, or any other statement in the UN climate reports, is nonsense.

“The IPCC owe it to the world to explain who among their expert reviewers actually agree with their conclusions and who don’t,” says Natural Resources Stewardship Project Chair climatologist Dr. Timothy Ball. “Otherwise, their credibility, and the public’s trust of science in general, will be even further eroded.”

That the IPCC have let this deception continue for so long is a disgrace. Secretary General Ban Kai-Moon must instruct the UN climate body to either completely revise their operating procedures, welcoming dissenting input from scientist reviewers and indicating if reviewers have vested interests, or close the agency down completely. Until then, their conclusions, and any reached at the Bali conference based on IPCC conclusions, should be ignored entirely as politically skewed and dishonest.

**John McLean is climate data analyst based in Melbourne, Australia.
Tom Harris is the Ottawa-based Executive Director of the Natural Resources Stewardship Project (nrsp.com).**

Item 3-13

Over 100 attendees of this conference (2008 International Conference on Climate Change) endorsed the Manhattan Declaration. Many who attended are world leading climate scientists, economists, policymakers, engineers, business leaders, medical doctors, as well as other professionals and concerned citizens from two dozen countries. To date a thousand who have since read the Manhattan Declaration have also endorsed the Declaration.

Manhattan Declaration on Climate Change

“Global Warming” Is Not A Global Crisis

We, the scientists and researchers in climate and related fields, economists, policymakers, and business leaders, assembled at Times Square, New York City, participating in the 2008 International Conference on Climate Change,

Resolving that scientific questions should be evaluated solely by the scientific method;

Affirming that global climate has always changed and always will, independent of the actions of humans, and that carbon dioxide (CO₂) is not a pollutant but rather a necessity for all life;

Recognising that the causes and extent of recently observed climatic change are the subject of intense debates in the climate science community and that oft-repeated assertions of a supposed 'consensus' among climate experts are false;

Affirming that attempts by governments to legislate costly regulations on industry and individual citizens to encourage CO₂ emission reduction will slow development while having no appreciable impact on the future trajectory of global climate change. Such policies will markedly diminish future prosperity and so reduce the ability of societies to adapt to inevitable climate change, thereby increasing, not decreasing human suffering;

Noting that warmer weather is generally less harmful to life on Earth than colder:

Hereby declare:

That current plans to restrict anthropogenic CO₂ emissions are a dangerous misallocation of intellectual capital and resources that should be dedicated to solving humanity's real and serious problems.

That there is no convincing evidence that CO₂ emissions from modern industrial activity has in the past, is now, or will in the future cause catastrophic climate change.

That attempts by governments to inflict taxes and costly regulations on industry and individual citizens with the aim of reducing emissions of CO₂ will pointlessly curtail the prosperity of the West and progress of developing nations without affecting climate.

That adaptation as needed is massively more cost-effective than any attempted mitigation, and that a focus on such mitigation will divert the attention and resources of governments away from addressing the real problems of their peoples.

That human-caused climate change is not a global crisis.

Now, therefore, we recommend –

That world leaders reject the views expressed by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change as well as popular, but misguided works such as "An Inconvenient Truth".

That all taxes, regulations, and other interventions intended to reduce emissions of CO₂ be abandoned forthwith.

Agreed at New York, 4 March 2008

The International Climate Science Coalition (ICSC) is an international association of scientists, economists and energy and policy experts working to promote better public understanding of climate change science and policy worldwide. ICSC is committed to providing a highly credible alternative to the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) thereby fostering a more rational, open discussion about climate issues.