

# PRESS RELEASE

IPSWICH, UK

21 JANUARY 2008

## *GLOBAL WARMING IS DEAD*

**Whether you know it or not**

**Whether you like it or not**

# IT IS DEAD

*Just like the parrot – gone, it is no more . . .*

RIP 21 January 2008

LS.

RE: EARTH COOLING, NOT WARMING

Despite enjoying a mild winter spell so far and contrary to continued biased media reporting, our beautiful planet Earth is not melting in the heat, it is cooling, quite rapidly in fact.

Since El Niño of 1998, our planet has been steadily cooling down, as expected by observing solar activity - the one and only *real* climate driver.

NASA themselves make statements on this:


[http://science.nasa.gov/headlines/y2006/10may\\_longrange.htm](http://science.nasa.gov/headlines/y2006/10may_longrange.htm) and  
[http://science.nasa.gov/headlines/y2007/14dec\\_excitement.htm?list1065474](http://science.nasa.gov/headlines/y2007/14dec_excitement.htm?list1065474)

2007 gets trumpeted as being amongst the 10 warmest in the past 113 years, but it also happens to be the coldest so far this century - *but nobody mentions that?! And 2008 is predicted to be colder still - despite falling in the warmer band?! Can you not see the fallacy in the media coverage - only reporting the "warm" bit?!*

The graph below shows the unequivocal proof of the cooling, despite all the recent years being part of the "warmest" on record, which was mostly due to our Sun's radiance. The cooling is also due to our Sun, as it has become less active than before, all part of natural, well-understood and well-documented cycles (see NASA links above).

After the current period of cooling, we can expect another period of warming, before a more drastic and longer-term period of cooling - nothing to do with carbon dioxide or mankind.

Please also note that the data for this graph is based on *actual observations*, not computer games played by a privileged few for seriously shady reasons.



Based on data from <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/sci/tech/7142694.stm>  
It is now (Jan.'08) claimed that "2007 was the coldest in this century –  
and in many places bitterly cold"  
( <http://www.lowefo.com/forecast.php?s=Netherlands> )

For some more unequivocal proof of the cooling, all based on *actual observations*:  
<http://www.bbc.co.uk/weather/world/news/13012008news.shtml>  
[http://www.iceagenow.com/Snowfall\\_this\\_season\\_could\\_break\\_record.htm](http://www.iceagenow.com/Snowfall_this_season_could_break_record.htm)  
[http://www.iceagenow.com/2007\\_Other\\_Parts\\_of\\_the\\_World.htm](http://www.iceagenow.com/2007_Other_Parts_of_the_World.htm)  
[http://www.iceagenow.com/Brrrrrr\\_Where\\_did\\_global\\_warming\\_go.htm](http://www.iceagenow.com/Brrrrrr_Where_did_global_warming_go.htm)  
[http://www.iceagenow.com/Year\\_of\\_Global\\_Cooling.htm](http://www.iceagenow.com/Year_of_Global_Cooling.htm)  
[http://www.iceagenow.com/Growing\\_Glaciers.htm](http://www.iceagenow.com/Growing_Glaciers.htm)  
[http://www.iceagenow.com/Antarctic\\_ice\\_grows\\_to\\_record\\_levels.htm](http://www.iceagenow.com/Antarctic_ice_grows_to_record_levels.htm)  
[http://www.21stcenturysciencetech.com/Articles%202004/Winter2003-4/global\\_warming.pdf](http://www.21stcenturysciencetech.com/Articles%202004/Winter2003-4/global_warming.pdf)  
[http://www.21stcenturysciencetech.com/Articles%202007/20\\_1-2\\_CO2\\_Scandal.pdf](http://www.21stcenturysciencetech.com/Articles%202007/20_1-2_CO2_Scandal.pdf)  
[http://www.ilovemycarbon dioxide.com/pdf/Memo\\_0308.pdf](http://www.ilovemycarbon dioxide.com/pdf/Memo_0308.pdf)

And if you still cling to the belief that puny man has any influence on our Earth's vast climate systems, then read this please:

<http://www.ilovemycarbon dioxide.com/pdf/the-ipccs-cardinal-error.pdf>

"The IPCC's cardinal error is in its logically inconsistent and prodigiously exaggerated estimate of the effect of what is called the "radiative forcing" effect of increases in greenhouse-gas concentration on global temperature. To put it another way, merely by correcting the IPCC's artfully-concealed cardinal error we achieve the equivalent of an 80% global cut in carbon emissions overnight. To put it another way still, we can put as much carbon dioxide in the atmosphere as we like, and it will make very little difference to temperature. Given the calculations I have outlined here, the flatlining of temperatures in recent years is unsurprising. The true cause of the recent warming is almost certainly the Sun, which has been more active in the past 70 years than at almost any time in the whole of the past 11,400 years (Usoskin *et al.*, 2003; Solanki *et al.*, 2005)."

**and this:** [http://www.ilovemycarbon dioxide.com/pdf/Memo\\_0508.pdf](http://www.ilovemycarbon dioxide.com/pdf/Memo_0508.pdf)

"Climate alarmism collapsed at Bali. There is no possibility that nations of the world will irreversibly commit themselves to undertake substantial measures that must inevitably damage their economies and hinder their measures to reduce poverty and increase their future prosperity in a competitive world. There is no way that the South African authorities will even consider not continuing with the construction of new coal-fired power stations, or banning the import of cheap motor cars from India. Our GGEs will continue to rise inexorably in the years ahead.

Climate change science has also suffered irretrievable damage. The rejection of the influence of variations in solar activity was a serious mistake. There is an abundance of well documented historical evidence stretching from 150 years ago through to this memo that demonstrates the opposite.

In contrast, there is no evidence of synchronous, sub-continental scale environmental changes that irrefutably demonstrate that they are caused by human activities.

It is increasingly doubtful whether a meaningful successor to the Kyoto Protocol will be in place when the protocol expires in 2012. It is also difficult to see how the IPCC and the UNFCCC can continue to function effectively in the years ahead.

There can be no doubt that population growth and increases in prosperity of peoples and nations will cause further environmental damage and atmospheric pollution. The minimisation of these adverse effects will require an international cooperative effort from scientists in all disciplines. This is not happening. Rather the opposite.

Think about it and the lack of honesty, transparency and reproducibility of the science that you are practising. It could save your career."

**and this:** <http://www.ilovemycarbon dioxide.com/pdf/EndersbeeReprint.pdf>

"I began by suggesting that I believed that there were very sound scientific reasons for the debate on the causes of global warming to continue. I think it is highly probable that almost all of the global warming over the past 250 years is due to natural causes, and is not caused by Man. On the other hand there is deadly pollution of the atmosphere in many parts of the world, and urban heat island effects that aggravate the air pollution in many world cities. These effects are caused by Man. They are mainly local and regional. This means that the solutions to these pollution effects are to be found at local and regional levels, and that means that the problems should be corrected at the source."

**"It is ridiculous to assume that the health problems of smog in India and China have global causes, and can be solved by carbon trading in the City of London."**

Carbon dioxide is not a pollutant, and it is vital for the continued life of all flora and fauna, including Man. The continued use of carbon fuels is inevitable. For many poor people in the world, access to carbon fuels offers the only salvation from famine and death. There is no need to burden electricity generation with the costs of carbon sequestration, but we can do much more to remove the nasty flue gases.

Our priority should be the reduction and control of atmospheric pollution. The control should be directed to reducing the emission of dangerous chemicals and particles that are now causing very serious health problems, and reducing life expectancy of people in most cities of the world. Such atmospheric pollution is also a cause of local climate problems, including low rainfall.

It is important to separate the causes of global warming from the causes of air pollution. The IPCC has interwoven pollution and global warming, and that is the prime cause of the log jam that has led to all the arguments. Air pollution and global warming are scientifically separate matters. I trust this short paper explains why many scientists are concerned about the IPCC reports, and why the debate should continue."

**and this:** <http://canadafreepress.com/index.php/article/1438>

". . . the nearly unanimous agreement that the claim of Global Warming as a legitimate threat to humanity is more an ideological juggernaut than a proven scientific certainty, fueled predominantly by the politics of fear from the left, and amply lavished with the continued financial support from unwitting governments and moral support from the main stream media.

This diverse assembly of Anthropogenic Global Warming skeptics (or Holocaust deniers as Ellen Goodman from the Boston Globe would call them) include experts from the fields of paleontology, chemistry, Chemical engineering, Mathematics, Physics, Agriculture, Astrophysics, Oceanography, Atmospheric Science, Geology, Meteorology, and Economics, to name a few. Many of them are also recent converts who once called themselves staunch believers in A.G.W.

A good number of them are former draft reviewers of the United Nations Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate Change report they have now happily disowned as dangerously speculative, as it portends to mandate drastic policy measures for signatories from world governments in order to stop the impending catastrophe presumably looming in the horizon.

Their collective body of work on the science of Global Climate consists of thousands of research studies and peer reviewed papers in myriad reputable scientific publications and academic institutions.

Their consensus is based in the scientifically verifiable notion that – stop the presses – periodic Hemispheric warming (and cooling) of the earth are natural cyclical phenomena, caused primarily by fluctuations in the sun's electro-magnetic radiation, water vapor, and a host of other culprits meaner than the rise in carbon dioxide levels, which is actually an effect rather than a cause of warming. This natural cycle has taken place - and will continue to take place - over millennia."

**"This means that the net impact that man - in all his industrial fury - has over any significant climate variations, is no more distinguishable – as a contributing former meteorologist puts it – than a “fart in a hurricane”.**

**and this:** <http://www.ilovemycarbondioxide.com/pdf/CourtneyStockholmCO2increase.pdf>

"It is commonly assumed that the rise in atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) concentration during the twentieth century (approx. 30% rise) is a result of anthropogenic emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>. However, the annual pulse of anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> into the atmosphere should relate to the annual increase of CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere if one is causal of the other, but their variations greatly differ from year to year. Furthermore, the annual increase to CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere is the residual of the seasonal changes to CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere, and the Northern Hemisphere seasonal changes (decrease and increase) each year are approximately an order of magnitude greater than both the total annual increase and the total annual anthropogenic emission. The above findings cause severe doubt to any 'projections' of future atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration and to any projections of future climate that consider atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration to be significant."

**and this:** <http://carbon-sense.com/wp-content/uploads/2008/01/garnaut-submission.pdf>

"Climate research is now big business, paid for overwhelmingly by taxpayers at the direction of committed officials and politicians. These big businesses need to maintain a sense of world crisis to keep the funds flowing. But there is no consensus on the science of global warming – there is widespread dispute which is now leading to international and outspoken opposition. Before we embark on a fundamental shift in economic priorities, destroy huge quantities of existing capital and skills, and impose very large costs on consumers or taxpayers, we need to be very sure that the basis of our argument is sound. We need to be **CERTAIN** that man-made CO<sub>2</sub> is the cause of a problem, and **CERTAIN** that curbing man-made CO<sub>2</sub> emissions will produce beneficial results.

On the one hand, the Alarmist Camp is dominated by paid academics and officials appointed by governments, often on the basis of their beliefs.

The IPCC report is controlled by a few whose whole reputation and future is tied to proving that global warming is caused by human activities. Their case rests more on models, forecasts and scenarios than on science and evidence. They are strongly supported by many other activist groups with other agendas, or vested interests in the result. On the other hand there is an ever growing band of independent scientists all over the world who believe that the evidence strongly favours the view that man's activities are a minute factor in determining global temperature."

"When these realities start to bite, and when the science of global warming collapses in the next cool era, there will be a huge political backlash against those Pied Pipers who led us to the carbon cemetery. The value of carbon credits will disappear quicker than CO2 in the wind, the Australian Greenhouse Office will be closed and many carbon traders, bankers, lawyers, regulators, academics, journalists and politicians will be looking for a new line of work."

***"It is the utmost human arrogance to think that man can control global temperature by trying to manipulate the amount of his emissions of carbon dioxide entering the atmosphere."***

and this: <http://www.lahontanvalleynews.com/article/20080109/Opinion/974957979>

"It is becoming increasingly obvious that the global warming panic has little to do with temperature change and everything to do with man's control of other men with climate as the instrument." Ed Iverson.

and this: <http://www.junkscience.com/Greenhouse/index.html>

- "There is no reason to believe that slightly lower temperatures are somehow preferable to slightly higher temperatures - there is no known "optimal" nor any known means of knowingly and predictably adjusting some sort of planetary thermostat."

- "Activists and zealots constantly shrilling over atmospheric carbon dioxide are misdirecting attention and effort from real and potentially addressable local, regional and planetary problems."

and this: <http://www.co2science.org/scripts/CO2ScienceB2C/articles/V11/N2/EDIT.jsp>

"Consequently, knowing that including the aerial fertilization and anti-transpiration effects of the expected rise in the air's CO2 content in the group of climate models studied by Mahowald *totally overpowered* the predicted climatic effects of the increase in atmospheric CO2 on the area of the world's deserts, one can begin to understand how the proper inclusion of the many other biophysical effects of atmospheric CO2 enrichment might nullify even the basic *climatic* effects that are currently predicted by state-of-the-art climate models."

and this: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/sci/tech/484868.stm>

"Ignore Global Warming. Instead, remember that humans have survived climate change for thousands of years, not by playing God with one or two politically selected factors, but by adapting to the new conditions, whether hot, cold, dry or wet. And, moreover, what about the opportunities global warming presents - far better than cooling any day!" Professor Philip Stott, University of London

and then, after informing yourselves thus, be brave: STOP THE AGW/ACC MADNESS, PLEASE!

***The science that AGW is based on has not got one leg left to stand on. To change the name from AGW to ACC is a farce. Climate change is ever ongoing, way beyond human control and a necessity for life.***

**THE WHOLE WORLD WILL REJOICE WITH YOU, OUR LEADERS, IF YOU SHOW CLARITY OF THOUGHT INSTEAD OF LAME-DUCK KOWTOWING TO UNELECTED BUREAUCRATS FOR SERIOUSLY DUBIOUS REASONS. COME ON!**

***We know what you are up to:*** [http://www.ilovemycarbon dioxide.com/scam\\_truth.html](http://www.ilovemycarbon dioxide.com/scam_truth.html)

Warm regards and available for debate if you are,

Hans Schreuder  
Ipswich, UK  
Analytical Chemist  
mMensa


[www.ips-pix.biz](http://www.ips-pix.biz)

[www.ilovemycarbon dioxide.com](http://www.ilovemycarbon dioxide.com)

**LATEST NEWS:**

<http://blogs.woodtv.com/?p=3080>[http://icecap.us/images/uploads/IPCC\\_VERIF.jpg](http://icecap.us/images/uploads/IPCC_VERIF.jpg)

Graph compares various forecasts with *actual observations*.  
Even the UK Met Office draws a gentle downward trend - oh how the truth hurts!



All of a sudden, satellite data are seriously inconvenient, aren't they?!  
If the lines of *observed* temperatures had been pointing ever upward, can you just imagine the outcry??!! Now, instead, the downward trend is downplayed and all the excuses in the world are put forward as to why "we" should not read too much into short-term trends?!

**Oh really? Get a life and face the truth:**

**"MAN HAS NO INFLUENCE OVER EARTH'S CLIMATE - NONE. PERIOD."**

