

**Memo 04/08**

## **THE COLLAPSE OF CLIMATE ALARMISM**

Will Alexander [alexwjr@iafrica.com](mailto:alexwjr@iafrica.com)

### **Part 4: Legitimacy**

**Adelaide. 11 January 2008**

The road that we are following is close to its destination. But first an important signboard.

#### **Concerns**

What are the major climatic concerns relating to the habitability of our planet? Obviously, they are rainfall and river flow – not temperature. Human beings live and thrive all the way from the Arctic to the equator. But human beings cannot survive in the waterless deserts, whether hot or cold.

This raises a fundamental question regarding the legitimacy of the IPCC science.

I am thoroughly familiar with the water-related situation in sub-continental Africa, having lived, worked and studied here for the whole of my professional career.

These are the IPCC's comments related to Africa in its synthesis report distributed at Bali. The emphases are mine.

By 2020 (**12 years from now**) between 75 and 250 million people are **projected** to be exposed to increased water stress due to climate change.

This is an extremely serious statement to make. What are the motives behind this gross exaggeration where all evidence leads to the opposite conclusion?



**Fig 4.1 Dignified refugees fleeing from the flooded Zambezi River in March 2000. (Internet photo)**

Recently, there were widespread floods in the Zambezi River that necessitated the temporary evacuation of thousands of people living in the floodplains. In Zimbabwe, December ended as the wettest December on record across much of the country. Over 300 mm of rain fell in nearly half of the country during the month. In the town of Chivhu, 504 mm of rain was recorded during the month. This rainfall for the country is nearly double the normal amount for December. Also, 27 people were killed due to the flooding that accompanied the heavy rain.

Most of Zambia lies within the catchment of the Zambezi River. The following is from a report titled 'Floods threaten lives' in *The Australian* newspaper of 9th January. Aid agencies warned that 1.5 million people in Zambia would be displaced by floods and the lives of tens of thousands were in danger yesterday as rising waters inundated southern Africa. Zambia has put half of its territory on alert while floods in Mozambique, fed by heavy rains from there and Zimbabwe, killed six people and cut major transport links to neighbouring countries. The early heavy rains have swollen rivers to alarming levels across the region.

All of this is happening while the IPCC reports predict a **reduction** in river flow in this region based on model projections.

Does the Hadley Centre really think that we in Africa are so dumb that we cannot see through their charade? No experienced hydrologist on the African continent will believe that the predicted 34.9% reduction in the flow in the Zambezi River can occur within the next 12 years. This is complete rubbish, to put it mildly. Yet it is published by one of the world's leading climate research organisations and distributed to the ten thousand participants at the Bali Conference. Has this institution no shame?

### **Origin of the delusion**

Where did all this nonsense start?

Take yourself back to 1988. The IPCC is about to be established. You are a member of a committee appointed to produce the IPCC's terms of reference. Prominent scientists have expressed concerns that rising GGEs will cause global warming, which in turn will result in threats to water supplies, floods, droughts, and threats to unique plant and animal species.

Would you not recommend that priority be given to establish the status quo in these fields to facilitate the identification of future changes as well as successes or failures of mitigation measures?

How would you feel if now, 20 years later, despite global research expenditures of billions of dollars there was still no such archive that independent researchers could access for their studies? Even more important, how would you feel when the IPCC reports and the Hadley Centre make no reference to national hydrological databases on the African continent but refer to temperature-based models for their projections?

Instead the IPCC followed a strange path. It went to great trouble to reconstruct a global temperature record from sparse and unrepresentative data. This data was then fed into large computers using complex mathematical models. The outputs from the models were used to substantiate the alarmist predictions of increases in floods, droughts, threats to water supplies, and loss of our unique plant and animal species. No numerical verification studies were performed.

### **Threats to habitat and species**

Why do we keep hearing about polar bears suffering from the effects of climate change? What about the African elephants? They are large and easily identified. A lot of data on their numbers and distribution are available.

Why do the IPCC reports not inform their readers that elephant populations on the African sub-continent are increasing? They are increasing to the extent that in some reserves they have to be culled because of the damage that they are causing to the natural vegetation. If we follow the IPCC logic we should be told that the growth of the elephant population is also evidence of climate change? Why the silence?

Where are those fields of South Africa’s precious Proteas and Namibia’s precious Kokerbooms (Quiver Trees) that are being destroyed by climate change? They do not exist.

I could fill many pages with similar examples of the IPCC’s dishonest reporting.

**Periodic behaviour**

Now let us return to where the last memo introduced the concept of the solar period as a time measurement unit. The figures in Memo 03/08 showed a very clear periodicity in the sunspot numbers but less dramatic periodicity for global air temperatures.

If, as is claimed, global temperatures and not variations in solar activity are the cause variations in global climate, including rainfall and river flow, then we would expect the periodicity signal in rainfall to be almost undetectable. But this is not so. In an earlier memo I quoted Tyson’s studies published in his book in 1987 – the year before the establishment of the IPCC. Table 4.1 is derived from my executive summary submitted to the Stern Review in November 2005. It shows the periodic sequence numbers for Tyson’s rainfall data.

**Table 4.1. Periodic range of wet and dry rainfall sequences.**

Years	Period beginning	Periodic range	Wet/Dry
1905-15	1889	17 to +3	Dry
1916-24	1913	4 to 12	Wet
1925-32		13 to 20	Dry
1933-43	1933	1 to 11	Wet
1944-52		12 to 20	Dry
1953-61	1954	-21 to 8	Wet
1962-70		9 to 17	Dry
1971-80	1976	-18 to 5	Wet

This information is presented in tabular form in Table 4.2.

**Table 4.2. Periodic behaviour of South African rainfall.**

Periodic behaviour of South African rainfall based on Tyson (1987)																												
Period starting																												
1996																												
1976	W	W	W	W	W																							
1954	W	W	W	W	W	W	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D
1933	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D
1913	D	D	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D
1889																												
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28

Note the dominance of wet years associated with the first sunspot cycle (years 1 to 11), and dry years with the second sunspot cycle (years 12 to 22). Based on this information, what is your projection for the coming years 14 to 21?

The periodic grouping of alternating wet and dry rainfall sequences and its correspondence with the alternating sunspot cycles is very clear in this table. David Bredenkamp found similar relationships in lake and groundwater levels. They are described in our joint paper that accompanied the last memo 03/08.

Another 20 years of data have become available since Tyson's analyses. It is also possible to express annual rainfall and river flow as percentages of their mean values. Composite graphs from a number of sites can be produced in Excel. Examples are in our joint paper and previous memos.

## **Nearly there**

The road followed in this series of memos is as straight and uncomplicated as the transcontinental highway through the Kalahari Desert. It shows that the basic assumption in the IPCC's approach that variations in solar activity do not have a meaningful effect on global climate is fundamentally in error. On the contrary, it is the dominant cause of the observed multiyear variations.

The scientific aspects of the IPCC reports were not discussed at Bali. The UNFCCC organisers made sure that this would not happen.

Another once revered British institution, The Royal Society, also followed an unprofessional path. It went out of its way to denigrate research that showed that the earth's climate does not operate within a closed system. It refuted the notion that extra-terrestrial processes play a significant role in climatic responses. It then went further. It tried to suppress contrarian science by asking the media not to report it.

Bali did not fail because of faulty science. It failed because the major atmospheric polluter, the USA, and the innocent developing nations of the world, ensured that the economically damaging countermeasures would not be implemented on a global scale.

There is steadily mounting observational evidence that undermines the alarmist IPCC theories. The current floods in the Zambezi River and recent floods in other areas of southern Africa are a good example. They completely refute the UK Met Office's prediction that the annual flows in the Zambezi River will decrease by more than 30% during the next 12 years. They also refute the IPCC's wider and more alarmist prediction that within the next 12 years between 75 and 250 million people in Africa would be exposed to water shortages as a result of global warming.

However, droughts follow floods as night follows day. For those with open minds, the linkage between variations in solar activity and synchronous variations in the earth's climate is incontestable. Tyson's observations in the table above are only one of many examples.

The world is already experiencing climatic disturbances associated with the occurrence of the sunspot minimum (not sunspot maxima). To those with engineering backgrounds this is an instability phenomenon. We explain its cause in our joint paper.

All indications are that we are now on the threshold of global cooling associated with the second and less active solar cycle.

Hopefully, the nations of the world will then shrug off the unfounded climate alarmism and get on with the real issues that need international cooperation.

## The future

This memo wraps up my views on the collapse of climate alarmism. I am now in the process of developing a do-it-yourself kit that others can use to evaluate the alarmist theories of future increases in the frequency and severity of floods and droughts. I will ask the participants of a short course to be presented by my University of Pretoria colleagues early next month to evaluate it. I will also ask them to evaluate the possibility that the world may soon enter into a period of global drought. Those of you with long memories may recall the global economic recession that accompanied the dustbowl drought of the 1930s. There are already signs that a global recession may be imminent.

Is there a linkage here as well? I will distribute their findings in my next memo due a month from now.

## Late news on solar activity

My attention has just been drawn to three short articles. The first is from the New Scientist dated 7 January. The second was also published in CCNet of 8 January. It is from the Royal Observatory of Belgium. I obtained my sunspot data from its website. I suggest that you visit it..

These are extremely important as they confirm my findings over the years that there is a synchronous linkage between the sunspot numbers and the hydro-meteorological responses. They sound the death knell for the IPCC and are a fitting climax to my memos predicting the collapse of climate alarmism.

=====

### (6) 'MAVERICK' SUNSPOT HERALDS NEW SOLAR CYCLE

New Scientist, 7 January 2008

[http://space.newscientist.com/article/dn13153-first-sunspot-of-new-solar-cycle-glimpsed.html?feedId=online-news\\_rss20](http://space.newscientist.com/article/dn13153-first-sunspot-of-new-solar-cycle-glimpsed.html?feedId=online-news_rss20)

Maggie McKee

A new 11-year solar cycle has officially begun, now that a sunspot has been found with a magnetic field pointing in the opposite direction from those in the previous cycle. But researchers are still divided over how active - and potentially damaging to Earth's satellites and power grids - the new cycle will be.

Sunspots are relatively cool regions where magnetic fields from within the Sun have risen up and broken through its surface. They vary in number - going from a minimum to a maximum and back to a minimum again - about every 11 years, the same timescale on which the Sun's magnetic poles reverse direction.

But predicting when the cycles will begin and end and how many sunspots they will produce is a tricky business, says David Hathaway of NASA's Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville, Alabama, US. For example, he had predicted that the new sunspot cycle, cycle 24, would be quite active. Since active cycles usually start earlier than average, he expected the cycle's first sunspot to appear a year ago - but it was only observed on Friday, 4 January.

"I'm happy to see this spot," he told New Scientist late on Friday. "For more than the last year, I come in every morning and look at the pictures from SOHO [the Solar and Heliospheric Observatory satellite] and say, 'No, not yet.' And today, someone beat me into work and said, 'Go take a look - I think there's a spot.'"

The spot - along with a couple of previous magnetic hints that cycle 24 was underway - suggests the Sun is at or near solar minimum, a time when sunspots in the new cycle outnumber the old.

Just when solar max will occur is up for debate, with some research teams predicting 2011 and others 2012. "The bigger the cycle, the shorter the time it takes to get there," says Hathaway. "A number of us believe it's going to be a big cycle and hence it will peak earlier."

FULL STORY at [http://space.newscientist.com/article/dn13153-first-sunspot-of-new-solar-cycle-glimpsed.html?feedId=online-news\\_rss20](http://space.newscientist.com/article/dn13153-first-sunspot-of-new-solar-cycle-glimpsed.html?feedId=online-news_rss20)

===== LETTERS =====

(7) "CAN THE SUN SAVE US FROM GLOBAL WARMING?"

Ingolf Dammasch [dammasch@oma.be]

Hi Benny,

a while ago, you cited the above-mentioned article by David Whitehouse (Independent, 05 Dec 2007). With respect to Sunspot Cycle 24, I can inform you that meanwhile it has started, which can be seen at the changed polarity (13 Dec 2007) <http://sidc.be/news/100/welcome.html>  
Several observatories have now seen the first sunspots (04 Jan 2008) <http://sidc.be/products/presto/>

While one might say that Cycle 24 started a bit late, it was the general opinion among my colleagues that concluding "the start of another Little Ice Age" would be rather premature, giving this little data. From my very personal point of view, I had the impression while reading Dr. Whitehouse's article that he wanted to make a more ironic point, namely, what huge conclusions a short time series might lead you to - in one direction or another.

Though I cannot speak for my colleagues, I think all of us would subscribe to the article's last sentence, "We must keep watching the Sun." If you want to learn more about the numerical development of sunspots - present and past - please take a look at our website <http://sidc.be/>

Greetings, IED

--

\*\*\* INGOLF E. DAMMASCH  
\*\*\* Royal Observatory of Belgium, Solar Influences Data Analysis Center  
\*\*\* Circular Avenue 3, 1180 Uccle, Brussels, Belgium  
\*\*\* +32 (0)2 7903959, +32 (0)476 025399  
\*\*\* [dammasch@oma.be](mailto:dammasch@oma.be), [dammasch@t-online.de](mailto:dammasch@t-online.de)

=====

**This memo has been modified and the references to solar news from a certain website removed, once this website was exposed as a scam:**

<http://junkscience.com/blog/2008/01/07/more-on-the-space-and-science-research-center-hoax/>

This modification has been confirmed by Professor Alexander in his final memo in this series:

[http://www.ilovemycarbondioxide.com/pdf/Memo\\_0508.pdf](http://www.ilovemycarbondioxide.com/pdf/Memo_0508.pdf)