

References on the Al Gore film "An Inconvenient Truth"

Contents: (Compiled by, and emphasis by Jack Hockel, DDS)

	Page
▪ INTRODUCTION	2
▪ Regarding Gore and his "mentor"	3
▪ TEMPERATURE INCREASES/GLOBAL WARMING	4-5
▪ Disease? Human-caused? Backpedaling	6
▪ The agendas of the doomsayers	7
▪ KYOTO PROTOCOL and the IPPC	8-9
▪ Groups that gain directly from The Kyoto Protocol	10
▪ GENERAL COMPUTER MODELING (GCM)	11-12
▪ Known and admitted deficiencies	12
▪ 928 ARTICLES/SCIENTIFIC CONSENSUS	13-14
▪ CO ₂ INCREASE	15-17
▪ Solar activity and earth's temperatures	17
▪ GLACIERS, SEA LEVELS, SNOW MELTING	18-19
▪ HURRICANES	20-21
▪ Will global warming cause hurricanes and severe storms?	20
▪ CONCLUSIONS	22
▪ Population is the bottom line	22
▪ REFERENCES	23
▪ Appendix: THE COOLING WORLD	24

Note: This film was made available to our parish by the California Interfaith Power and Light (CIPL), which was founded by Reverend Sally Bingham of Grace Cathedral in San Francisco in 1998.

The CIPL is promoted as a "Religious Response to Global Warming."

St. Francis Parish is listed as a member on the CIPL website.

CIPL's promotional pamphlet states the following "Global Warming Facts:"

- California is the fifth largest emitter of global warming causing greenhouse gases in the world.
- In the past 100 years, California's average temperature increased 2 degrees Fahrenheit. By the 2090's, CA's average summer temperature is projected to increase another 3.5 degrees in a best case emissions scenario, and up to 18 degrees Fahrenheit in a worst case scenario. We will experience longer and more intense heat waves and more wildfires.
- There will be increased health risks, respiratory ailments and asthma, which most adversely affect the young and elderly.
- Heat-related deaths could increase by 130 to more than 500 % by the end of this century.
- CA's snow pack could decrease by 25-40% by mid-century, and in a worst-case scenario by 70-90% by the end of the century, severely affecting the water supply to all segments of society.

Many of the above "Facts" are controversial in the scientific community and, like the movie, are in some cases, downright FALSE. They are intended to create fear, and lie behind a political agenda. This compilation from the literature is presented to document this statement and is available on the web at goremoviefacts.blogspot.com.

Dr. Jack Hockel

INTRODUCTION

I (Jack Hockel) saw Al Gore's apocalyptic film "An Inconvenient Truth" twice in August and took notes. These pages are a response to the content of the movie. I was impressed by the glitzy propaganda in the movie, but not the scientific content. It is definitely **not a documentary!** It is full of half-truths, distortions and deceptions. If Gore were marketing global warming as a product, he would be shut down by the FTA for deceptive advertising. He showed many graphs and trendlines; none were labeled: no units, methods of data acquisition, references, or estimates of error in the data as a scientific report should include. Gore's college education was in journalism not any branch of science, and this **is not a scientific work!** It is pseudoscience in manipulative cinematic wrapping. It is an infomercial, much more about political propaganda to get Al Gore back into the presidential race, if Hillary stumbles, than about **scientific truth.**

MIT's Alfred P. Sloan professor of meteorology Richard Lindzen recently complained about the "shrill alarmism" of Gore's movie. Lindzen acknowledges that global warming is real, and he acknowledges that increased carbon emissions **might** be causing the warming -- **but they also might not.** "We do not understand the natural internal variability of climate change." (Lindzen isn't a fake scientist, he's **an inconvenient scientist.** No wonder he's ignored. He goes so far as to describe the UN-IPCC report [see the page on Kyoto Protocol] as "absurd...very much a children's exercise of what might possibly happen" in a worst-case scenario prepared by a "peculiar group" with "no technical competence.")
(James D Glassman. *Kyoto "Absurd" Says MIT Scientist*, Tech Central Station, March 5, 2001.
<http://www.techcentralstation.com/030501L.html>)

"A general characteristic of Mr. Gore's approach is to assiduously ignore the fact that the **earth and its climate are dynamic**; they are always changing even without any external forcing. To treat all change as something to fear is bad enough; to do so in order to exploit that fear is much worse."
(Richard S. Lindzen, *op-ed in the June 26, 2006 Wall Street Journal*)

"Gore is hysterical. He said, 'we must make the rescue of the environment the central organizing principle for civilization.' The extremism is troubling, even shocking. Gore's book **elevates hysteria to a virtue** and regards doubt as a disease."
(Jonathan Rauch, *National Journal*, September 18, 1999)

"Gore's circumstantial arguments are so weak that they are pathetic. It is simply incredible that they, and his film, are commanding public attention. The man is an embarrassment to US science and its many fine practitioners, a lot of whom know (but feel unable to state publicly) that **his propaganda crusade is mostly based on junk science.**"
(Professor Bob Carter, of the Marine Geophysical Laboratory at James Cook University in Australia, on Gore's film, as quoted in the *Canadian Free Press*, June 12, 2006)

The late political scientist Aaron Wildavsky more correctly characterized global warming as the **"mother of all environmental scares."**

Al Gore even lies when he's off camera. In an interview with Moira Macdonald (Seattle Times, approx. June 2, 2006, Gore states: "I was elected (to Congress) in 1976. The following year, I started to stir up interest in Congress in global warming." Maybe Gore invented the global warming idea **and** the Internet, too.
(*"Convenient Lies In 'An Inconvenient Truth,'" Howard Maccabee, MD, PhD, July 2006, personal notes*)

There was no global warming hypothesis in 1976 or 1977. You may remember that the scare then was about "global cooling." In fact Dr. Stephen Schneider of the National Center for Atmospheric Research endorsed a book called "The Cooling" by Lowell Ponte (Prentice-Hall, 1976).

Regarding Gore and his "mentor," Roger Revelle

Gore's "global warming mentor" at Harvard did not at all share Gore's alarmist views. (*Environment News (published by the Heartland Institute, Chicago) 3, no. 1 (January 2000): 9, or www.sepp.org/weekwas/1999/Oct2.html*)

About Roger Revelle (Gore's "mentor")

Gore implies that Revelle agreed with the GW hypothesis, which is not true. A great scientist and teacher at UC San Diego, Revelle died in 1991. He started the remarkable series of measurements of atmospheric CO₂ in 1957. As a visiting professor at Harvard University, he taught a freshman course attended by then-student Al Gore. Here is what Revelle said about global warming. It will make you less frightened.

OMNI interview

In March 1984 *Omni* magazine published an extensive interview with Revelle.

Omni: A problem that has occupied your attention for many years is the increasing levels of CO₂ in the atmosphere, which could cause the Earth's climate to become warmer. Is this actually happening?

Revelle: I estimate that the total increase [in CO₂] over the past hundred years has been about 21 percent. But whether the increase will lead to a significant rise in global temperature, we can't absolutely say.

Omni: [If it happens], what will the warming of the Earth mean to us?

Revelle: There may be lots of effects. Increased CO₂ in the air acts like a fertilizer for plants. . . . you get more plant growth. Increasing CO₂ levels also affect water transpiration, causing plants to close their pores and sweat less. That means plants will be able to grow in drier climates.

Omni: Does the increase in CO₂ have anything to do with people saying the weather is getting worse?

Revelle: People are always saying the weather's getting worse. Actually, the CO₂ increase is predicted to temper weather extremes.

Revelle's letters

In a July 18, 1988, letter to then-Senator Tim Wirth, Revelle cautions that "we should be careful not to arouse too much alarm until the rate and amount of warming becomes clearer. It is not yet obvious that this summer's hot weather and drought are the result of a global climatic change or simply an example of the uncertainties of climate variability. My own feeling is that we had better wait another ten years before making confident predictions."

Revelle had made an even stronger statement just a few days earlier, in a July 14, 1988 letter to Congressman Jim Bates: "Most scientists familiar with the subject are not yet willing to bet that the climate this year is the result of 'greenhouse warming.' As you very well know, climate is highly variable from year to year, and the causes of these variations are **not at all well understood**. My own personal belief is that we should wait another ten or twenty years to really be convinced that the greenhouse effect is going to be important for human beings, in both positive and negative ways."

Revelle's writings

In the premiere issue of *Cosmos*, in 1991, Revelle and coauthors S.F. Singer and C. Starr contributed a brief essay, "What to do about greenhouse warming: Look before you leap." The three write: "Drastic, precipitous and, especially, unilateral steps to delay the putative greenhouse impacts can cost jobs and prosperity and increase the human costs of global poverty, **without being effective**."

They continue, "Stringent controls enacted now would be economically devastating, particularly for developing countries for whom reduced energy consumption would mean slower rates of economic growth without being able to delay greatly the growth of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. Yale economist William Nordhaus, one of the few who have been trying to deal quantitatively with the economics of the greenhouse effect, has pointed out that ' . . . those who argue for strong measures to slow greenhouse warming have reached their conclusion without any discernible analysis of the costs and benefits.'"

Revelle and his colleagues conclude, "It would be prudent to complete the ongoing and recently expanded research so that we will know what we are doing before we act. 'Look before you leap' may still be good advice."

So what was it that Gore heard? It certainly wasn't what he said in the movie!

TEMPERATURE INCREASE (GLOBAL WARMING - GW)

Global warming proponents are seemingly oblivious to the fact that global fluctuations in temperature, characterized by centuries of significant warming and cooling trends, are normal. They have seized upon natural, benign temperature changes and misrepresented them as something man-made and catastrophic. NASA satellites indicate that the **earth's temperature has cooled slightly since 1979**. "The Northern Hemisphere apparently cooled from around 1940 until the late 1970s – despite rising levels of atmospheric greenhouse gasses. **Gore** makes no mention of this inconvenient event that **shatters his depiction** of a world relentlessly heating as greenhouse pollution increases. Gore shows charts of global temperature changes using **statistically challenged "hockey stick"** depictions of temperatures rising sharply in recent decades. But Gore begins his charts at the start of what climatologists call the "Little Ice Age" that chilled Europe from 1350 until 1850. Unmentioned are previous centuries of medieval warming when parts of Europe might have been warmer than they are today...**Gore concealed** that these periods of warming occur naturally every thousand years or so and have little or nothing to do with pollution created by humans."

("Legitimate threat or Hot Air," Lowell Ponte and Marc Morano, NewsMax, July 2000)

Two Canadian researchers confirm that the **"hockey-stick" graphs are based on a statistically flawed method** and their technical rebuttal was published in *Geophysical Research Letters*. They found that the same set of data could be used to show a gradual cooling during the 20th century: "If a group of proxies is selected because they are sensitive to temperature, the simplest way to characterize their dominant pattern is to standardize the scale and calculate the mean." If that is done, "One notes that the 20th century is unexceptional and, for what it is worth, **that there is a downward trend over the 20th century.**"

(McIntyre, Stephen and Ross McKittrick (2005) Hockey Sticks, Principal Components and Spurious Significance Geophysical Research Letters, Vol. 32, No. 3, February 2005)

"Gore's 'hockey stick' graphs, where the graph suddenly starts rising and going out of sight, are **fraudulent**. They are entirely inconsistent with all known scientific experimental measurements and with the written historical record. The author of the graphs, Michael Mann, who provided the false temperature graph for **Gore's movie, used incorrect math and mathematical analysis has entirely discredited the graph.**"

("Hockey Stick Hokum," Wall Street Journal, July 14, 2006, p. 12)

The surface temperature readings global warming theory advocates rely on do not provide **temperature data for the oceans** (or nearly 70 percent of the earth's surface) and tend to be located predominantly in the Northern Hemisphere while under-representing the Southern Hemisphere. Furthermore, the majority of land-based readings are recorded in towns and cities that yield artificially high temperatures. This phenomena is known as the **Urban Heat Island Effect** and it is **one of the major sources of error** that have led some scientists to falsely conclude that rapid global warming is occurring. (Like the 107 measuring stations in 49 California counties.) One of the reasons that many surface temperature sites show a gradual warming trend is that the temperature increases as the urban population grows and air traffic increases. *(John L. Daly, "What's Wrong With The Surface Record?" Monograph, January 14, 1998)*

Surface temperature readings from **rural areas can also be subject to distortions**. A prime example of this is the case of the Low Head Lighthouse located on the northern coast of Australia's Tasmania island. Since 1963, Low Head has recorded a major temperature increase of nearly 2° F. Global warming proponents have seized on this "warming" as proof of global warming. Site photographs of Low Head showed that several decades ago there

were low-lying bushes only a few feet from the thermometer. These bushes were well below the level of the thermometer itself, leaving it fully exposed, as it should be to the cool prevailing northwest wind. But over the past several decades, the bushes have grown and are now blocking the temperature gauges from the prevailing winds. As a result, the site has become a suntrap, causing the gauge to record rapidly rising daytime temperatures. (*John L. Daly, "Hot Air At Low Head," Monograph, 1996*)

The arctic regions have not warmed as predicted, but have cooled. Between 1955 and 1990, when the arctic should have warmed by 3°F according to the climate models, the **arctic actually cooled by 1°F**. (*Douglas V. Hoyt, "Greenhouse Warming Scorecard," Monograph, 1997*)

"...Temperature measurements in the arctic suggest that **it was just as warm there in the 1930's**...before most greenhouse gas emissions. Don't you ever wonder whether sea ice concentrations back then were low, too?"
(*Roy Spencer wrote in an open letter to Gore in his May 25, 2006 column.*)

The current warming trend may be a natural phenomenon, and we don't know how much is man-made. Most of the climate community has agreed since 1988 that **global** mean temperatures have increased on the order of **one degree Fahrenheit over the past century (.4° F in the U.S.)**(since 1895), having risen significantly from about 1919 to 1940, decreased between 1940 and the early '70s, increased again until the '90s, and remaining essentially flat since 1998. The Climate Change Science Program, the Bush administration's coordinating agency for global-warming research, declared it had found "clear evidence of human influences on the climate system." What exactly was this evidence? The **models (see section on GCMs)** imply that greenhouse warming should impact atmospheric temperatures more than surface temperatures, and yet **satellite data show no warming in the atmosphere since 1979**.
(*"Don't Believe the Hype."* John Lindzen, Article published in the Wall Street Journal 7/2/06.)

Temperature records taken at the South Pole between 1957 and 1987 also **show no warming**. (*J. Sansom, "Antarctic Surface Temperature Time Series," Journal of Climate 2 [1989]: 1164*)

A paper by D. Dahl-Jensen et al displays a temperature record from a Greenland ice-core borehole that clearly shows an **absence of warming** in the last fifty years.
(*"Past Temperatures Directly from the Greenland Ice Sheet," Science 282 [1999]: 268-79*)

Current controversy revolves around whether the twentieth century was the warmest in the past thousand years. Although the analysis of some proxy data supports this notion, it is clearly contradicted by others that show evidence for the warm period around 1100A.D., often termed the "Medieval Climate Optimum," followed by the "Little Ice Age" that lasted off and on until about 1860. **There is general agreement that the global climate warmed between about 1860 and 1940 as we emerged from the "Little Ice Age."** (About 0.5° C)

Most scientists recognize that we have had increasing temperatures for the past 150 years or more. Yet, in spite of U.N. and EPA proclamations to the contrary, there is **no evidence supporting any of the tragic consequences** that are supposed to accompany global warming, such as increased number and strength of hurricanes, super hot summers, and Antarctic icecap melting.

(*Eric S. Blake, Jerry D. Jarrell (retired), Edward N. Rappaport and Christopher W. Landsea. The Deadliest, Costliest, and Most Intense United States Tropical Cyclones From 1851 To 2004, NOAA Technical Memorandum NWS TPC-4, August 2005.*)

There is **less agreement about the causes of this recent warming, but the human component is thought to be quite small**. This conclusion seems to be borne out by the fact that the climate cooled between 1940 and 1975, just as industrial activity grew rapidly after World War II. It has been difficult to reconcile this cooling with the observed increases in greenhouse gases.

(*J. R. Christy et al., "MSU Tropospheric Temperatures: Dataset Construction and Radiosonde Comparisons," Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology, 2000.*)

The climate record since 1979 has been in controversy, with surface observations indicating a warming **while satellite and balloon-borne radiosondes showed no warming of the bulk of the atmosphere between 1979 and 1997. This disparity has not yet been satisfactorily explained.**

(National Research Council, Reconciling Observations of Global Temperature Change, Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 2000)

"There is **no warming trend** in the U.S. summer temperatures over the last 80 years."

(Patrick Michaels and Robert Balling, Jr. The Satanic Gases, p. 174. Balling is director of the Office of Climatology at Arizona State University.)

"Rather than warming as previously thought, portions of Antarctica have been dramatically **cooling** by 1.2°F per decade for the past 20 years, and there exists "strong evidence of ice-sheet growth."

(Peter Doran, et. al. "Antarctic climate cooling and terrestrial ecosystem response." Nature, January 31, 2002, 415:517-520)

Disease from Global Warming?

Malaria, claimed as a byproduct of warming, was once common in Michigan and Siberia and remains common in Siberia--mosquitoes don't require tropical warmth.

Anthropogenic (human-caused)?

Estimates of . . . natural variability are critical to the problem of detecting an anthropogenic signal. . . . We have estimated the spectrum . . . from palaeo-temperature proxies and compared it with . . . general circulation models. . . . None of the three estimates of the natural variability spectrum agree with each other. . . . Until . . . resolved, it will be hard to say, with confidence, that an **anthropogenic (human-caused) climate signal has or has not been detected.**

*(T. P. Barnett, B. D. **Santer**, P. D. Jones, R. S. Bradley, and K. R. Briffa, "Estimates of Low-Frequency Natural Variability in Near-Surface Air Temperature," Holocene 6 (1996): 255-65)*

The second author in the above study, Santer, was quoted in the CC Times article (10/12/06) on **hurricanes**, claiming that he now has the information, based on **computer modeling. He is also the one whose work in 1995 was questioned** because he changed it to support the IPCC, and readily admitted it.

(Singer, Fred, "Climate Policy - from Rio to Kyoto, A Political Issue for 2000 - and Beyond," Hoover Institution, Stanford Univ., 2000.)

Referring to the above-mentioned IPCC Report, F. Seitz said, "In my more than 60 years as a member of the American scientific community, including service as president of both the National Academy of Sciences and the American Physical Society, I have never witnessed a more **disturbing corruption of the peer-review process** than the events that led to this IPCC report." (See separate section on Kyoto Protocol)

(F. Seitz, "Global Warming Report: Basic Rules Disregarded," Wall Street Journal, June 12, 1996; Also, in S. F. Singer, "Climate Debate," Nature 382 (1996): 392; P. Weiss, "Industry Group Assails Climate Chapter," Science 272 (1996): 1734.)

Backpedaling

Not even the leading scientists pushing the global warming theory have been able to stand behind their original pronouncements. Jim **Hansen**, the NASA scientist who inaugurated the global warming scare with his dramatic 1988 Senate testimony that significant global war-

ming was already underway, predicted back then that by now the temperature should have increased by about .8°F. However, even surface records (which are prone to such distortions as the Urban Heat Island Effect) indicate that **the temperature has risen by only .2°F**. Satellite data for the same period show a modest cooling. Hansen stated that the amount of CO₂ did not increase as much as he thought it would and that nature was absorbing more CO₂ than he calculated.

(Patrick Michaels, "Inhaling A Decade Of Hot Air Vapors," The Washington Times, June 28, 1998)

A gathering of several dozen of the world's leading climatologists **condemned Hansen** for making exaggerated claims beyond what his or their data could support. (Hansen has been a consultant to Gore and has admitted that he has been willing to exaggerate science in order to get the public's attention.)

(Science, June 2, 1989, "Hansen vs. the World on the Greenhouse Threat.")

At a June 1998 hearing of the U.S. House of Representatives Small Business Committee the chairman of the IPCC was presented with the fact that the surface temperature had only warmed .2°F since 1988, when Hansen's global warming model predicted an increase of .8°F. The chairman admitted that **Hansen's model and other global warming models that were used to justify Kyoto were "wrong."**

("Global Warming Moderates Nail Extremists 8 Ways," World Climate Report, New Hope Environmental Services, Ivy, Virginia, August 12, 1998.)

The agendas of the doomsayers

Dr. Stephen **Schneider** (see p. 2) is a climate scientist who has played a pivotal role in shaping the global warming debate. What is odd about Schneider's strident advocacy of global warming is that **he was an equally strident advocate of global cooling 20 years ago**. At that time, Schneider clearly believed that CO₂ did not pose a threat of dangerous warming in the near future. By the 1980s, when the surface-record seemed to indicate that the temperature was increasing, Schneider found a new crusade in global warming. In the October 1989 issue of Discover magazine, Schneider kindly provided an insight into what motivated him to take up this new crusade, telling Discover magazine: **"To capture the public imagination, we need loads of media coverage; we have to offer up some scary scenarios, make simplified dramatic statements and little mention of any doubts we might have...Each of us has to decide the right balance between being effective, and being honest."**

(John L. Daly, "Stephen Schneider: Greenhouse Superstar," Monograph, 1996)

Then there are the politicians like Tim **Wirth** (D-Colo). He is a former senator who worked in the Clinton-Gore administration and for Hillary Clinton in 1990: "We've got to ride the global warming issue. **Even if the theory of global warming is wrong, we will be doing the right thing** – in terms of economic policy and environmental policy." And **Gore, in the movie: "Our collective nervous system needs a jolt."**

"The global warming issue has spawned an entire industry that makes its proponents rich, powerful and famous. It is a **vehicle they can ride to other agendas**...To politicians and government bureaucrats, **the issue is being sold as an 'emergency'** to justify huge expansions of government power, regulation and taxation...most atmospheric scientists have jobs at government institutions such as the NCAR or state universities, or depend on government grants, some may see their future paychecks as dependent on **selling global warming as a crisis that requires vastly more government spending.**"

("Legitimate threat or Hot Air," Lowell Ponte and Marc Morano, NewsMax, July 2006)

Does this give you any insight into the mind of the GW activist?

THE KYOTO PROTOCOL and the IPCC

International climate policy is based on the 1997 Kyoto Protocol, which calls on industrialized nations to carry out, within one decade, drastic cuts in the emission of greenhouse gases (**GHG**) that stem mainly from the burning of fossil fuels. The Protocol is ultimately based on Chapter 8 of the **1996 Scientific Assessment Report** issued by the **Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)**, a U.N. advisory body using calculations from **General Circulation Models (GCM = computer modeling – garbage in-garbage out – see separate page on GCMs)**. The IPCC's main conclusion states that "the balance of evidence suggests a discernible human influence on global climate." This widely quoted, innocuous-sounding but **ambiguous phrase** has been misinterpreted by many to mean that climate disasters will befall the world unless strong action is taken immediately and sufficed as the smoking gun for Kyoto. **Gore wants the US to sign on to Kyoto.**

The next IPCC report again described the problems surrounding what has become known as the **attribution issue**: that is, to explain what mechanisms are responsible for observed changes in climate. Some deployed the **lassitude argument**--e.g., we can't think of an alternative--to support human attribution.

The IPCC introduced a previously neglected climate factor, namely, a negative "radiative forcing" (**cooling**) from **anthropogenic (produced by man)** sulfate aerosols arising mainly from the sulfur emissions of power plants and industries in Europe and North America which increase the amount of solar energy reflected back into space before it can warm the earth and was the reason why the degree of predicted greenhouse warming was not being observed. (Only **then**, when they had an excuse, did they admit that such a discrepancy actually existed.)
(Lindzen, 2006 and Sassone, Section 823.)

The National Academy of Sciences issued a report enumerating the **difficulties with attribution**, but again the report was **ambiguously claimed**: "The changes observed over the last several decades are likely mostly due to human activities, but we cannot rule out that some significant part of these changes is also a reflection of natural variability." (Lindzen, 2006)

It is frequently claimed that chapter 8, which gave rise to the major IPCC conclusion, is based on 130 peer-reviewed articles. Actually, the conclusion is based mainly on two research papers by Santer et al., **neither one of which had been published** at the time the chapter was under review. One paper (B. D. Santer et al., "Towards the Detection and Attribution of an Anthropogenic Effect on Climate," *Climate Dynamics* 12 [1995]: 79-100) appeared only in December 1995, **after the IPCC report was approved**; the other paper (B. D. Santer et al., "A Search for Human Influences on the Thermal Structure of the Atmosphere," *Nature* 382 [1996]:39-46) appeared in July 1996, **after the IPCC report was printed** (in May 1996). Since then the scientific community at large scrutinized both of these papers, and found that **certain factors were edited out in the final report; this gave the misleading impression** that there is a positive trend, and therefore, increasing agreement between calculated and observed temperature patterns—hence, "a discernible human influence on climate." We are thus led to conclude that the evidence presented is based on selective data and **does not support the IPCC's conclusion** that a human influence can be discerned.

(Singer, Fred, "Climate Policy – from Rio to Kyoto, A Political Issue for 2000 – and Beyond," Hoover Institution, Stanford Univ., 2000.)

Unbelievably, the **same authors**, in a concurrently appearing research paper, said: "Estimates of . . . natural variability are critical to the problem of detecting an anthropogenic signal. . . . We have estimated the spectrum . . . from palaeo-temperature proxies and compared it with . . . general circulation models. . . . None of the three estimates of the natural variability spectrum agree with each other. . . . Until . . . resolved, **it will be hard to say, with confidence, that an anthropogenic climate signal has or has not been**

detected."

T. P. Barnett, B. D. Santer, P. D. Jones, R. S. Bradley, and K. R. Briffa, "Estimates of Low-Frequency Natural Variability in Near-Surface Air Temperature," Holocene 6 (1996): 255-65.)

Interestingly, it was the second author, **Santer** (see paragraph above), who, in the 9/12/06 CC Times, said that greenhouse gasses, produced by man, cause hurricanes. Once again, he relied on 22 computer models, only this time he got 19 other scientists to agree with him (not a difficult task when **they all need government/UN/foundation funding to exist.**)

A team of twenty-three economic experts reexamined the 1996 IPCC (Working Group III) **review of economic impacts**. This reexamination shows a substantial gain for agriculture and forest growth but little effect on other economic activities in the United States; it finally concludes that a **warming, from whatever cause, would produce economic benefits rather than economic losses**.

R. Mendelsohn and J. E. Neumann (in The Impact of Climate Change on the United States Economy [Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1999])

Determined efforts are under way by environmental groups and their sympathizers in foundations and in the federal government to restrict and phase out the use of fossil fuels (and even nuclear reactors) as sources of energy. Such measures **may** reduce greenhouse-gas emissions into the atmosphere but also effectively **deindustrialize** the United States.

Bjorn Lomborg, a former member of Greenpeace and author of the 2004 book "Global Crisis, Global Solutions," has asserted that the **Kyoto treaty would be an economic disaster for the world while having only minimal effects on climate change**, and he dismissed the notion that Kyoto would impact anything but economic growth.

In 2000, French president Jacques Chirac reportedly called Kyoto "the first component of an **authentic global governance**."

Clinton never submitted it to Congress, although the Senate voted 95-0 against it. Canada announced in May 2006 that it is **dropping out of the Kyoto Protocol**. The new Prime Minister received a letter signed by 60 prominent scientists that **questioned how severe global warming will be** and whether Kyoto is the best way to deal with environmental concerns.

Almost no European nations have met their targets for reducing pollution under Kyoto.

There is considerable disagreement about the probable date when atmospheric GHG concentration might reach double the preindustrial level as the IPCC predicted. Estimates vary from the year 2050 all the way to **never**. The 5.2 percent cut in emissions (by industrialized nations only) is **ineffective** in slowing down the increase in GHG levels. According to the IPCC, stabilization of CO₂ concentration at the 1990 level requires emission cuts of between 60 and 80 percent on a worldwide basis, not just from industrialized nations. Informed estimates hold that emissions from developing nations, especially China, will predominate after about 2020.

(S. Fred Singer, Climate Policy – from Rio to Kyoto, Stanford University 2000, p 34)

The Kyoto Protocol is so complicated as to be practically infeasible, due to:

- 1) The allocation of national quotas -To whom should a nation's emission quotas be allocated.
- 3) An international authority will have to be created.

(Singer, 2000, p 36)

The Kyoto Protocol is costly.

There is little doubt that implementation of the emission cuts would be extremely expensive, in terms of higher energy prices, reduced economic growth, and loss of employment as industry moved to countries not required to cut emissions. (These include such giants as China, India, Brazil, and Mexico.) **(Schwarzenegger's plan for California will have these same effects-ed.)**

To sum up:

"Controlling emissions, by whatever method, is extremely costly, distorts economic decisions, destroys jobs, is difficult to monitor, and practically impossible to enforce. It is likely to create huge international bureaucracies and police forces, damaging not only industrialized countries but also certainly coal and oil exporters, and most of the developing countries, since they depend on trade with the industrialized nations. In addition, controls would do little good unless emissions are cut drastically **worldwide** - they **do not place stringent requirements** on developing nations. For the Protocol to go into effect, 55 percent of the nations representing at least 55 percent of emissions will have to ratify. Since the United States is the largest emitter of carbon dioxide (36 percent), it holds the key to its implementation. However, **China will soon take the lead** (see section on CO₂)."

(Paul Portney, head of the respected policy institute Resources for the Future, at a conference of the U.S. Energy Information Administration on March 22, 1999.)

Groups That Gain Directly From The Kyoto Protocol in one way or another.

- Scientists of all stripes get **more funds for research**, not just climate experts but also social scientists and even **theologians** who ponder the ethics of environmental change.
- Bureaucrats see their **power increase** as their budgets grow; they receive perks, recognition, and the ability to control the lives of others.
- Environmental activists, and especially their well-paid leaders, share some of the same objectives; perhaps that's why **they work so well with government**.
- The media find disasters of any kind irresistible—even if fictitious, they sell newspapers and airtime on TV.
- Many consulting groups and industries receive direct financial benefits from the **two-billion-dollar-a-year research budget of the federal government**.
- Finance ministers, who see this as a convenient way of raising additional revenue through a **large-scale energy tax or carbon tax**.
- The "one worlders," including U.N. officials, see this as an opportunity to strengthen **world government**. The so-called "Earth Charter" is being advanced by these groups.
- The **antigrowth and antitechnology advocates**, who want to deindustrialize the United States and other developed countries.
- The **neo-Malthusians** who believe that we are running out of resources—that the world is facing disaster unless we cut back on growth.
- The neopagans, who put Nature above mankind, worship plants and animals, and **consider humans to be outside of nature**. (For example, the remarkable testament of Al Gore's thinking, *Earth in the Balance*, his 1992 compendium of environmental alarms.)

If the basis were just science or economics, then Kyoto won't make it. But in a democracy, the battle will be political, especially since the media appear to have already chosen to accept and promote global warming fears. **It will be a U.S. political decision that determines the global fate of the Kyoto Protocol.**

(Singer, pp 43-5)

GCMs – GENERAL CIRCULATION MODELS

(Note: GCMs are fancy computers)

"You should approach climate models with a degree of awe and a sense of humor, they are incredible accomplishments in code-writing, but **they are not the real world.**"

(Dr. John Christy, one of the world's leading climatology experts and head author of the IPCC summary report)

This paper throws **doubt on the ability of models to make predictions**: "The forces that drive long-term climate change are not known with an accuracy sufficient to define future climate change."

(James E. Hansen et al., "Climate Forcings in the Industrial Era" Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 95 (1998): 12753–58.)

"Our climate models, when run backward, fail to show accurately what the climate was 20, 50 or 100 years ago, so we know these computer programs are, to be charitable, imperfect...Of more than 30 major computer climate models developed by scientists around the world, **no two agree precisely with one another.**"

("Legitimate threat or Hot Air," Lowell Ponte and Marc Morano, NewsMax, July 2006,)

"The important question—the focus of scientific debate—is whether the available evidence supports the results of calculations from the current General Circulation Models (GCMs). **Unless validated by the climate record, the predictions of future warming based on theoretical models cannot be relied on.** GCMs are not able to account for observed climate variations, which are presumably of natural origin, for the following reasons:

1. GCMs **assume** that the atmospheric level of carbon dioxide will continue its increase.
2. One must **assume** that global temperatures will really rise to the extent calculated.
3. The putative warming has been labeled as greater and more rapid than anything experienced in human history. **But a variety of historical data contradicts this apocalyptic statement.**"

(Singer, 2000)

Hartwig Volz, a geophysicist with the RWE Research Lab in Germany, has called the **climate models** predicting climate alarmism "fairy tales."

The models expect the most dramatic temperature rise at high latitudes, but scientists searching for such evidence in the Polar Regions are coming up **empty-handed.**

(J. D. Kahlet et al., "Absence of Evidence for Greenhouse Warming over the Arctic Ocean in the Past 40 Years," Nature 361 [1993]: 335–37.)

Richard Kerr exposed other **shortcomings of climate models**. He refers in particular to the need for "flux adjustments," an arbitrary correction of the energy flux between atmosphere and ocean to prevent a drift of the atmospheric temperature. *(Climate Modeling's Fudge Factor Comes under Fire, Science 263 (1994):152.)*

One researcher stated bluntly: "The oceanographic models that are coupled to the atmospheric ones are so **primitive** that I have no confidence in any integration carried out for a year or two"

(reported in S. Shackley et al., Adjusting to Policy Expectations on Climate Change Modeling: An Interdisciplinary Study of Flux Adjustments in Coupled Ocean-Atmosphere General Circulation Models. Report No. 48 [Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change, 1999]).

GCMs predict a warming trend that increases with altitude, rising to about 0.5° C per decade—in **clear disagreement with all observations, whether from the surface, balloons, or satellites.** *The report confirms the validity of the satellite data that show no appreciable warming of the bulk of the atmosphere and of the surface data that show a strong warming of the surface in the past twenty years. The report does not resolve the disparity.*

(National Research Council, Reconciling Observations of Global Temperature Change, Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, January 13, 2000)

"In sum, a strategy must recognize what is possible. In climate research and modeling, we should recognize that we are dealing with a coupled non-linear system, and therefore that the **prediction of a specific future climate is not possible.**"

("Further Fallout from Kyoto Decision," Global Warming Information Page. <http://www.globalwarming.org/polup/pol4-4-01.htm>)

When Mr. Stephanopoulos, on ABC, confronted Mr. Gore with the fact that the best estimates of rising sea levels are far less dire than he suggests in his movie, Mr. Gore defended his claims by noting that **scientists "don't have any models** that give them a high level of confidence" one way or the other.

"All measurements systems have errors (especially for climate trends), and researchers differ in their views of what kinds of errors exist, and how they should be corrected."

(Arthur B. Robinson, Sallie L. Baliunas, Willie Soon, and Zachary W. Robinson. "Environmental Effects of Increased Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide." Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine. 1997. Roy Spence, "Some Convergence of Global Warming Estimates," <http://www.techcentralstation.com/081105RS.html>.)

Computer models have many other known and admitted deficiencies such as the following:

- 1) If they were correct, since we already have had a 50% increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide, we should already have had about three times as much warming as has occurred.
- 2) Nearly all warming since 1881 took place before 1940, but nearly all the increase in carbon dioxide has occurred since 1940.
- 3) All computer models contain tuning or fudge factors designed to produce answers closer to those that are expected.
- 4) The smallest scale in a model is the grid size, which is usually more than 1 x 1 degree of latitude. Calculating such things as cloud physics on this scale leave the results suspect.
- 5) When used to reconstruct the present climate, the models make large errors in local areas in temperature and have produced, for example, as much rain over the Sahara as over Britain. They are universally acknowledged not to be dependable in terms of local weather conditions.
- 6) The large differences between results from different models is reason enough to be skeptical of model results in general.
- 7) The estimates of the warming to be expected have been gradually declining over the past decade.

(Richard A. Kerr, "Climate Modeling's Fudge Factor Comes under Fire," Science 265, 1528, 1994.)

928 ARTICLES/SCIENTIFIC CONSENSUS

This is the first **BIG LIE** in Gore's movie. **THERE IS NO CONSENSUS!**

A study in the journal *Science* by the social scientist Nancy Oreskes claimed that a search of the ISI Web of Knowledge Database for the years 1993 to 2003 under the key words "global climate change" produced 928 articles (**not 983 as Gore claims**), all of whose abstracts supported what she referred to as the consensus view. A British social scientist, Benny Peiser, checked her procedure and found that only 913 of the 928 articles had abstracts at all, and that **only 13 of the remaining 913 explicitly endorsed the so-called consensus view**. Several actually opposed it.
(Lindzen, *Wall Street Journal*, 6/26/06. See *References page*)

It is **sheer fantasy** to suggest that a majority of scientists with expertise in disciplines related to global climate change endorse an alarmist interpretation of the data. Consider the following:

In 1992, a "Statement of Atmospheric Scientists on Greenhouse Warming," opposing global controls on industrial greenhouse-gas emissions, drew about **100 signatures**, mostly from members of technical committees of the **American Meteorological Society**. The 1992 "**Heidelberg Appeal**," which also expressed skepticism on the urgency for global action to restrict greenhouse-gas emissions, drew more than **4,000 signatures** from scientists worldwide.

A **survey of 400** German, American and Canadian climate researchers conducted by the Meteorologisches Institut der Universität Hamburg and the GKSS Forschungszentrum found that **67 percent either disagreed or were uncertain** about the proposition that global warming will occur so quickly that lack of preparation could prove disastrous.

The 1996 "**Leipzig Declaration**," sponsored by the prime minister of the state of Saxony, echoed the previously released Heidelberg Appeal, and was signed by **more than a hundred** climate and other scientists, including several who participated in the IPCC report, who expressed their doubts about the validity of global warming forecasts.

A 1997 survey by American Viewpoint found that state climatologists believe that global warming is largely a natural phenomenon by a margin of 44 to 17 percent.

In May 1998, more than 17,000 scientists - including 2,388 specialists in the field of climate change (physicists, geophysicists, climatologists, meteorologists, oceanographers, and environmental scientists) signed the "Oregon Petition," a petition to Congress questioning the theory of human-induced climate change, the need for government action to address global warming and the Kyoto Protocol. The petition stated:

"We urge the United States government to **reject the global warming agreement** that was written in Kyoto, Japan in December, 1997, and any other similar proposals. The proposed limits on greenhouse gases would harm the environment, hinder the advance of science and technology, and damage the health and welfare of mankind.

There is **no convincing scientific evidence** that human release of carbon dioxide, methane, or other greenhouse gasses is causing or will, in the foreseeable future, cause catastrophic heating of the Earth's atmosphere and disruption of the Earth's climate. Moreover, there is substantial scientific evidence that **increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide produce many beneficial effects upon the natural plant and animal environments of the Earth.**"

<http://www.sitewave.net/pproject/> Also, <http://www.oism.org/pproject/>

The claim that 2,500 IPCC scientists supported the 1995 IPCC conclusion cannot be sustained. IPCC delegates are generally social scientists, policy analysts, economists, public relations specialists and various government functionaries, individuals who cannot remotely be considered climate change experts. **Only about a hundred** of the fewer than two thousand names listed in the three volumes of the report **have appropriate scientific credentials** (i.e., climate change scientists) and **many of these are on record as opposing** or doubting the IPCC conclusion. In any case, the only poll conducted of IPCC contributors and reviewers back in 1991 showed that, while the majority supported the chapter they worked on, this **did not extend to the Summary.**

("No Scientific Consensus on Greenhouse Warming," Wall Street Journal, September 23, 1991; also, Dr. Fred Singer, "A Treaty Built On Hot Air, Not Scientific Consensus," Wall Street Journal, July 25, 1997.)

"Given that the (GW) concern has led to a tenfold increase in funding, agencies are very reluctant to let go of this, especially since all you are called upon to say is you think [global warming] is possible. That is hardly a ringing endorsement...**speaking about consensus relieves everyone of the need to even have the faintest idea what they are talking about.** They just have to say everyone agrees, and so they no longer even have to think about the issue.

(Lindzen, 7/2/06, see references)

CO₂ INCREASE

The leading theory on global warming holds that the planet is getting warmer because human industrial activity over the last century is filling the atmosphere with carbon dioxide (CO₂), a greenhouse gas. According to this theory, carbon dioxide in the atmosphere prevents heat from escaping into space. The retained heat causes an increase in temperatures. This is called the greenhouse effect. It turns out that **Gore's graphs have it backwards – increased temperatures precede, not follow, CO₂ increases.**

"Gore states that the US is the world's largest producer of CO₂ (carbon dioxide). He ignores the very relevant fact that the **US is also a very great absorber of CO₂**, because of our gigantic store of "biomass" i.e. trees, agricultural plants, etc. Some studies show that the US is a net "sink" for CO₂. This was one of the reasons why the Kyoto protocol would have been economically unfair to the US. We were to be **penalized for our CO₂ production and not rewarded for our CO₂ absorption."**
(Howard Maccabee, Notes, see references)

Gore's film somehow omitted the details that nations such as **China and India are exempted** from the Kyoto protocols. These nations have the largest populations, and the fastest growing populations. Notably China has the fastest growing industrial production and the fastest growth of CO₂ production. **"The Chinese plan to build 500 additional coal-burning power plants**, erecting one each week for more than a decade to come."
(*"Legitimate threat or Hot Air," Lowell Ponte and Marc Morano, NewsMax, July 2006,*)

"Unless China finds a way to clean up its coal plants and the thousands of factories that burn coal, pollution will soar at home and abroad. The increase in global-warming gases from China's coal use will **probably exceed** that for all (other) industrialized countries combined ever the next 25 years, surpassing by five times the reduction in such emissions that the Kyoto Protocol seeks."
(*"Pollutions from Chinese Coal Casts Shadow around the Globe," NY Times, 6/11/06, p.1*)

This in itself **gives the lie** to Gore's implication that U.S. adhering to Kyoto would be effective in preventing global climate change.

There is tremendous uncertainty whether man-caused global warming is even occurring, or if CO₂ is even directly involved in warming. In all three of the most recent glacial terminations, **the earth warmed well before there was any increase in the air's CO₂ content.**

(Fischer, H., Wahlen, M., Smith, J., Mastroianni, D. and Deck B. "Ice core records of atmospheric CO₂ around the last three glacial terminations." *Science* 283: 1712-1714, 1999. Also, Staufer, B., Blunier, T., Dallenbach, A., Indermuhle, A., Schwander, J., Stocker, T.F., Tschumi, J., Chappellaz, J., Raynaud, D., Hammer, C.U. and Clausen, H.B. Atmospheric CO₂ concentration and millennial-scale climate change during the last glacial period. *Nature* 392: 59-62, 1998. AND, Cheddadi, R., Lamb, H.F., Guiot, J. and van der Kaars, S. Holocene climatic change in Morocco: a quantitative reconstruction from pollen data. *Climate Dynamics* 14: 883-890, 1998. AND Gagan, M.K., Ayliffe, L.K., Hopley, D., Cali, J.A., Mortimer, G.E., Chappell, J., McCulloch, M.T. and Head, M.J. Temperature and surface-ocean water balance of the mid-Holocene tropical western Pacific. *Science* 279: 1014-1017, 1998. AND Raymo, M.E., Ganley, K., Carter, S., Oppo, D.W. and McManus, J. Millennial-scale climate instability during the early Pleistocene epoch. *Nature* 392: 699-702, 1998. AND Indermuhle, A., Stocker, T.F., Joos, F., Fischer, H., Smith, H.J., Wahlen, M., Deck, B., Mastroianni, D., Tschumi, J., Blunier, T., Meyer, R. and Stauffer, B. Holocene carbon-cycle dynamics based on CO₂ trapped in ice at Taylor Dome, Antarctica. *Nature* 398: 121-126, 1999.)

There is general agreement that the increase in atmospheric greenhouse gases (GHG), such as CO₂, methane, nitrous oxide, and so on, over the last hundred years or so is due

to human activities. Of the total, nearly 97 percent is water vapor and **only 1.9 percent is CO₂**. Attention has focused mainly on CO₂ from fossil fuel burning, the most important anthropogenic GHG. **Less than half of the released CO₂ remains in the atmosphere; this fraction seems to be diminishing.** The rest is absorbed by the ocean and by the biosphere, thereby speeding up the growth of agricultural crops and forests.

(Patrick Michaels and Robert Balling, Jr. The Satanic Gases, Clearing the Air About Global Warming Washington, DC: CATO Institute, 2000), p. 25.)

For reasons as yet unexplained, the rate of increase of atmospheric **CO₂ has slowed considerably in the last decades**, and methane may have stopped increasing altogether. This makes it extremely difficult to predict future concentrations of CO₂ and methane, the latter depending primarily on the rate of population growth (originating mainly through cattle raising and rice growing).

(Singer, Fred, "Climate Policy – from Rio to Kyoto, A Political Issue for 2000 – and Beyond," Hoover Institution, Stanford Univ., 2000.)

Additional carbon dioxide not only acts as a fertilizer for most plants, it also allows them to obtain the carbon dioxide they require with reduced opening of the stomata on their leaves which in turn reduces their loss of water by evaporation. Thus, they not only produce more biomass, they also do it with more efficient use of water. *(Sylvan H. Wittwer, "Flower Power: Rising Carbon Dioxide is Great for Plants," Policy Review, Fall 1992 (62), 4-9, 1992.)*

Everyone agrees that a warming produced by an increase in CO₂, or by any other cause, will lead to more evaporation and therefore to a higher level of atmospheric WV (Water Vapor); however, it is the WV concentration in the upper troposphere—not in the boundary layer—that determines whether the feedback is positive or negative. On that score, opinions differ widely and probably will continue to do so until the necessary data are at hand. **Yet until GCM climate sensitivity is validated by observations, one cannot accept the predictions of large future temperature increases.**

(Singer, 2000)

A review of the research literature concerning the environmental consequences of increased levels of atmospheric carbon dioxide leads to the conclusion that **increases during the 20th Century have produced no deleterious effects upon global weather, climate, or temperature.** Increased carbon dioxide has, however, markedly increased plant growth rates. **Predictions** of harmful climatic effects due to future increases in minor **greenhouse gases like CO₂ are in error** and do not conform to current experimental knowledge.

(Environmental Effects of Increased Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide, ARTHUR B. ROBINSON ‡ , SALLIE L. BALIUNAS † , WILLIE SOON † , AND ZACHARY W. ROBINSON ‡ Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine, 2251 Dick George Rd., Cave Junction, Oregon 97523 [info@oism.org]; January 1998.)

The leader of the largest German climate institute, Klaus Hasselmann, a well-known promoter of global warming, has tried to address this question. He finally concluded that "uncertainties in the detection of anthropogenic climate change can be expected to subside only gradually in the next few years, while the predicted signal is still slowly emerging from the natural climate variability noise . . . once the signal has been unequivocally detected above the background noise." I take this convoluted language to mean that **a human influence on global climate has not yet been detected.**

(K. Hasselmann, "Are We Seeing Global Warming?" (Science 276 [1997]:914–15). Another article ("No Guilty Verdict Yet for Climate Change," Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, December 15, 1999) comments on Hasselmann's transformation from global warming advocate to a less certain position about human influence on changing climate

A report by the leading international group of specialists in this technique, representing ten major climate centers, concludes: "At present it is **not possible** to make a very confident statement about the relative contributions of specific natural and anthropogenic forcings to observe climate change. One of the main reasons is that fully realistic simulations of climate change due to the combined effects of all anthropogenic and natural forcings mechanisms have yet to be computed."

(T. P. Barnett, K. Hasselmann, M. Chelliah, T. Delworth, G. Hegerl, P. Jones, E. Rasmusson, E. Roeckner, C. Ropelewski, B. Santer, and S. Tett, "Detection and Attribution of Recent Climate Change: A Status Report" Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society 80 (1999): 2631–59)

NASA reports that "the rate of growth of **greenhouse gas emissions has slowed** since its peak in 1980. Although the authors cite the control of CFCs as explaining much of the reduction, the good news is that; "The climate warming projected by the Goddard Institute study is about half as large as typical increases cited by the report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)." Even so, **a large number of scientists do not believe there is even sufficient evidence to show that what little warming is occurring is caused by man-caused increases in CO₂.**

("Easing off the (Greenhouse) Gas" NASA, January 15, 2002. http://science.nasa.gov/headlines/y2002/15jan_greenhouse.htm)

"There is evidence that **high carbon dioxide levels do not necessarily lead to high temperatures.** When the CO₂ levels were over ten times higher than they are now, about 450 million years ago, the planet was in the depths of the absolute coldest period in the last half billion years. On the basis of this evidence, how could anyone still believe that the recent relatively small increase in CO₂ levels would be the major cause of the past century's modest warming? **There is a very good correlation between Earth's temperature and natural celestial phenomena such changes in the brightness of the Sun.**"

(Tim Patterson, paleoclimatologist at Canada's Carleton University, testifying before Canada's Commons Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development. Reported in Canada Free Press, 6/12/06)

"The Sun's variability shaped planetary atmospheres and the Earth's global climate, clearly separating those due to anthropogenic forcing."

(Dibyendu Nandy and P.C.H. Martens, Unraveling Long-Term Solar Climate: The Stars as Suns, ILWS WORKSHOP 2006, GOA, FEBRUARY 19-20)

"Periods of high solar activity corresponded with periods of warmth on Earth and periods of low solar activity likewise corresponded with periods of wet, cool weather...**the current high level of solar activity may also have an impact on the terrestrial climate.** We note a general similarity between our long-term SN reconstruction and different reconstructions of temperature: both SN and temperature show a slow decreasing trend just prior to 1910, followed by a steep rise."

(Mursula, K., Usokin, I., & Cliver, E. 2004, Sol. Phys., 224, 3. Douglas V. Hoyt and Kenneth H. Schatten, The Role of the Sun in Climate Change, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1997.)

The earth's outer atmosphere, known as the thermosphere, is notoriously volatile and is affected by forces scientists have yet to fully understand. By day, for instance, the thermosphere, which extends to about 300 miles into space, heats up to as much as 800°F, causing it to expand by several miles while nighttime cooling causes it to contract. In September 1998, Martin Jarvis, an atmospheric research physicist in Cambridge, England conceded that **long-term changes in the sun's intensity could alternatively explain the thermosphere's contraction.**

(Joby Warrick, "Scientists in Britain Say Sky May Be Shrinking," Washington Post, September 17, 1998)

GLACIERS, SEA LEVELS, SNOW MELTING

"Along with most popular media, **Gore pictorially emphasizes the decrease in the Arctic ice-pack.** This may be deliberate, to take attention from the fact that the quantity of ice in the Antarctic, which is not only many times larger than the Arctic, but is also **increasing, much more than the decrease in the Arctic.**

Gore and his allies conveniently forget that the global climate models that they worship predict comparable warming at both poles. **How can we trust models that got it wrong for the whole Antarctic continent?"**

("Convenient Lies In 'An Inconvenient Truth,'" Howard Maccabee, MD, PhD, July 2006, personal notes)

Gore trekked to Grinnell Glacier in Glacier National Park, Montana in September of 1997. His press event was held during summer. All glaciers in mid-latitude regions melt in the late summer and stop melting in winter when the temperature usually stays below freezing. The Grinnell Glacier has been gradually receding for 150 years. That means that the glacier was retreating for 100 years before man-made CO₂ emissions were significant. The World Glacier Monitoring Service in Zurich, Switzerland noted that, between 1926 and 1960, 70 percent of 625 glaciers in the United States, Soviet Union, Iceland, Switzerland, Austria and Italy were retreating. After 1980, though, **55 percent of those same glaciers were advancing.**

(Douglas V. Hoyt, "Greenhouse Warming Scorecard," Monograph, 1997)

"Alpine glaciers have been retreating since the early 19th century, and were advancing for several centuries before that. Since about 1970, many of the glaciers have stopped retreating and some are **now advancing again. And, frankly, we don't know why.**"

(Lindzen, 7/2/06, see references page)

Conway demonstrates the continuing **melting of the West Antarctic** ice sheet, which is responsible for much of the sea-level rise that has been ongoing since the end of the last Ice Age, about 15,000 years ago. He suggests that a putative global warming **will slow down rather than speed up the ongoing sea-level rise** as more evaporation and precipitation lead to more rapid ice accumulation on the Antarctic continent.

(H. Conway et al., "Past and Future Grounding-Line Retreat of the West Antarctic Ice Sheet," Science 286 [1999]: 280-83)

Since 1940...data have been undergone predominantly a **cooling trend**...The Greenland ice sheet and coastal regions are not following the current global warming trend. The Arctic was as warm or warmer in 1940. The evidence so far suggests that the **Greenland ice sheet is actually growing on average.**

(Chylek, P., J. E. Box, and G. Lesins. "Global Warming and the Greenland Sheet" Climatic Change, 63 (2004): 201-21.)

Not shown on Gore's graphs is the Medieval Warm Period (MWP), a time of temperatures warmer than average beginning in about 800 A.D. and lasting until about 1300 A.D.; it was followed by the "Little Ice Age," a period of several centuries of colder than normal temperatures (lasting until about 1869). Greenland's weather was mild in the (MWP), similar to today or warmer.

(Jared Diamond, UCLA Professor of geography, in Disasters – Old and New Perspectives, Antonio Missiroli, 24-27 June 2005, EU-ISS, Paris)

Regarding Gore's claim that there has been a sharp drop-off in the **thickness of the Arctic ice** cap since 1970:

"The survey that Gore cites was a single transect across one part of the Arctic basin in the month of October during the 1960s when we were in the middle of the cooling period. The 1990 runs were done in the warmer month of September, using a wholly different technology."

(Tim Ball, Former University of Winnipeg climatology professor, Canadian Free Press.)

Syun-Ichi Akasofu, director of the International Research Center in Fairbanks, Alaska, told a Senate hearing, in April 2006, that highly publicized climate models showing a disappearing Arctic were nothing more than **"science fiction."**

"There exists **"strong evidence of ice-sheet growth (in Antarctica)."**

(Richard B. Alley. "On Thickening Ice?" Science, January 18, 2002; 295:451-452. "Positive Mass Balance of the Ross Ice Streams, West Antarctica" Ian Joughin and Slawek Tulaczyk, Science 2002 January, 18; 295:476-480.)

"Some scientists also argue that the amount of water the Antarctic ice-sheet holds should increase over the course of the next 100 years, producing a **sea level drop of 3.54 inches."**

(A. Ohmura, et. al. "A Possible Change in Mass Balance of Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets in the coming century." J. Climate 9:2124-35.)

The UN IPCC has recently reported that, **"No significant acceleration in the rate of sea-level rise during the 20th century has been detected."**

Sea levels have been rising at a rate of about **7 inches per century**. Climate specialists believe that the steady rise in sea level is related to tectonic changes in the shape of the ocean basin, phenomena human beings have no control over. Warmer temperatures would melt glaciers and cause an expansion in the ocean. But warmer temperatures would also be accompanied by an increased rate of evaporation. This would lead to more rainfall and, in the Polar Regions, more snowfall, which would have the **effect of thickening the ice caps while lowering sea levels.**

(Dr. Fred Singer, "The Sky Isn't Falling, And The Ocean Isn't Rising," Wall Street Journal, July 25, 1997)

Gore cunningly claims that global warming is causing the **snows of Mt. Kilimanjaro to disappear. This has also been debunked by scientific reports.** For example, a 2004 study in the British science Journal Nature makes clear that Kilimanjaro is experiencing less snowfall because there's less moisture in the air due to deforestation around Kilimanjaro. Satellite measurements show the peak is colder today than it was in 1970. This is just another "snow job"

("Legitimate threat or Hot Air," Lowell Ponte and Marc Morano, NewsMax, July 2006,)

Gore implies that the Aral Sea in Central Asia has been drying up as a consequence of global warming. In fact, it has been shrinking because **the former Soviet Union diverted rivers that once kept it full.**

HURRICANES

There is general agreement that we can't attribute any particular hurricane to global warming. To be sure, there is one exception, Greg Holland of the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Boulder, Colo., who argues that it must be global warming because he **can't think of anything else!**

Will Global Warming Cause an Increase in Hurricanes and Severe Storms?

It has been widely reported that hurricanes and severe storms are increasing as a result of human-made global warming. In 1996, Newsweek carried a cover story titled, "Blizzards, Floods and Hurricanes: Blame Global Warming." Is there any evidence to support this? The meteorological record is clear on the question. **There has been no upward trend in the number of tropical storms and hurricanes in the Atlantic during the last 50 years** although the concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere has been increasingly rapidly. **(There were no U.S. hurricanes in 2006).**

(Landsea, C.W., et al., 1996, Geophysical Research Letters, Vol. 23, No. 13, 1697-1700, with permission).

The most intense and destructive hurricanes with sustained winds of 100 miles an hour or more, exceptionally violent and destructive, have actually become **less frequent in the last 50 years.**

The 1995 IPCC report says "Overall there is **no evidence that extreme weather events, or climate variability, has increased,** in a global sense, through the 20th century ..."
(Eric S. Blake, Jerry D. Jarrell (retired), Edward N. Rappaport and Christopher W. Landsea. The Deadliest, Costliest, and Most Intense United States Tropical Cyclones From 1851 To 2004, NOAA Technical Memorandum NWS TPC-4, August 2005.)

Asked if **Hurricane Katrina** was caused by global warming, *Dr. William Gray, professor of atmospheric science and head of the Tropical Meteorology Project at Colorado State University,* replied "I am very confident that it's not.... if we go back from 1970 through the middle '90s, that 25 year period - even though the globe was warming slightly, **the number of major storms was down,** quite a bit down." Continuing his answer, Dr. Gray blasted those scientists who try to link the frequency and intensity of hurricanes to global warming. "They would like to have the possibility open that global warming will make for more and intense storms because **there's a lot of money to be made on this,**" he warns. **"If you want to get federal funding, you better not come out and say human-induced global warming is a hoax because you stand the chance of not getting funded."**

The bottom line is that actual observations of the climate show that there is **no foundation** for fears that increases in greenhouse gases are causing an increase in the number of hurricanes and violent storms.

'Hurricanes and Global Warming: Is There a Link?' George Taylor, TechCentralStation.com, August 2005

"What you see across the Atlantic in the hurricane formation region is that **the ocean is cooling down.** This is a linear trend from 1950 to 2004. In the Gulf of Mexico, by the way, in the eastern Gulf, it is cooling down; in the western, it is warming up. Now why is it cooling down? Because we have had ten years of more tropical storms and tropical storms take heat out of the ocean. If it weren't cooling down, I would think something is wrong."

(Atlantic Hurricanes: The True Story, The George Marshall Institute, Dr. James O'Brien is the Robert O. Lawton Distinguished Professor of Meteorology & Oceanography and Director of Center for Ocean-Atmospheric Prediction Studies at Florida State University in Tallahassee. His honors include membership in Norway's Academy of Science and Letters and the Russian Academy of Science. In 1991, he was named Secretary of the

Navy Professor of Meteorology and Oceanography and in 1999 he was appointed State of Florida Climatologist. 10/12/05.)

There are **no known scientific studies** that show a conclusive physical link between global warming and observed hurricane frequency and intensity. Whatever suggested changes in hurricane activity that might result from global warming in the future are quite small in comparison to the large natural variability of hurricanes, typhoons and tropical cyclones. For example, the latest GFDL global warming study suggested about a 5% increase in the winds of hurricanes 80 years in the future. This contrasts with the more than doubling that occur now in numbers of major hurricanes between active and quiet decades in the Atlantic basin. If global warming is influencing hurricane activity, then we should be seeing a global change in the number and strength of these storms. Yet there is **no evidence** of a global increase in the strength and frequency of hurricanes, typhoons, and tropical cyclones over the past several years.

(*'Hurricanes and Global Warming,' Chris Landsea, Posted January 19, 2005*)

"There has been an upswing in the Atlantic since 1995, and this year's bumper crop of storms has struck Florida in numbers and intensities seldom occurring before. A sign of things to come? According to Bill Gray, "Various groups and individuals have suggested that the recent large upswing in Atlantic hurricane activity (since 1995) may be in some way related to the effects of increased man-made greenhouse gases such as carbon dioxide (CO₂). **There is no reasonable scientific way** that such an interpretation of this recent upward shift in Atlantic hurricane activity can be made."

(*Are Global Warming and Katrina Linked? Interview of Dr. William Gray, professor of atmospheric science and head of the Tropical Meteorology Project at Colorado State University; he pioneered the science of hurricane forecasting.*)

Kevin Trenberth, National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR), says (1) "there is no sound theoretical basis for drawing any conclusions about how **anthropogenic climate change** affects hurricane numbers or tracks, and thus how many hit land"; (2) "it is not yet possible to say how El Nino and other factors affecting hurricane formation may change as the world warms"; and (3) "our physical understanding suggests that the intensity of rainfall from hurricanes is probably increasing even if this increase cannot yet be proven".

(*"Uncertainty in Hurricanes and Global Warming," Science, June 17, 2005*)

Hurricane historian Jay Barnes of Pine Knoll Shores, North Carolina says that ocean heat is the key ingredient for hurricane formation. More heat could "generate more storms and more intense hurricanes." Numerous studies in recent years have found **no evidence** that the number of hurricanes and their northwest Pacific Ocean cousins, typhoons, is increasing because of the rise in global temperatures."

(*'Is Global Warming Making Hurricanes Worse?' John Roach, National Geographic News August 4, 2005*)

Careful analysis of global hurricane data shows that, against a background of increasing SST (Sea Surface Temperature), **no global trend has yet emerged** in the number of tropical storms and hurricanes. Only one region, the North Atlantic, shows a statistically significant increase, which commenced in 1995. However, a simple attribution of the increase in numbers of storms to a warming SST environment **is not supported**, because of the lack of a comparable correlation in other ocean basins where SST is also increasing."

(Patrick Michaels. "Global Warming and Hurricanes: Still No Connection," Tech Central Station, September 16, 2005. <http://www.techcentralstation.com/091605F.html>)

For an excellent discussion, see:

Linkage Between Hurricanes and Global Warming Tenuous,
The George C. Marshall Institute, September 6, 2005, www.marshall.org

CONCLUSIONS

The diversity of opinions on issues related to global warming points to one unassailable fact: we simply do not know enough about the geophysical processes of the planet to make useful predictions about climate change. In fact, new climate surprises spring up all the time.

- **Nonscientists generally do not want to bother with understanding the science of climatology.**
- Given that the **question of human attribution largely cannot be resolved**, its use in promoting visions of disaster constitutes nothing so much as a **bait-and-switch scam**.
- There is a clear attempt to **establish truth not by scientific methods but by perpetual repetition. (Goebbel's Big Lie - the bigger the lie, the more likely it is to be believed)**

It is a sign of pride to think that man has an effect on the forces of nature.

The earth and its climate are dynamic; they are always changing even without any external forcing. To treat all change as something to fear is bad enough; to do so in order to **exploit that fear** is much worse. Regardless, these items are clearly not issues over which debate is ended--at least not in terms of the actual science.

(Lindzen, 7/2/06)

POPULATION IS THE BOTTOM LINE

Remember, it is the UN that is sponsoring the Kyoto Protocol – the same UN that sponsors population control throughout the world. It is also the huge foundations that provide a lot of the money and impetus for global warming “research” who also fund worldwide contraception and abortion.

The US population will reach 300 million in the near future, largely due to immigration as well as life expectancy. Yet, we have “an insolvent Social Security system due to the ‘fertility crisis’...our replacement rate is 2.1, 1.7 for college educated non-Hispanic white women whose children are most likely to become taxpaying citizens...Countries with generous social security systems have lower fertility rates and marriage rates and higher divorce rates.”

(Jennifer Roback Morse, Ph.D., Author: Smart Sex: Finding Life-Long Love in a Hook-up World. Former economics teacher at Yale and George Mason University, Research Fellow, Hoover Institution)

Al Gore is on record in favor of abortion, as is his Democratic party. He claims that global warming is a moral issue, but supports abortion. Sally Bingham of CIPL has said, “Global warming is not only a scientific problem — but **the most important moral issue of our time. It directly affects the survival of future generations.**”

Here's what I say: what about the 4,000 babies a day, “**the future generations,**” that are killed by abortion? **They are what affect the survival of our country!**

RESOURCES AND REFERENCES

S. Fred Singer

Earned his Ph.D. in physics at Princeton University, was the first director of the U.S. Weather Satellite Service, founding Dean of the School of Environmental and Planetary Sciences, University of Miami; Chief Scientist, U.S. Department of Transportation; Deputy Assistant Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; Deputy Assistant Secretary, U.S. Department of the Interior; and Professor Emeritus of environmental sciences at the University of Virginia, among other positions. He chaired the U.S. government panel investigating possible climate effects from a fleet of supersonic transports (SSTs).

Singer is President and founder of The Science & Environmental Policy Project, a non-profit, educational organization based in Fairfax, Virginia. A Fellow of the AAAS, American Geophysical Union, and the American Institute for Aeronautics and Astronautics, Singer has received numerous honors, including a White House Commendation for the early design of space satellites and a Commerce Department Gold Medal for the development and management of weather satellites. He was recognized by NASA in 1997 for his research on particle clouds. Singer's 16th book is *Hot Talk, Cold Science: Global Warming's Unfinished Debate* (Oakland, California: Independent Institute, 1997)

On January 27, 1992, then-Senator Albert Gore was scheduled to appear on "Larry King Live" to discuss the global warming issue. When he learned that Dr. Fred Singer had been booked to appear on the same program, Gore backed out, saying that he "could not appear under those circumstances." The segment was canceled. A week later, Larry King agreed to let Gore back on the show, alone and unchallenged.

Referenced is Singer's Essay "Climate Policy – from Rio to Kyoto, A Political Issue for 2000 – and Beyond," Hoover Institution, Stanford Univ., 2000.

Richard Lindzen

Alfred P. Sloan Professor of Meteorology, Department of Earth, Atmospheric and Planetary Sciences, MIT. He is the recipient of the AMS's Meisinger, and Charney Awards, and AGU's Macelwane Medal. He is a corresponding member of the NAS Committee on Human Rights, a member of the NRC Board on Atmospheric Sciences and Climate, and a Fellow of the AAAS¹. He is a consultant to the Global Modeling and Simulation Group at NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center, and a Distinguished Visiting Scientist at California Institute of Technology's Jet Propulsion Laboratory. (Ph.D., '64, S.M., '61, A.B., '60, Harvard University)

8/30/06 Article published in the Boston Globe by Alex Beam, "MIT's inconvenient scientist"
7/2/06 Article published in the Wall Street Journal by Lindzen, "Don't Believe the Hype."

Frederick Seitz

Past President, National Academy of Sciences, U.S.A. President Emeritus, Rockefeller University. Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine.

Howard Maccabee, MD, PhD

"Convenient Lies In 'An Inconvenient Truth,'" July 2006, personal notes

Robert Sassone

"Handbook on Population," Stafford, VA: American Life League, 1994, Sections 801-826.

Appendix: “THE COOLING WORLD,” Reid Bryson, author

Excerpts from the 4-28-1975 issue of NEWSWEEK:

(Note: 30 years ago the scare was that the world was cooling)

“Reid Bryson of the University of Wisconsin points out that the Earth’s average temperature during the great Ice Ages was only about seven degrees lower than during its warmest eras – and that the present decline has taken the planet about a sixth of the way toward the Ice Age average. Others regard the cooling as a **reversion to the ‘little ice age’ conditions** that brought bitter winters to much of Europe and northern America between 1600 and 1900...”

“The **drop in food output** could begin quite soon, perhaps only 10 years from now.

“Time magazine quoted a University of Toronto climatologist as saying:

‘I don’t believe that the world’s present population is sustainable if there are more than three years like 1972 in a row.’”

“The evidence in support of these predictions has now begun to accumulate so massively that meteorologists are hard-pressed to keep up with it. In England, farmers have seen their **growing season decline** by about two weeks since 1950, with a resultant overall loss in grain production estimated at up to 100,000 tons annually. During the same time, the average temperature around the equator has risen by a fraction of a degree – a fraction that in some areas can mean drought and desolation. Last April, in the most devastating outbreak of tornadoes ever recorded, 148 twisters killed more than 300 people and caused half a billion dollars’ worth of damage in 13 U.S. states.”

“...advance signs of fundamental changes in the world’s weather... almost unanimous in the view that the trend will **reduce agricultural productivity** for the rest of the century.”

“Just what causes the onset of major and minor ice ages remains a mystery.”

“The growth of world population and creation of new national boundaries make it impossible for starving peoples to migrate from their devastated fields.”

“Some of the more spectacular solutions proposed, such as melting the Arctic ice cap by covering it with black soot or diverting arctic rivers, might create problems far greater than those they solve.”

(Note: overpopulation is a theme that runs through Gore’s movie and much of the GW literature)

The current global climate scare has no more basis in reality than the last one. “That whole concept of another Ice Age is probably the **greatest single hoax** ever perpetrated on the American people...and it was, until this global warming thing came along.”

(Sen. James Inhofe, chairman of the House Committee on Environment and Public Works, Senate floor speech, Sept. 25, 2006)