

OPEN LETTER TO POLICY MAKERS & THE MEDIA

(originally posted on 3 December 2007 and emailed on 5 December, 2007)

Lectori Salutem,

Global Warming Petition - signed by over 19,000 American scientists already:

<http://www.oism.org/pproject/>

Any person with a clear thinking brain will see that AGW is nonsense and there is unfortunately no need to be a climate scientist to understand that.

Look at it this way:

If CO₂ causes the alleged positive feedback, then how come in our ever-changing climate as recorded by ice cores and sediment samples over the past hundreds of thousands of years, this has never happened, *ever*. If it had, we would not be here because the temperature would have continued rising to levels that are no longer capable of supporting life. The minute additional 110ppmv makes no difference to that observation. Historical levels have been far in excess of the current 381ppmv without tipping the scales, for obvious reasons.

As is well known now (*finally*), increased CO₂ levels follow temperature rises (for obvious and well understood reasons), but the temperatures always come down again, *despite the initially continued increase in CO₂ levels, which then decrease again all by themselves following on from the lower temperatures.*

Why oh why are so many people blinded by the AGW lobby?

Why oh why is there no proper debate on the issue?

When will one of you have the courage to organise a proper debate with scientists such as Dr Gray, Professor Bellamy and Professor Henderson, to name just three of thousands of top scientists of all disciplines who disagree with the IPCC and who would be more than willing to debate the issues?

Do you really think that these scientists risk being vilified for the fun of it, come on?!

One more time, in case you don't know what it is all about:

There is absolutely no scientifically proven evidence *whatsoever* that carbon dioxide has ever influenced the climate in more than a minute way, in line with its minute concentration in the atmosphere.
No evidence whatsoever, none, zippo, zilch, nada, niets, niks!

Reducing carbon emissions will not affect the climate in any way. It will have no effect whatsoever, can't you see that? Can you not read with an open mind and do your own research?!

Or are you all in the pockets of the environmental lobbyists in the US and EU? Only reporting on what you get "fed" by the "right channels"?

Allow me to feed you these few pertinent extracts, in the sincere hope that it will awaken in you the utter **sense of urgency** with which an open debate has to be organised:

By Dr V R Gray

<http://nzclimatescience.net/images/PDFs/unsoundscience3.pdf>

"Despite persistent efforts, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has never succeeded in the task set to it by the Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC), of supplying sound scientific evidence for the belief that human emissions of greenhouse gases are harming the climate. The evidence that has been supplied is based on unsound scientific methods and mathematics. This paper is an attempt to summarise some of it. The IPCC never makes "forecasts". But this does not seem to worry the politicians and the general public who do not understand that the gut feelings of people financially dependent on models are the only basis for these "projections". They cheerfully convert them in to certain forecasts, sufficient to consign the world to an economically damaging assault on energy supply."

By Professor David Henderson

Both the process and the milieu are now firmly in place. IPCC member governments have shown no disposition to question or amend them in the context of AR4, and the new report is likely to bear a close family relationship to its predecessors. This official backing for the IPCC is understandable. Since it was established in 1988, the Panel has come a long way. It has successfully produced three massive and agreed reports, covering a wide range of complex issues; it has secured for these reports and their conclusions the endorsement of its many and diverse member governments; it has informed the thinking of those governments and prompted decisions by them; it has created, and gained approval for, a well defined set of procedures for conducting its work; and in relation to issues of climate change *it has become the sole source of information and advice that its member governments treat as authoritative*. Its many participants and outside supporters can argue that it has created a world-wide consensus.

I would now question the idea that the IPCC has established a well-founded consensus across the whole range of issues relating to climate change, and indeed I doubt whether the achievement of such a consensus ought to be the aim. I have come to believe that the status that the IPCC has acquired, as an established monopoly provider of information and advice to governments, should be held in question.

In relation to climate change, an urgent present need is to build up a sounder basis than now exists for reviewing and assessing the issues. A process should be established, for informing and advising governments and public opinion alike, which is more objective, more representative, more rigorous and more balanced than that which the IPCC and its sponsoring departments and agencies have built up and shown themselves unwilling to change.

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld200506/ldselect/ldeconaf/12/5012502.htm>
http://nzclimatescience.net/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=43&Itemid=31

By John McLean

http://nzclimatescience.net/images/PDFs/mclean-disband_the_ipcc.pdf

The IPCC is a political lobby group whose members undertake research funded by governments and produce peer-reviewed scientific papers. Then teams of authors, including some of the original researchers, write reports based on those peer-reviewed papers and declare those reports to be an accurate summary of the field. In normal circumstances there would be howls of protest were authors permitted to review and promulgate their own work, and the summary documents would be automatically rejected on the grounds that the authors had vested interests. But this is how the IPCC has operated since its inception, in fact since its charter directed it to concentrate on the risks posed by any human influence on climate. Even worse, the IPCC has, via complaisant governments, skewed scientific research to concentrate on aspects of its own claims to the detriment of the wider science. Those claims have very little evidence to support them but such is the dominance of the IPCC that the targeted research has produced more experts in those fields and more scientific papers, potential authors and partisan reviewers through which the IPCC can sustain its claims. To top it all off the IPCC makes statements that imply a far more intense review process and far greater support for its claims than the evidence really shows. The bias and manipulation of climate science has gone on for long enough and the problems are too great to rectify from within. The only sensible course of action is to disband the IPCC. If we really must have a central body to co-ordinate the science then we need one that is independent and transparent, and encompasses all aspects of climate science rather than being fixated on an unproven human cause."

By Vaclav Klaus

The dictates of political correctness are strict and only one permitted truth, not for the first time in human history, is imposed on us. Everything else is denounced. **As someone who lived under communism for most of his life, I feel obliged to say that I see the biggest threat to freedom, democracy, the market economy and prosperity now in ambitious environmentalism, not in communism.**

The author Michael Crichton stated it clearly: "the greatest challenge facing mankind is the challenge of distinguishing reality from fantasy, truth from propaganda".

I feel the same way, because **global warming hysteria has become a prime example of the truth versus propaganda problem**. It requires courage to oppose the "established" truth, although a lot of people – including top-class scientists – see the issue of climate change entirely differently. They protest against the arrogance of those who advocate the global warming hypothesis and relate it to human activities.

Continued ./.

I agree with Professor Richard Lindzen from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who said: “future generations will wonder in bemused amazement that the early 21st century’s developed world went into hysterical panic over a globally averaged temperature increase of a few tenths of a degree, and, on the basis of gross exaggerations of highly uncertain computer projections combined into implausible chains of inference, proceeded to contemplate a roll-back of the industrial age”. *The issue of global warming is more about social than natural sciences and more about man and his freedom than about tenths of a degree Celsius changes in average global temperature.*

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/reprint/klaus_freedom_endangered.pdf

By John Brignell

Authors such as your reviewer and James Le Fanu have contended that there was a sea change in western society that occurred in about 1982 and, sure enough, that is where this account begins. That was the year that the acronym AIDS was adopted and, by one of those ironic quirks of coincidence, on the very month that this book was issued the UN has finally admitted what the sceptics always knew, that it had grossly exaggerated the scale and nature of the epidemic. From that time on all hell broke loose, with an unending sequence of “disasters” – killer eggs, listeria hysteria, mad cows and human CJD, E. coli, The Millennium Bug, Satanic abuse, speed kills, lead, passive smoking, asbestos and finally the big one – Global Warming. This account spells out the progression, a lengthy tragicomedy of irony, incompetence and sheer perfidy. Each scare is analysed in terms of the pushers and the blockers through various stages.

There were so many factors that were common to these outbreaks, not least in the consequences. There was draconian legislation, the mass closure of viable productive businesses, multiplication of officials supported by the taxpayer, the enrichment of lawyers, stepwise erosion of human liberty etc., all based on little or no evidence. There were mysterious multipliers, in which one case became millions, as with the early scare of salmonella in eggs (in fact, subsequent extensive surveys failed to produce any cases at all).

<http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/reprint/scaredtodeathreview.html>

Please know that I care nought for fame or fortune, but passionately for ***our precious planet Earth, which is being destroyed at breakneck speed, not by carbon emissions but through other issues that need to be addressed with even more urgency and compassion than the current fallacious emissions reduction and carbon trading schemes.***

Emission reduction and carbon trading schemes are as much a crime against humanity as growing virgin agricultural crops in order to produce bio fuels (now finally recognised as such by a UN rapporteur as well as Oxfam. Please read about it for yourselves here:

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/americas/7065061.stm> and <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/7072386.stm>

Our precious planet needs urgent remedial action on many fronts, but reducing carbon emissions will not only make no difference to the climate, it will actually make matters worse by stifling development of social and economic models that stand at least a chance of making a difference to the well-being of all of us in the decades and centuries ahead.

PLEASE OPEN YOUR EYES AND YOUR MINDS TO WHAT IS HAPPENING RIGHT UNDER YOUR NOSES AND CALL FOR AN URGENT OPEN DEBATE, PLEASE! FOR FACTS SAKE!

IT IS ONLY AL GORE AND THE IPCC WHO SAY THE DEBATE IS OVER – IT IS NOWHERE NEAR OVER, IN FACT IT HASN'T YET STARTED!

Kind regards,

Hans Schreuder
Ipswich, UK
Analytical Chemist (1966)
mMensa (1973)

Please also read the following prophetic warning by climate scientists back in 1992 and the equally prophetic Heidelberg Appeal, both signed by the world's top scientists.

LATEST NEWS – 29 Nov. and 05 Dec. 2007 – SEE FURTHER DOWN

Original version: <http://www.sepp.org/policy%20declarations/statment.html>

Statement by Atmospheric Scientists on Greenhouse Warming

WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 27, 1992---As independent scientists, researching atmospheric and climate problems, we are concerned by the agenda for UNCED, the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, being developed by environmental activist groups and certain political leaders. This so-called Earth Summit is scheduled to convene in Brazil in June 1992 and aims to impose a system of global environmental regulations, including onerous taxes on energy fuels, on the population of the United States and other industrialized nations.

Such policy initiatives derive from highly uncertain scientific theories. They are based on the unsupported assumption that catastrophic global warming follows from the burning of fossil fuels and requires immediate action. We do not agree.

A survey of U.S. atmospheric scientists, conducted in the summer of 1991, confirms that there is no consensus about the cause of the slight warming observed during the past century. A recently published research paper even suggests that sunspot variability, rather than a rise in greenhouse gases, is responsible for the global temperature increases and decreases recorded since about 1880.

Furthermore, the majority of scientific participants in the survey agreed that the theoretical climate models used to predict a future warming cannot be relied upon and are not validated by the existing climate record. Yet all predictions are based on such theoretical models.

Finally, agriculturalists generally agree that any increase in carbon dioxide levels from fossil fuel burning has beneficial effects on most crops and on world food supply.

We are disturbed that activists, anxious to stop energy and economic growth, are pushing ahead with drastic policies without taking notice of recent changes in the underlying science. We fear that the rush to impose global regulations will have catastrophic impacts on the world economy, on jobs, standards of living, and health care, with the most severe consequences falling upon developing countries and the poor.

David G. Aubrey, Ph.D., Senior Scientist, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute

Nathaniel B. Guttman, Ph.D., Research Physical Scientist, National Climatic Data Center

Hugh W. Ellsaesser, Ph.D., Meteorologist, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

Richard Lindzen, Ph.D., Center for Meteorology and Physical Meteorology, M.I.T.

Robert C. Balling, Ph.D., Director, Laboratory of Climatology, Arizona State University

Patrick Michaels, Ph.D., Assoc. Professor of Environmental Sciences, University of Virginia

Roger Pielke, Ph.D., Professor of Atmospheric Science, Colorado State University

Michael Garstang, Ph.D., Professor of Meteorology, University of Virginia

Sherwood B. Idso, Ph.D., Research Physicist, U.S. Water Conservation Laboratory

Lev S. Gandin, Ph.D., UCAR Scientist, National Meteorological Center

John A. McGinley, Chief, Forecast Research Group, Forecast Systems Laboratory, NOAA

H. Jean Thiebaut, Ph.D., Research Scientist, National Meteorological Center, National Weather Service, NOM

Kenneth V. Beard, Ph.D., Professor of Atmospheric Physics, University of Illinois

Paul W. Mielke, Jr., Ph.D., Professor, Dept. of Statistics, Colorado State University

Thomas Lockhart, Meteorologist, Meteorological Standards Institute

Peter F. Giddings, Meteorologist, Weather Service Director

Hazen A. Bedke, Meteorologist, Former Regional Director, National Weather Service

Gabriel T. Csanady, Ph.D., Eminent Professor, Old Dominion University

Roy Leep, Executive Weather Director, Gillett Weather Data Services

Terrance J. Clark, Meteorologist, U.S. Air Force

Neil L Frank, Ph.D., Meteorologist

Michael S. Uhart, Ph.D., Meteorologist, National Weather Service

Bruce A. Boe, Ph.D., Director, North Dakota Atmospheric Resource Board

Andrew Detwiler, Ph.D., Assoc. Prof., Institute of Atmospheric Sciences, S. Dakota School of Mines & Technology

Robert M. Cunningham, Consulting Meteorologist, Fellow, American Meteorological Society

Steven R. Hanna, Ph.D., Sigma Research Corporation

Elliot Abrams, Meteorologist, Senior Vice President, AccuWeather, Inc.

William E. Reifenyder, Ph.D., Consulting Meteorologist, Professor Emeritus, Forest Meteorology, Yale University

David W. Reynolds, Research Meteorologist

Jerry A. Williams, Meteorologist, President, Oceanroutes, Inc.

Lee W. Eddington, Meteorologist, Geophysics Division, Pacific Missile Test Center

Werner A. Baum, Ph.D., former Dean, College of Arts & Sciences, Florida State University

David P. Rogers, Ph.D., Assoc. Professor of Research Oceanography, Scripps Institution of Oceanography

Brian Fiedler, Ph.D., Asst. Professor of Meteorology, School of Meteorology, University of Oklahoma

Edward A. Brandes, Meteorologist

Melvyn Shapiro, Chief of Meteorological Research, Wave Propagation Laboratory, NOM

Joseph Zabransky, Jr., Associate Professor of Meteorology, Plymouth State College

James A. Moore, Project Manager, Research Applications Program, National Center for Atmospheric Research

Daniel J. McNaughton, ENSR Consulting and Engineering

Brian Sussman, Meteorologist

Robert D. Elliott, Meteorologist, Fellow, American Meteorological Society

H. Read McGrath, Ph.D., Meteorologist

Earl G. Droessler, Ph.D., North Carolina State University

Robert E. Zabrecky, Meteorologist

William M. Porch, Ph.D., Atmospheric Physicist, Los Alamos National Laboratory

Earle R. Williams, Ph.D, Assoc. Prof. of Meteorology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

S. Fred Singer, Ph.D., Atmospheric Physicist, Univ. of Virginia, President, Science & Environmental Policy Project

Please note: Affiliations listed are for identification purposes only.

The Heidelberg Appeal – see next page

LATEST NEWS – 29 NOVEMBER 2007 – SEE FURTHER DOWN

The Heidelberg Appeal

Background

The Heidelberg Appeal was publicly released at the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro. By the end of the 1992 summit, 425 scientists and other intellectual leaders had signed the appeal. Since then, word of mouth has prompted hundreds more scientists to lend their support. Today, more than 4,000 signatories, including 72 Nobel Prize winners, from 106 countries have signed it. In spite of this spontaneous and growing support from the world's scientific community, the Heidelberg Appeal has received little media attention.

Neither a statement of corporate interests nor a denial of environmental problems, the Heidelberg Appeal is a quiet call for reason and a recognition of scientific progress as the solution to, not the cause of, the health and environmental problems that we face. The Appeal expresses a conviction that modern society is the best equipped in human history to solve the world's ills, provided that they do not sacrifice science, intellectual honesty, and common sense to political opportunism and irrational fears.

The Heidelberg Appeal

We want to make our full contribution to the preservation of our common heritage, the Earth.

We are, however, worried at the dawn of the twenty-first century, at the emergence of an irrational ideology which is opposed to scientific and industrial progress and impedes economic and social development.

We contend that a Natural State, sometimes idealized by movements with a tendency to look toward the past, does not exist and has probably never existed since man's first appearance in the biosphere, insofar as humanity has always progressed by increasingly harnessing Nature to its needs and not the reverse. We full subscribe to the objectives of a scientific ecology for a universe whose resources must be taken stock of, monitored and preserved.

But we herewith demand that this stock-taking, monitoring and preservation be founded on scientific criteria and not on irrational preconceptions.

We stress that many essential human activities are carried out either by manipulating hazardous substances or in their proximity, and that progress and development have always involved increasing control over hostile forces, to the benefit of mankind.

We therefore consider that scientific ecology is no more than extension of this continual progress toward the improved life of future generations.

We intend to assert science's responsibility and duties toward society as a whole.

We do, however, forewarn the authorities in charge of our planet's destiny against decisions which are supported by pseudoscientific arguments or false and nonrelevant data.

We draw everybody's attention to the absolute necessity of helping poor countries attain a level of sustainable development which matches that of the rest of the planet, protecting them from troubles and dangers stemming from developed nations, and avoiding their entanglement in a web of unrealistic obligations which would compromise both their independence and their dignity.

The greatest evils which stalk our Earth are ignorance and oppression, and not Science, Technology, and Industry, whose instruments, when adequately managed, are indispensable tools of a future shaped by Humanity, by itself and for itself, overcoming major problems like overpopulation, starvation and worldwide diseases.

Signatories

Below are listed some of the more than 4000 signers

*Denotes Nobel Prize Winner

- Bruce N. Ames, Director, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences Center, Berkeley-Biochemistry-U.S.A.
- * Phillip W. Anderson, Nobel Prize (Physics), Princeton University-Physics-U.S.A.

- * Christian B. Anfinsen, Nobel Prize (Chemistry), John Hopkins University-Baltimore-Biology-U.S.A.
- Henri Atlan, Professor, Head of Nuclear Medicine Department, Hotel Dieu, Paris-Nuclear Medicine-France
- * Julius Axelrod, Nobel Prize (Medicine), Lab. Of Cell Biology Nat. Institute of Mental Health-Cell Biology-U.S.A.
- Aden Bauleiu-Inserm, Ac. of Sciences, France, National Institute of Sciences, U.S.A. Lasker Prize-Endocrinology-France
- * Baruj Benacerraf, Nobel Prize (Medicine), National Medal of Science, President, Dana-Farber, Inc.-Cancerology-U.S.A.
- * Hans Albrecht Bethe, Nobel Prize (Physics), Emeritus Professor, Cornell University-Ithaca-NY-Nuclear Physics-U.S.A.
- *Sir James W. Black, Nobel Prize (Medicine), Professor Of Analytical Pharmacology King's College, London- Pharmacology-Grande-Bretagne
- * Nicholas Bloembergen, Nobel Prize (Physics), Harvard University-Physics-U.S.A.
- Sir Hermann Bondi, Emeritus Professor Of Mathematics King's College University Master of Churchill College Cambridge-Mathematics-Grande-Bretagne
- * Norman E, Borlaug, Nobel Prize (Peace), Sc. Consult CAMWOOD, Mexico Pdt. Sasakawa African Assoc.-Agriculture-U.S.A.
- Pierre Bourdieu, College de France-Sociology-France
- * Adolph Butenandt, Nobel Prize (Chemistry), Hon. Pres. Max-Planck Institute-Chemistry-Allemagne
- * Thomas R. Cech, Nobel Prize (Chemistry), University of Colorado-Chemistry-U.S.A.
- Carlos Chagas, Academia Pontificia, WIS-Medicine-Bresil
- * Owen Chamberlain, Professor, Nobel Prize (Physics), Emeritus Professor, University Of California-Berkeley-U.S.A.
- * Stanley Cohen, Nobel Prize (Medicine), Distinguished Professor, Department of Biochem., Vanderbilt University-Biochemistry-U.S.A.
- *Sir John Warcup Cornforth, Nobel Prize (Chemistry), School of Chemistry and Molecular Sciences, Brighton-Chemistry-Grande-Bretagne
- * Jean Dausset, Nobel Prize (Medicine), Ac. of Sciences, France, Pres. U.M.S.E., W.I.S., Paris-Immunology-France
- * Gerald Debreu, Nobel Prize (Economy), Emeritus Professor of Economics and Mathematics, University Of California-Economy-U.S.A.
- * Johan Deisenhofer, Nobel Prize (Chemistry), University of Texas, Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas-Biochemistry-U.S.A.
- Sir Richard Doll, Emeritus Professor Of Medicine, Radcliffe Infirmary, Oxford-Epidemiology-Grande-Bretagne
- * Christian de Duve, Nobel Prize (Medicine), Biology-Belgique
- * Manfred Eigen, Nobel Prize (Chemistry), President of Max Plank Institute, Gottingen-Chemistry-Allemagne
- * Richard R. Ernst, Nobel Prize (Chemistry), Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Zurich-Chemistry-Suisse
- * Pierre-Gilles de Gennes, Nobel Prize (Physics), Ac. of Sciences, Professor, College de France, Paris-Physics-France

- * Ivar Giaever, Nobel Prize (Physics), Institute Professor, R.P.I.-Physics-U.S.A.
- * Donald A. Glaser, Nobel Prize (Physics), Professor of Physics, University of California-Physics-U.S.A.
- Francois Gros, Professor, College de France, Ac of Sciences, France, Vice President of WIS, Paris - Biology of development-France
- * Roger Guillemin, Nobel Prize (Medicine), Whittier Institute, La Jolla-Medicine-U.S.A.
- * Herbert A. Hauptman, Nobel Prize (Chemistry), Pres. Med. Found. of Buffalo, Professor of Biophysics Sc-Biophysics-U.S.A.
- Harald zur Hausen, Professor, Dr., Director of German Cancer Research Center, Heidelberg-Cancerology-Allemagne
- Mrs. Francoise Heritier-Auge, Professor, College de France, Pres Cons Nat. Sida Dir, Ehess-Anthropology-France
- * Dudley R. Herschbach, Nobel Prize (Chemistry), Baird Professor Of Science, Harvard University, Cambridge-Chemistry-U.S.A.
- * Gerhard Herzberg, Nobel Prize (Chemistry), National Research Council of Canada, Chemistry - Canada
- Benno Hess, Professor, Doctor, Honorary Senator and Former Vice President, Max-Planck Society , WIS - Biophysics-Allemagne
- * Anthony Jewish, Nobel Prize (Physics), Professor, Cavendish Laboratory, Cambridge University Physics - Grande-Bretagne
- * Roald Hoffman, Nobel Prize (Chemistry), Professor Of Chemistry, Cornell University-Chemistry-U.S.A.
- * Robert Huber, Nobel Prize (Chemistry), Max-Planck Institute for Biochemie, Biochemistry-Allemagne
- *Sir Andrew Fielding Huxley, Nobel Prize (Medicine), Formerly President of London, Medicine-Grande-Bretagne
- Serguei Petrovich Kapitza, Professor of Sciences, Institute for Physical Problems, WIS-Physics, electrodynamics-Russie
- * Jerome Karle, Nobel Prize (Chemistry), Chief Scientist, Lab for Structure of Matter, Chemistry-U.S.A.
- *Sir John Kendrew, Nobel Prize (Chemistry), Professor, The Old Guildhall, Cambridge, Molecular Biology-Grande-Bretagne
- * Klaus Von Klitzing, Nobel Prize (Physics), Professor, Max-Planck Inst. Solid State Research, Stuttgart-Physics-Allemagne
- * Aaron Klug, Nobel Prize (Chemistry), M.R.C. Lab. of Molecular Biology, Cambridge-Chemistry-Grande-Bretagne
- * Edwin G. Krebs, Nobel Prize (Medicine), Professor Emeritus, Department of Pharm & Biochem, University of Washington-Biochemistry-U.S.A.
- * Leon Lederman, Nobel Prize (Physics), Director Emeritus, Fermi Nat'l Accelerator Laboratory, Nuclear Physics-U.S.A.
- * Yuan T. Lee, Nobel Prize (Chemistry), Professor of Chemistry, University of California-Berkeley-U.S.A.
- * Jean-Marie Lehn, Nobel Prize (Chemistry), Professor, College de France, W.I.S. Chemistry-France
- Pierre Lelong, Professor, Ac of Sciences, W.I.S.-Mathematics-France
- * Wassily Leontief, Nobel Prize (Economy), Professor, New York University-Economy-U.S.A.

- * Rita Levi-Montalcini, Nobel Prize (Medicine), Ac Lincei, Ac Pontificia, W.I.S.-Neurosciences-Italie
- Andr Linchnerowicz, Professor, Ac of Sciences France, Ac Lincei, Ac Pontificia, President of W.I.S., Mathematical Physics-France
- Richard S. Lindzen, Professor, US National Academy of Sciences, M.I.T., W.I.S.-Meteorology-U.S.A.
- * William N. Lipscomb, Nobel Prize Winner (Chemistry), Professor Emeritus, Harvard University, Cambridge-Chemistry-U.S.A.
- * Harry M. Markowitz, Nobel Prize (Economics), Speizer Professor of Finance, Baruch College-U.S.A.
- * Simon van der Meer, Nobel Prize (Physics), Geneva-Nuclear Physics-Suisse
- * Cesar Milstein, Nobel Prize (Physiology), Dr Cambridge-Physiology-Grande-Bretagne
- *Sir. Nevil F. Mott, Nobel Prize Winner (Physics), Emeritus Professor, Cambridge University, Physics-Grande-Bretagne
- * Joseph Murray, Nobel Prize (Medicine), Professor, Dr Surgery, Harvard Med School-Cell Biology-U.S.A.
- * Daniel Nathans, Nobel Prize (Medicine), Professor, John Hopkins Un, School of Medicine, Baltimore-Molecular Genetics-U.S.A.
- Daniel W. Nebert, Professor, Director, Center for Environmental Genetics, University of Cincinnati, Genetics-U.S.A.
- * Louis Neel, Nobel Prize (Physics), Physics-France
- * Erwin Neher, Nobel Prize (Medicine), Doctor, Director, Max-Planck Institute, Biophysics, Goettingen-Biophysics-Allemagne
- * Marshall W. Nirenberg, Nobel Prize (Medicine), National Institutes of Health, Bethesda-Medicine-U.S.A.
- * George E. Palade, Nobel Prize (Medicine), Professor, Division of Cellular & Molecular Med, Cell Medicine-U.S.A.
- * Linus Pauling, Nobel Prize (Chemistry, Peace), Professor, Linus Pauling Institute Sc and Med, Chemistry-U.S.A.
- Jean-Claude Pecker, Professor Hon, College de France, Ac of Sciences, Royal Ac of Belgium, W.I.S.-Astrophysics-France
- * Amo A. Penzias, Nobel Prize (Physics), Professor, Bell Laboratories, Murray Hill-Physics-U.S.A.
- * Max Ferdinand Perutz, Nobel Prize (Chemistry), MRC Laboratory of Molecular Biology, Cambridge-Biochemistry-Grande-Bretagne
- Julian Peto, Professor, Head, Section of Epidemiology, Institute of Cancer Research, London-Epidemiology-Grande-Bretagne
- Richard Peto, Professor of Medical Statistics & Epidemiology, University of Oxford-Epidemiology-Grande-Bretagne
- * John Charles Polanyi, Nobel Prize (Chemistry), Professor Of Chemistry, University of Toronto-Chemistry-Canada
- *Lord George Porter, Nobel Prize (Chemistry), Professor, Chairman, Photomolec, Sc Imperial College, London-Chemistry-Grande-Bretagne
- * I. Prigogine, Nobel Prize (Chemistry), Professor, Director, Institute Intern. de Phys. et de Chim, Bruxelles-Chemistry-Belgique
- A. Prochiantz, Pr, Director of Research CNRS, Ecole Normale Suprieure, Paris, W.I.S.-Pharmacology-France

- Ichtiaque Rasool, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena-Physics-France
- * Tadeus Reichstein, Nobel Prize (Medicine), Professor Emeritus, Org Chemistry, University of Basel-Organic Chemistry-Suisse
- * Heinrich Rohrer, Nobel Prize (Physics), IBM Research Laboratory, Physics-Suisse
- * Bert Sakmann, Nobel Prize (Medicine), Professor, Max-Planck Inst for Med. Forschung, Heidelberg-Cell Biology-Allemange
- * Abdus Salam, Nobel Prize (Physics), International Centre for Theoretical Physics, Italie
- Jonas Salk, Distinguished Pr., Dr , International Health Sciences-Biology-USA
- Evry Schatzman, Professor, Ac of Sciences-France-Astrophysics-France
- * Arthur L. Schawlow, Nobel Prize (Physics), Stanford University-Physics-U.S.A.
- G. Schettler, Professor, Director, Former President, Academy of Sciences, Heidelberg-Cardiology-Allemagne
- Elie A. Shneour, Professor, Director, Biosystems Research Institute, San Diego, California-U.S.A.
- * Kai Siegbahn, Nobel Prize (Physics), Physics-Suede
- S. Fred Singer, Professor of Environmental Sciences, University of Virginia, Director of the Washington S.E.P.P, EnvironmentalSciences-U.S.A.
- * Richard Laurence Millington Syngé, Nobel Prize (Chemistry), Biochemistry-Grande-Bretagne
- GP Talwar, Professor Emeritus, Nat Inst of Immunology, Ac of Sciences, India, W.I.S.-Immunology-Inde
- * Jan Tinbergen, Nobel Prize (Economy), Economy-Pays-Bas
- *Lord Alexander Todd, Nobel Prize (Chemistry), Chemistry-Grande-Bretagne
- Alvin Toffler, Author-Futurist-Futurology-U.S.A.
- * Charles H. Townes, Nobel Prize (Physics), W.I.S. Professor Emeritus, Physics, University of California, Berkeley-Physics-U.S.A.
- Ren Truhaut, Professor, Pharmacology Facult des Sciences, Pharmaceutiques, Paris-Toxicology-France
- *Sir John R. Vane , Nobel Prize (Medicine), Professor, Chairman of William Harvey Research Institute, London-Endocrinology-Grande-Bretagne
- * Harold E. Varmus, Nobel Prize (Medicine), Professor of Microbiology, University of California, San Francisco-Microbiology-U.S.A.
- * Thomas Huckle Weller, Nobel Prize (Medicine), Professor Emeritus, Harvard-Medicine-U.S.A.
- * Elie Wiesel, Nobel Prize (Peace), University of Boston Literature-U.S.A.
- * Torsten N. Wiesel, Nobel Prize (Medicine), Professor, Lab of Neurobiology, Rockefeller University of New York, Neurobiology-U.S.A.
- * Robert W. Wilson, Nobel Prize (Physics), Head, Radio Physics Res Department, AT&T Bell Laboratories-Physics-U.S.A.

LATEST NEWS – 29 NOVEMBER 2007 – SEE BELOW

LATEST NEWS

29 November 2007

Full article here: http://forecastingprinciples.com/Public_Policy/PolBears.pdf

Pertinent excerpts (emphasis mine):

“In all, AMD violated 73 of the 90 forecasting principles we were able to rate. They used two un-validated methods and relied on only one polar bear expert to specify variables, relationships, and inputs into their models. **The expert then adjusted the models until the outputs conformed to his expectations** “

“Green and Armstrong (2007) examined long-term climate forecasting efforts and were unable to find a single forecast of global warming that was based on scientific methods. The climate modelers’ procedures violated many forecasting principles and some of the violations were critical. This formal auditing result is consistent with earlier cautions. For example, Soon et al. (2001) found that the current generation of GCMs is unable to meaningfully calculate the climatic effects of added atmospheric carbon dioxide given severe limitations from both the uncertainties and unknowns in representing all relevant physical processes. There appears to be much uncertainty about the direction and extent of global mean temperature changes in the long-term (Soon et al. 2001), **the most plausible forecast is that mean temperatures will remain much the same. In order to produce valid forecasts, it is necessary to use procedures that are consistent with accepted forecasting principles.**”

“Despite the lack of validity of unaided forecasts by experts, many public policy decisions are based on their predictions. Research on persuasion has shown that people have substantial faith in the value of such forecasts and that faith increases when experts agree with one another. **Although they may seem convincing at the time, expert forecasts can, a few years later, serve as important cautionary tales.**”

“Research since 1980 has added support to the Seer-sucker Theory. In particular, Tetlock (2005) recruited 284 people whose professions included, "commenting or offering advice on political and economic trends." He asked them to forecast the probability that various situations would or would not occur, picking areas (geographic and substantive) within and outside their areas of expertise. By 2003, he had accumulated over 82,000 forecasts. **The experts barely if at all outperformed non-experts and neither group did well against simple rules.**”

My comments:

As a policymaker or a news organisation, you can continue to believe in Fairies, but the enclosed information is based on ACTUAL FACTS and this latest report is further proof of the fallacious nature of the AGW scaremongering tactics.

ASK YOURSELVES WHAT YOU STAND TO GAIN BY CONTINUING TO STICK YOUR HEADS IN THE SAND AND IGNORE THE **FACTS** THAT ARE SO **BLATANTLY OBVIOUS**.

PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE RECOGNISE THE FALSEHOOD OF AGW AND THE HIDDEN AGENDA OF THOSE WHO FORCE THESE LIES DOWN THE LINE.

LATEST BALI NEWS

05 December 2007

<http://www.globalwarmingheartland.org/article.cfm?artId=22401>

Taylor said, "The ICSC scientists don't agree with the pre-determined 'Bali Mandate', so instead of discussion and debate, we get censorship. Until the UN rejects the politicization of climate change, their reports, protocols, and mandates aren't worth reading--much less ratifying."