



GLOBAL WARMING IN 2008 – AN OPEN LETTER TO EVERYBODY

Happy New Year to all and I would appreciate it if you would allow me to further illustrate a better interpretation of the facts on the issue of man-made global warming, with links to the latest articles by the very best brains in related sciences and despite so many leading international academies proclaiming that the “science is settled” and “the debate is over”. It won’t be the first time in our recent history that leading scientific institutions have been proven woefully wrong on the issues of their day and man-made global warming is likely to be another one. Only by continuous debate and reading, with an open mind, the latest peer-reviewed articles by scientists in pertinent fields of expertise can we reach conclusions that approximate the truth. We collectively do not yet know anywhere near enough on the many aspects of our existence to know the truth about a wide range of complex matters, our climate and climate change amongst them. To make far-reaching decisions based on so little understanding is to run the risk of causing untold suffering and long-term damage for no worthwhile gain.

Common sense is essential in understanding what often appear to be contradictory scientific opinions.

The consensus building and reviewing processes used by the UN IPCC have been analysed and called into question by suitably qualified scientists and statisticians alike. The very idea behind statements such as “the science is settled” and “the debate is over” is preposterous in any field of endeavour other than the design of a wheel for locomotive purposes, which is best if it perfectly round.

“We only understand 10 percent of the climate issue. That is not enough to wreck the world economy with Kyoto-like measures” - Henk Tennekes, former research director, Royal Dutch Meteorological Institute. Once it is stated that “the debate is over” it is rather obvious that the door to differing opinions or new research findings is closed.

Governments the world over owe it to the public to show that they have done their own research, reached their own conclusions, published the work upon which they have based their conclusions and are not acting out the edicts handed down by small group of unelected UN officials who in turn base their work on a small group of relevantly qualified scientists who have in effect had a lot of their own work ignored or significantly altered with no means of recourse to the incorrect usage of their work! Several scientists threatened legal action to have their names removed from the report, as their original work had been ignored or altered against their wishes!

The links below are a random selection from hundreds of articles written by thousands of scientists from across all relevant scientific disciplines and linked off these articles, many more articles and scientific papers can be found that will in the very least provide the diligent reader with enough peer-reviewed material to decide on what is and what is not likely to be the true state of our Earth and its climate. At the last count, there were nearly 20,000 scientists who had signed up to the need for a debate, based on their own peer-reviewed research being at odds with the published UN IPCC work and ignored by the mainstream media for their own dubious reasons. Only research or an event that even remotely helps to promote AGW is given airtime and column space, quite extraordinary really and behaviour reminiscent of former Communist regimes!

Arctic ice melting is news, record Arctic ice re-growing at a record rate is not?!

2% of Antarctica warming is news, 98% of Antarctica cooling and thickening is not?!

For up to date actual pictures of ice at the poles: <http://iup.physik.uni-bremen.de:8084/amsr/amsre.html>

At all times, please keep in mind that our atmosphere is currently estimated to hold around 3 *thousand* Gigatons* of carbon dioxide (3×10^{15} kg – source: KNMI, Holland). To imagine that by cutting our emissions at levels of even 1 Gigaton* (1×10^9 tons* - quite impossible, but just as an example), at massive costs to all of our planet's inhabitants, will have any influence at all on our climate is to disregard simple Kindergarten math, as that quantity amounts to a mere 0.0333% of the total level. That simple fact alone should be enough to stop the idea dead in its tracks. However, to continue to believe that man can influence the climate in any way at all by cutting even a few thousand Gigatons of carbon dioxide from the emissions total whilst doing nothing about world-wide population increases coupled with the rampant consumerism of 25% or so of the world's most 'advanced' inhabitants, is to continue to deny the truth about these serious matters. (* figures corrected 23 January 2008)

Instead of spending billions on ineffective emission reduction schemes or fines or carbon trading, billions should be spent on research into truly viable alternative energy sources (not growing crops just for fuel, not forcing CFLs – to name just two non-viable solutions) as well as a viable alternative economic model that does not rely on ever increasing sales volumes in order to satisfy the ever hungry financiers that hover like vultures over our economy. Further billions should be spent on changing the way in which we educate our children in order to teach them worthwhile values in life like responsibility for self and others. Only then can we begin to tackle the real drivers of economic and emission growth and resource depletion: people themselves. Vision is needed to see this improved model of global co-operation and well-being but see it we must, for we surely have to come to terms with the fact that we can not continue to increase our numbers without restraint and wage wars without end over ever diminishing resources. Widespread devastation will follow as surely as emission reductions or carbon trading will make no difference whatsoever to our climate.

In any case, instead of global warming, and based on actual observations that are fully verifiable by all, our life-giving Sun is telling us that we should prepare for a period of increasingly cold winters, already signaled by the early arrival of substantial snow in most European mountain ranges, Arctic ice reforming at an unprecedented rate and three recent ice and snow storms across wide areas of the US, killing over 50 people and causing major havoc for hundreds of thousands (all by mid-December) – you can ignore me, but you can't ignore Nature itself. Temperatures across the world are *not* increasing as they should according to the fundamental theory behind global warming – the greenhouse effect. Something else is happening and it is vital that we find out what or else we may spend billions of Dollars needlessly.

If the Government scientific advisers in your country deny what I have written here, than challenge them to a debate. Actual verifiable proof that 110ppmv of additional carbon dioxide influences the climate or could even be responsible for the alarmist consequences is absolutely and totally non-existent. Any proof that has been paraded as such is purely circumstantial and prognoses of disasters are based solely on climate models that can not even predict the weather for next week with more than a 50% chance of being accurate. John Brignell PhD: "The only experimentally proven effect of increased carbon dioxide in the air is an increase in the growth rate of plants, and, in particular, crops. The "science" the IPCC keeps citing as "unequivocal" is a lie, a base and evil lie. It exists only in the flawed and duplicitous computer models that could never and will never begin to capture the infinite complexity of the earth's atmosphere."

My motivation for writing this letter is so that the right measures are proposed for the right reasons as well as to help you see the world as it is and not as you are lead to believe by the media. In the final analysis, it appears to be only about the money, specifically scientific funding whereby funds are handed only to those institutions who will follow the party-line of the day. Despite media reports to the contrary, there is no discernable global warming at all anymore and no actual net warming for the past 70 years. It is all part of ever ongoing global weather patterns over which puny man has no control whatsoever. It is not too late to call a halt to a man-made crisis that will not be solved by cutting a bit of carbon dioxide from our atmosphere whilst doing nothing about many other more serious issues over which we have an actual control and that will make an actual difference to our well-being.

Yours sincerely,

Hans Schreuder
Ipswich, UK

<http://www.ilovemycarbondioxide.com>

Links are in date order – all are of equal importance and all should be read before making any decisions.

<http://www.heartland.org/NewYork08/newyork08.cfm> - 22 December 2007 - The 2008 International Conference on Climate Change is the first major international conference to focus on issues and questions not answered by advocates of the theory of man-made global warming. Hundreds of scientists, economists, and public policy experts from around the world will gather on March 2 - 4, 2008, at the Marriott New York Marquis Hotel on Manhattan's Time Square, to call attention to widespread dissent in the scientific community to the alleged "consensus" that the modern warming is primarily man-made and is a crisis. Actual surveys of climate scientists and recent reviews of the scholarly literature both show the so-called "skeptics" may actually be in the majority of the climate science community. They do not lack scholarly credentials or scientific integrity, but a platform from which they can be heard.

<http://epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Minority.SenateReport#report> - 20 December 2007 - This report is in the spirit of enlightenment philosopher Denis Diderot who reportedly said, "Skepticism is the first step towards truth." Over 400 prominent scientists from more than two dozen countries recently voiced significant objections to major aspects of the so-called "consensus" on man-made global warming. These scientists, many of whom are current and former participants in the UN IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change), criticized the climate claims made by the UN IPCC and former Vice President Al Gore.

<http://www.anxietycenter.com/warning/main.htm#the> - 20 December 2007 - To finish out 2007, we shall examine carbon, mostly in the form of carbon dioxide - a gas second to oxygen in importance to all life on earth - so that anyone can understand the insanity of being told that carbon dioxide will bring about a massive "global warming" unless all forms of human activity are severely curtailed. "The only experimentally proven effect of increased carbon dioxide in the air is an increase in the growth rate of plants, and, in particular, crops." "The self-appointed chief inquisitor of the atom in question is Al Gore. Armed with a towering disregard of reason, truth or evidence, he preaches the coming Armageddon with all the fervour of an Old Testament prophet."

<http://www.mclean.ch/climate/IPCC.htm> - 19 December 2007 - The IPCC under the Microscope: For some odd reason the IPCC is seen as an impartial organization - it's not - whose reports are accurate - very doubtful -, written by experts - not all authors - and the predictions credible - impossible because the IPCC knows the models are incomplete. These reports are claimed to be examined by 2,500 reviewers - only in total - who are impartial - far from it - and these reviewers are unanimous in their agreement with the IPCC - only 5, none very credible, agreed with the major claim. It is high time people took a hard look at the organization whose charter requires it to "assess ... the risk of human-induced climate change". If the IPCC declared there was no risk then its reason for its existence would disappear. Shouldn't that make you suspicious from the outset? Who are the IPCC's report authors and reviewers? For the most part they have vested interests in the debate because they undertake research that is often biased towards a human influence on climate.

http://www.iceagenow.com/Year_of_Global_Cooling.htm - 19 December 07 - Since the mid-19th century, the mean global temperature has increased by 0.7 degrees Celsius. This slight warming is not unusual, and lies well within the range of natural variation. Carbon dioxide continues to build in the atmosphere, but the mean planetary temperature hasn't increased significantly for nearly nine years. Antarctica is getting colder. Last January, \$1.42 billion worth of California produce was lost to a devastating five-day freeze. In April, a killing freeze destroyed 95 percent of South Carolina's peach crop, and 90 percent of North Carolina's apple harvest. Extreme cold weather is occurring worldwide. The Canadian government warns that this winter is likely to be the coldest in 15 years.

<http://www.nationalpost.com/news/story.html?id=164002> - 13 December 2007 - 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. It is not possible to stop climate change, a natural phenomenon that has affected humanity through the ages. "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."

http://www.joelschwartz.com/pdfs/Schwartz_IPCC_SR_analysis_120407.pdf , In many key areas, observational evidence suggests the real climate often behaves differently or even opposite to what climate models say we should expect to see under greenhouse warming. The "high agreement" referenced here can only refer to politicians and UN bureaucrats, for the complete report of WG III makes clear that there is intense controversy about our energy prospects. This more balanced discussion of the availability of energy options is nowhere to be seen in media coverage. The difference seen here between the nuance of the complete working group reports and the breezy confidence of the SPMs suggests that we should look with skepticism on the SR-SPM's claims that GHG mitigation will be cheap (about 0.12 percent of global GDP) and easy. These figures will not survive even cursory scrutiny by climate economists outside the IPCC and are not likely to be embraced by many finance ministries anyway. If the cost were truly as modest as the IPCC claims, the controversy about emissions reductions would long ago have been dispatched and the world would be well on its way to achieving large reductions in GHG emissions. Instead, the debate has only grown more intense as the real costs of restricting energy use become more apparent to policymakers and the public.

<http://www.numberwatch.co.uk/Carbon.htm> - October 2007 - "In praise of Carbon" by John Brignell PhD: "Shortly after the discontinuity that launched the universe (if, indeed, that is the way it happened) the elementary particles came together to form the first atoms – hydrogen, helium, lithium; later beryllium, boron – and then something quite unique, an element of such startling properties that the ultimate outcome was the profound and mysterious development to which we designate the abstraction of "life". Furthermore that development reached such a state of advancement that it could understand the nature of that which gave it being and then the perversity to vilify it as the root of all evil." "There is no scientific theory linking carbon dioxide to the "runaway" global warming that is the basis of the calamitous predictions. The contribution of the gas to the making of a comfortable planet by the greenhouse effect is well understood, modest and self-limiting. It is only turned into a terror by computer models. These are worthless; depending as they do on extensive guesswork about the ill-understood mechanisms and interactions involved in climate, and involving so many tunable parameters and feedback factors that they could produce any desired result by appropriate tweaking. A quarter of a century ago, before science came under firm bureaucratic control, such models would have been laughed out of court." "The putative experimental evidence is equally dubious. It all sounds very impressive and scary, but on close examination tends to dissolve like the morning mist in the light of the sun. It is only recently that a small troupe of volunteers with few resources has begun a serious audit of the claims. The much vaunted "high-quality" sensor network turns out to be ramshackle almost beyond belief; the processing of the data involves inapplicable methods, glaring errors and unexplained adjustments, which all mysteriously turn out to exaggerate the desired effect. There is a morbid and obsessive secrecy among the practitioners that is quite contrary to the open nature of the scientific method, which prompts the question "What have they got to hide?" Details of publicly funded "research" are kept, quite illegally, from the public who fund it; and only the claimed results, inevitably apocalyptic, are exposed. Such data that have been wrested with great difficulty from their creators almost invariably turn out to be subject to serious dubiety." "There are many ironies in the appointment of carbon as the epitome of original sin. Modern religious man, having made the foolish, empty gesture of turning his back on the atom that is his primal progenitor and the essence of his being, has admitted a Trojan horse that is being used to attack basic human liberties gained by centuries of struggle. Carbon-based, carbon-dioxide-exhaling politicians invent carbon taxes, carbon trading and carbon rationing; quite meaningless paper transactions that only serve to manacle the masses and (naturally) enrich those individuals with an eye to the main chance." "Carbon has been framed for purely political purposes."

http://www.iceagenow.com/Antarctic_ice_grows_to_record_levels.htm - 13 September 2007 - While the media has focused on the Arctic, the Southern Hemisphere (Antarctica) has quietly set a new record for most ice extent since 1979, meteorologist Joe D'Aleo wrote at IceCap Tuesday: "The press have totally boycotted news from the Southern Hemisphere where ice and snow levels are currently at their highest since data have been collected."

http://nzclimatescience.net/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=125&Itemid=1 - 27 August 2007 - Open letter to the British High Commissioner by Professor Will Alexander. "My frequent attempts to encourage a healthy exchange of views on this subject have failed. I have attached the title and introductory page of my 93-page technical report that I submitted to the Stern Review nearly two years ago. Part 2 of the report deals specifically with the evaluation of climate change science. In a spirit of cooperation and in order to facilitate the discussions, I will gladly prepare a master CD that includes the full report as well as my 120-slide PowerPoint presentation."

<http://www.lavoisier.com.au/papers/Conf2007/R-Evans2007.html> - 29 June 2007 - The belief that mankind can 'stop climate change' by decarbonising our economy is as irrational a belief as one can find in any primitive religion. But in legislating for carbon emission trading schemes we are declaring our commitment to superstition of the most primitive kind. If the recent discoveries of the power of galactic cosmic rays to influence cloud formation become more widely known, faith in anthropogenic carbon dioxide as the controlling force on climate will become a joke. Despite all the politically-charged fanfare, the policies examined in the report will do absolutely nothing to reduce any future adverse effects of higher average global surface temperatures on Australia.

<http://www.financialpost.com/story.html?id=597d0677-2a05-47b4-b34f-b84068db11f4&k=29751> - 20 June 2007 - Politicians and environmentalists these days convey the impression that climate-change research is an exceptionally dull field with little left to discover. We are assured by everyone from David Suzuki to Al Gore to Prime Minister Stephen Harper that "the science is settled." At the recent G8 summit, German Chancellor Angela Merkel even attempted to convince world leaders to play God by restricting carbon-dioxide emissions to a level that would magically limit the rise in world temperatures to 2C. Climate stability has never been a feature of planet Earth. The only constant about climate is change; it changes continually and, at times, quite rapidly.

<http://www.co2science.org/scripts/CO2ScienceB2C/education/reports/hansen/hansencritique.jsp> - 6 June 2007 - To these papers can be added many others that also depict increasing coral calcification rates in the face of rising temperatures and/or atmospheric CO2 concentrations, including those of Clausen and Roth (1975), Coles and Coles (1977), Kajiwarra et al. (1995), Nie et al. (1997), Reynaud-Vaganay et al. (1999) and Reyanud et al. (2004). As for why this is the way earth's corals respond, McNeil et al. (2004) say that "observed increases in coral reef calcification with ocean warming are most likely due to an enhancement in coral metabolism and/or increases in photosynthetic rates of their symbiotic algae," as we have consistently said when noting over and over that coral calcification is a biologically-driven process that can overcome physical-chemical limitations that in the absence of life would appear to be insurmountable.

<http://www.oism.org/pproject/> - 2007 - 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. . . . signed by over 19,000 American scientists thus far.

<http://nzclimatescience.net/images/PDFs/unsoundscience3.pdf> - 2007 - Despite persistent efforts, the IPCC has never succeeded in the task set to it by the Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC), of supplying sound scientific evidence for the belief that human emissions of greenhouse gases are harming the climate. The evidence that has been supplied is based on unsound scientific methods and mathematics. These examples show that the IPCC depends on unsound and mathematically unacceptable methods to compile its "evidence" that human-induced greenhouse gas emissions are harming the climate.

http://www.ff.org/centers/csspp/pdf/20060331_issues.pdf - March 2006 - While the greenhouse reductions would exact a high human price, in terms of sacrifices to our standard of living and freedoms, they would yield statistically negligible results in terms of measurable impacts to climate change. There is no expectation that any statistically significant global warming reductions would come from the Kyoto Protocol. And if an enforced international agreement yields no promised results, then independent State or local mandatory mitigation programs appear facile, wasteful and irresponsible.

<http://www.lavoisier.com.au/papers/Conf2007/Archibald2007.pdf> - June 2007 – "The Past and Future of Climate" by David Archibald, 24 pages, from which I have taken the following: In this presentation, I will put forward a prediction of climate to 2030 that differs from most in the public domain. It is a prediction of imminent cooling. And it is a prediction that you will be able to check up on every day. I will finish up combining a solar-driven prediction and the anthropogenic contribution to make a prediction of climate to 2030. The satellite record is the highest quality temperature data series in the climate record. It shows that the temperature of the Southern Hemisphere has been flat, with a slight increase in the Northern Hemisphere.

To reconstruct climate prior to thermometer records, isotope ratios and tree ring widths are used. The peak of the Medieval Warm Period was 2°C warmer than today and the Little Ice Age 2°C colder at its worst. The total range is 4° centigrade. The warming over the 20th century was 0.6 degrees by comparison. This recent warming has melted ice on some high passes in the Swiss Alps, uncovering artifacts from the Medieval Warm Period and the prior Roman Warm Period. It was warmer again not long after the last ice age ended. Sea level was 2 metres higher than it is today. Since the Holocene Optimum, we have been in long term temperature decline at about 0.25° per thousand years.

For most of the last 600 million years, the Earth's climate has been steady at an average temperature of 22°C, apart from periods of ice ages. Ice ages have occurred roughly 140 million years apart, driven by the Sun's position in the spiral arms of the Milky Way galaxy. There is no correlation in the geologic record between atmospheric carbon dioxide and global temperature. The Earth went into an ice age 450 million years ago despite a level of atmospheric carbon dioxide that is ten times what it is today. 150 million years ago, atmospheric carbon dioxide levels were five times what they are today, but that didn't stop a Cretaceous-aged glaciation. I should mention that the proponents of Anthropogenic Global Warming state that higher atmospheric carbon dioxide levels will cause the oceans to become more acidic which will kill off coral reefs and other types of marine life. Coral reefs first formed back in the Devonian period when atmospheric carbon dioxide levels were ten times what they are today.

Anthropogenic warming is real, it is also miniscule. Using the MODTRAN facility maintained by the University of Chicago shows that the effect of carbon dioxide on temperature is logarithmic and thus climate sensitivity decreases with increasing concentration. The first 20 ppm of carbon dioxide has a greater temperature effect than the next 400 ppm. There are no deleterious consequences of higher atmospheric carbon dioxide levels.

<http://sitewave.net/news/MaryEllenGilder.htm> "Historically, the claim of consensus has been the first refuge of scoundrels; it is a way to avoid debate by claiming that the matter is already settled. Whenever you hear the consensus of scientists agrees on something or other, reach for your wallet, because you're being had." Let's be clear: "The work of science has nothing whatever to do with consensus. Consensus is the business of politics. Science, on the contrary, requires only one investigator who happens to be right, which means that he or she has results that are verifiable by reference to the real world. In science consensus is irrelevant. What are relevant are reproducible results."

"The greatest scientists in history are great precisely because they broke with the consensus."

<http://www.sepp.org/policy%20declarations/statment.html> - 27 February 1992 – The Early Warning not heeded!