

statement addressed politicians and called for immediate action -- whatever that may be -- amid warnings that without such action the world becomes an unrecognizable – and, in places, impossible – place to live and would face decades of social unrest and war.

The plea came as Lord Stern, the former chief economist of the World Bank whose report two years ago drew attention to the possible results of global warming, told the conference that unless politicians grasped the gravity of the situation it would be "devastating". Increases in average temperatures of six degrees C by the end of the century were an increasing possibility and would produce conditions not seen on Earth for more than 30 million years, he said. That could mean massive rises in sea level, whole areas devastated by hurricanes, and others turned into uninhabitable desert, he claimed, forcing billions of people to leave their homelands.

Meanwhile, in Washington DC, the Obama White House was running into more opposition, from Democrats as well as Republicans, to the proposed Cap&Trade scheme. A White House briefing informed Senate staffers that the likely cost would far exceed the \$650 billion shown in the budget document, and could go as high as \$2 trillion [<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2009/mar/18/obama-climate-plan-could-cost-2-trillion/>]. The actual cost, of course, depends on how and where the carbon emissions are set each year. While politicians talk of ambitious targets in 2020 or 2050, they have not prepared a year-by-year “roadmap.” Judging from the European experience with their ETS [Emission Trading Scheme], they are likely to make exceptions for specific industries or groups – or perhaps even go to “soft caps” (raising the cap whenever the price of permits seems to high). It all points to an ideal playground for politicians and for lobbyists.

[This portends a strategy of sneaking out the back door. It would be embarrassing to simply toss out the whole structure that many have promoted for so long, but via this arrangement they can let off the hook every industry that might suffer. The de facto result would be to abandon cap & trade.]

SEPP Science Editorial #10-2009 (3/21/09)

The latest alarmist concerns about sea level rise

Apparently the IPCC-4 (2007) estimate for sea level rise by the year 2100 are now considered to be not catastrophic enough. As reported by the BBC <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/7598861.stm> , the preferred estimate seems to be 200 cm, about five times the median IPCC value and ten times the observed rate of rise over the last few centuries <http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/abstract/sci.321/5894/1340>

The only justification given, in a paper published in *Science*, is a more rapid melting of glaciers and ice sheets from Greenland and Antarctic – all this in spite of the fact that no such events occurred during the Medieval Warm Period about 1000 years ago. One member of this group, Shad O’Neel from the US Geological Survey, warns that even 18 cm/century might turn out to be catastrophic. He’s apparently unaware of the fact that 18 cm/century is the ongoing rate of rise -- which implies no additional rise in sea level. In other words, the human influence is essentially zero.

Al Gore's documentary *An Inconvenient Truth* has received much criticism, and so has James Hansen, for implying that a rise of 20ft (6m) was possible in the near future. Their fond hopes have been dashed by recent publications on the “collapse” of the West Antarctic Ice Sheet (WAIS). Apparently, it will slowly melt away in a few millennia – unless a new ice age intervenes. (But we have known this for more than a decade.)

Andrew Revkin (NYT) reports on [two new papers in the journal Nature](#) focusing on the WAIS. The paper by [David Pollard at Penn State](#) and [Robert M. DeConto of the University of Massachusetts](#) at Amherst provides an estimated time frame for the loss of ice that its authors say should be of some comfort. (If the entire WAIS melted, sea levels worldwide would rise more than 15 feet.) They ran a five-million-year computer simulation, using data on past actual climate and ocean conditions gleaned from seabed samples (the subject of the other paper) to validate the resulting patterns. The bottom line? In this simulation, the ice sheet does collapse when waters beneath fringing ice shelves warm 7 to 9 degrees Fahrenheit or so, but

the process at its fastest takes thousands of years. Overall, the pace of sea-level rise from the resulting ice loss doesn't go beyond about 1.5 feet per century, Dr. Pollard said in an interview, a far cry from what was thought possible a couple of decades ago.

1. [Senate should vote against confirming Holdren](#)
2. [Climate 'denial' is now a mental disorder](#)
3. [Obama's Global Warming straddle](#)
4. [Carbon offsets scam](#)
5. [Enviros want more energy until we produce it, then oppose it](#)
6. [Everyone hates ethanol](#)
7. [Climate sceptics fight tide of alarmism](#)
8. [La Natura, non l'attivit a dell'uomo, governa il clima](#)

NEWS YOU CAN USE

The EPA has just taken the first step towards national reporting of GHG emissions. This is the thin edge of the environmental wedge to introducing further burdens on US utilities and businesses, which shortly will be embodied in carbon/CO2 cap-trade legislation. The EPA's proposed rule will be published in the *Federal Register*. A pre-publication copy: www.epa.gov/climatechange/emissions/ghgrulemaking.html
The public can comment on the proposed rule for 60 days following publication in the *Federal Register*. EPA plans to conduct two public hearings: April 6 and 7, 2009, at the EPA Potomac Yard Conference Center, Arlington, VA; and April 16, 2009, at the Sacramento Convention Center, Sacramento, CA.

Why GE supports C&T

http://www.dcxaminer.com/politics/Obamas-hidden-bailout-of-General-Electric_03_04-40686707.html

Yet another [Summit on America's Climate Choices](#), to be held March 30-31, 2009 in Washington, D.C., "provides an opportunity for study participants to interact with major thought leaders and key constituencies to frame the questions and issues that the study will address." Four panels of experts will release consensus reports in late 2009:

- [Panel on Limiting the Magnitude of Future Climate Change](#)
- [Panel on Adapting to the Impacts of Climate Change](#)
- [Panel on Advancing the Science of Climate Change](#)
- [Panel on Informing Effective Decisions and Actions Related to Climate Change](#)

"The [Committee on America's Climate Choices](#) will issue a final report in 2010 that will integrate the findings and recommendations from the four panel reports and other sources to identify the most effective short-term actions and most promising long-term strategies, investments, and opportunities for responding to climate change." *SEPP comment: Ho hum; where have we heard all this before?*

SEPP questions posed to yet another Washington energy confab (sponsored by *Newsweek*, March 23)

1. Wind power and solar power are unreliable, requiring standby conventional generating capacity. They produce piddling amounts of wildly expensive electric power and require large collecting areas and long transmission lines to consuming locations.

Why are we spending huge sums to subsidize uneconomic wind and solar, when one nuclear plant could replace them all at a fraction of the cost?

2. Corn ethanol requires as much or more energy to produce than it supplies, produces more CO2 than it supposedly saves, displaces food crops and raises the price of all food in the US and in poor counties, ruins agricultural soils and pollutes the water in our streams.

Why do we mandate the use of ethanol as a motor fuel additive, when it is not needed, requiring huge taxpayer subsidies and protective tariffs?

3. Energy generation from fossil fuels, and esp. coal, emits CO2 -- an invisible, non-toxic gas that's a natural component of the atmosphere and essential for all growing plants, for agriculture and forestry. An increasing number of climate scientists point to solid evidence that the warming effects of CO2 are insignificant and that climate changes are controlled by natural forces, mainly solar activity.

Why don't we settle the science dispute once and for all in a grand debate, stop demonizing CO2, quit scaring the public and Congress with climate horror stories, and just forget about trying to regulate global CO2 emissions?

UNDER THE BOTTOM LINE

A Modest Proposal (March 17, 2009) - by "[Jonathan Swift](#)"

A Modest Proposal to Prevent the Pernicious Warming of our Fair Globe Whilst Enriching the Treasury of the Realm and Avoiding All Inconvenience to Ladies and Gentlemen of Refinement Who Otherwise Might Suffer Severe Annoyance From Such Climatory Consequences Were the Situation Left Unremedied

<http://pajamasmedia.com/blog/a-modest-proposal-to-prevent-the-pernicious-warming-of-our-fair-globe/>

North Korea improves its ecological footprint by flooding its coalmines

<http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/9f0d498a-11b6-11de-87b1-0000779fd2ac.html>

Zombie science: A sinister consequence of evaluating scientific theories purely on the basis of enlightened self-interest <http://www.mantleplumes.org/WebDocuments/Charlton2008.pdf>

By Bruce G. Charlton, MD (Editor-in-Chief - Medical Hypotheses) in Vol 71, pp 327-329 (Sept 2008)

First Reville Prize, awarded to Al Gore:

http://www.americanthinker.com/blog/2009/03/gores_groesome_new_prize_1.html

<http://ccantoni.blogspot.com/2009/03/new-species-of-stupido-erudio.html>



1. SENATE SHOULD VOTE AGAINST CONFIRMING HOLDREN

http://cei.org/cei_files/fm/active/0/William%20Yeatman%20-%20Holdren%20WebMemo.pdf

Washington, D.C., March 12, 2009 President Barack Obama this week indirectly attacked his own nominee for White House Science Adviser, Dr. John P. Holdren, in remarks made when signing a presidential memorandum on protecting scientific integrity in government policy. President Obama said that the memorandum is about ensuring that scientific data is never distorted or concealed to serve a political agenda and that we make scientific decisions based on facts, not ideology.

President Obama's goal is laudable, yet the scientist he wants to put in charge of implementing this memorandum is Dr. John P. Holdren. Dr. Holdren is the very model of a scientist who puts his political agenda ahead of sound science, said Competitive Enterprise Institute Director of Energy and Global Warming Policy [Myron Ebell](#). A long-time advocate of population control and industrial de-development, most recently Dr. Holdren has distorted, concealed, exaggerated, and misrepresented the scientific data in order to promote his extreme global warming and energy-rationing agenda.

When it comes to science and public policy, President Obama is confused, said CEI energy policy analyst [William Yeatman](#). On the one hand, he says that science policy should be based on facts, not ideology. On the other, he nominated an ideologue of the apocalypse, Dr. John P. Holdren, to become White House Science Adviser. Holdren achieved scientific notoriety by championing a variety of unfounded doomsday scenarios, including ecocide, global cooling, nuclear winter, and now, climate disruption. While Holdren's science is kooky, his record of policy prescriptions is terrifying. He advocated population control and de-development as solutions to his imagined eco-catastrophes.

The Senate should vote against confirming Dr. Holdren to be the White House Science Adviser, Ebell concluded. Defeating Dr. Holdren's nomination will save President Obama much embarrassment and help accomplish the Presidents laudable objective of protecting scientific integrity from political interference.

For further analysis of Holdren's 40-year record of outlandish scientific assertions, consistently wrong predictions, and dangerous public policy choices, read the CEI Web Memo by William Yeatman, [Dr. John P. Holdren: De-development Advocate is the Wrong Choice for White House Science Adviser](#) (PDF).

PS On March 19, the US Senate approved the nominations of John Holdren as [President Obamas science adviser](#) and [Jane Lubchenco](#) as the administrator of the [National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration](#), I predict that Obama may find Holdren a huge burden.

[2. CLIMATE 'DENIAL' IS NOW A MENTAL DISORDER](#)

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/christopherbooker/4953981/Climate-denial-is-know-a-mental-disorder.html>

By Christopher Booker, 07 Mar 2009

How odd that, last Monday, none of our media global warming groupies should have bothered to report what was billed to be "the largest ever demonstration for civil disobedience over climate change". There was talk of hundreds of thousands of protestors converging on Washington to hear Jim Hansen, the scientist who talks of coal-fired power stations as "factories of death", call yet again for all coal plants to be closed. Perhaps the lack of coverage was due to the fact that, before Hansen arrived to address a forlorn group of several hundred hippies, Washington was blanketed in nearly a foot of snow.

It was generally another bad week for the warmists. The Met Office, which has been one of the chief pushers of the global warming scare for 20 years, had to admit that this has been "Britain's coldest winter for 13 years", despite its prediction last September that the winter would be "milder than average". This didn't of course stop it predicting that 2009 will be one of "the top-five warmest years on record".

US climate sceptics such as those on the *Watts Up With That* website, for whom the predictions of the UK Met Office have become a regular source of amusement, recalled its forecast that 2007 would be "the warmest year on record globally", just before global temperatures dived by nearly a full degree Celsius, cancelling out the entire net warming of the past 100 years.

Ever wilder wax the beleaguered warmists in their rhetoric. Our science minister Lord Drayson said last week he was "shocked" to find how many of the captains of industry he meets are "climate deniers". This was the same Lord Drayson who, as our defence procurement minister, assured Parliament in 2006 that Snatch Land Rovers afforded "the level of protection we need". The continuing death toll of soldiers in these unprotected vehicles approaches 40.

Even Drayson is outbid, however, by the groupies in *The Guardian*, who now suggest that people like Christopher Booker should no longer be compared to "Holocaust deniers" but consigned to even more outer darkness by branding them as climate "Creationists", the dirtiest word they know. Meanwhile at the University of the West of England in Bristol this weekend, a conference of "eco-psychologists", led by a professor, are solemnly exploring the notion that "climate change denial" should be classified as a form of "mental disorder".

I myself am off this weekend to New York, to join all the top "deniers", "creationists" and victims of psychic disorder at a conference organised by the Heartland Institute. It is an honour to be asked to speak alongside such luminaries as Professor Richard Lindzen of MIT, Dr Fred Singer, founder of the US satellite weather forecasting service, and the Czech President, Vaclav Klaus (not to mention those two revered climate bloggers, Steve McIntyre of Climate Audit and Anthony Watts). I shall report on this historic event next week.

3. OBAMA'S GLOBAL WARMING STRADDLE

Whatever else it accomplishes, cap and trade will be a huge tax on the productive sectors of the economy. The "cap" is a government-imposed limit on total emissions; companies then buy permits from the government to emit pollutants up to the amount of the cap, and can then trade these permits with each other. The process of issuing and pricing the permits will be an invitation to astonishing amounts of lobbying and favor-seeking. Cap and trade, in the words of MIT's Richard Lindzen, will be a bureaucrat's dream.

According to a recently released study by the George C. Marshall Institute:

- o The cost of cap and trade to the overall economy -- depending on the size and scope of the legislation -- is anywhere from a 0.3 percent to 3 percent drop in GDP in 2015 below what it would otherwise be.
- o Americans would see their electricity prices jumping 5-15 percent by 2015, natural gas prices up 12-50 percent by 2015, and gasoline prices up 9-145 percent by 2015.

The numbers are staggering, which is why the Obama administration plans to divert some of the permit revenues to its "making work pay" tax credit, reimbursing low-income individuals up to \$400 a year and \$800 for couples. It won't be enough, says the *Standard*:

- o The Senate failed to pass cap-and-trade legislation in 2007 -- the Lieberman-Warner bill -- which the Marshall Institute estimates would have cost each American household \$1,100 in 2008, rising to \$1,437 by 2015, and \$2,979 in 2050.
- o Obama's plan is far more ambitious, and would be a far greater burden to American consumers; the administration projects that the tax would raise some \$650 billion for federal coffers between 2012 and 2019.

The other reason for not hurrying up with a carbon tax may well be that the science underlying climate-change alarmism has taken a beating, says the *Standard*. "It's been a catastrophic year" for global warming activists, says Christopher Horner of the *Competitive Enterprise Institute*. All of a sudden, "the observations are very inconvenient."

Source: Michael Goldfarb, "Obama's Global Warming Straddle," *Weekly Standard*, March 12, 2009; and NCPA <http://www.weeklystandard.com/Content/Public/Articles/000%5C000%5C016%5C254xxzyp.asp>

4. CARBON OFFSETS SCAM

While much media attention has been paid to "cap-and-trade" schemes as a way to prevent global warming, there is a second path to "global warming" salvation -- carbon offsets. But it's all just smoke and mirrors, says Sterling Burnett, a senior fellow with the *National Center for Policy Analysis*.

Under a carbon offset scheme, a country (or company) can meet its emission targets by paying others to reduce their emissions. To facilitate this process, the United Nations created the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM), an international market where buyers who need to offset their emissions can purchase carbon credits from developing countries.

Unfortunately, proving that emission cuts are reductions that wouldn't have occurred absent the offset payments is proving difficult, says Burnett:

- o Almost three-quarters of CDM registered projects were already complete at the time of approval, and thus, didn't need carbon credits to be built.
- o An estimated 40 percent of CDM projects registered by 2007 represented "unlikely or at least questionable" emission cuts.
- o Between a third and two-thirds of CDM offsets don't represent actual emission cuts.

And even when CDM certified projects do cut greenhouse gas emissions, the system is inefficient, says Burnett:

- o Nearly 30 percent of carbon offset credits currently pay for capture and destruction of trifluoromethane (HFC-23), a greenhouse gas byproduct of manufacturing refrigerant gases.
- o The carbon offset credits that sold to reduce HFC-23 at current demand are twice as valuable as the refrigerant itself; HFC-23 emitters could receive as much as \$7.15 billion from the sale of carbon offsets through the CDM.
- o By contrast, if companies paid plants directly, the cost would be less than \$155.4 million.

It's debatable whether Congress should even take up climate legislation. However, if Congress does act, it should be skeptical of the merits of carbon offset schemes, warns Burnett.

 Source: H. Sterling Burnett, "Carbon offsets scam," *Washington Times*, March 8, 2009.

<http://washingtontimes.com/news/2009/mar/08/carbon-offsets-scam/>

5. ENVIROS WANT MORE ENERGY UNTIL WE PRODUCE IT, THEN OPPOSE IT

By Gretchen Randall, March 16, 2009

Issue: Two new examples of how environmentalists claim they favor alternative energy yet oppose it once it becomes viable: First, the push for cleaner-burning gasoline led to useless oxygenates. The first of these, MTBE, was found to harm ground water and discontinued. (Note: The U.S. EPA knew MTBE would pollute groundwater two years before lobbying for its use.)

Next, corn was converted to ethanol and mixed with gasoline to ostensibly reduce our usage of petroleum from the Middle East. The amount of ethanol that refineries must use was also mandated by Congress. Now that gasoline demand is falling, so is the amount of ethanol used. The renewable fuel lobby wants Congress to raise today's 10% blend of ethanol in gasoline to 15% or more -- even though most cars, trucks, boats, snowmobiles and other engines can't run on more than a 10% blend.

For once, even environmentalists oppose such action, but not for any rational reason. Groups such as the Natural Resources Defense Fund, Sierra Club, and even the American Lung Association (once in favor of ethanol use) are in opposition because they believe increased use of ethanol in gasoline will increase CO2

emissions, not decrease them, as these groups previously claimed.

Another example of environmental duplicity is Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid's (D-NV) plan to build new transmission lines to carry solar and wind power from remote areas like the California desert to cities. Reid wants the federal government to be able to override objections from states on the siting of the power lines – and the objection of state regulators, property owners, and environmental groups -- the same environmental groups that lobby for renewable energy. The California Desert Coalition is opposed to new power lines through California's desert and instead recommends less consumption of energy -- which indeed indicates the true objective of environmental groups

<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2009/03/14/MNFV16FBEG.DTL>

6. EVERYONE HATES ETHANOL

The Wall Street Journal, March 16, 2009, page A18

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB123716798764436701.html>

These days, it's routine for businesses to fail, get rescued by the government, and then continue to fail. But ethanol, which survives only because of its iron lung of subsidies and mandates, is a special case. Naturally, the industry is demanding even more government life support.

Corn ethanol producers -- led by Wesley Clark, the retired general turned chairman of a new biofuels lobbying outfit called Growth Energy -- want the Obama Administration to make their guaranteed market even larger. Recall that the 2007 energy bill requires refiners to mix 36 billion gallons into the gasoline supply by 2022. The quotas, which ratchet up each year, are arbitrary, but evidently no one in Congress wondered what might happen if the economy didn't cooperate.

Now the recession is hammering demand for gas. The Energy Information Administration notes that U.S. consumption fell nearly 7% in 2008 and expects another 2.2% drop this year. That comes as great news for President Obama, who is achieving his carbon-reduction goals even without a new carbon tax, but the irony is that the ethanol industry is part of the wider collateral damage.

Americans are unlikely to use enough gas next year to absorb the 13 billion gallons of ethanol that Congress mandated, because current regulations limit the ethanol content in each gallon of gas at 10%. The industry is asking that this cap be lifted to 15% or even 20%. That way, more ethanol can be mixed with less gas, and producers won't end up with a glut that the government does not require anyone to buy.

The ethanol boosters aren't troubled that only a fraction of the 240 million cars and trucks on the road today can run with ethanol blends higher than 10%. It can damage engines and corrode automotive pipes, as well as impair some safety features, especially in older vehicles. It can also overwhelm pollution control systems like catalytic converters. The malfunctions multiply in other products that use gas, such as boats, snowmobiles, lawnmowers, chainsaws, etc.

That possible policy train wreck is uniting almost every other Washington lobby -- and talk about strange bedfellows. The Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers, the Motorcycle Industry Council and the Outdoor Power Equipment Institute, among others, are opposed, since raising the blend limit will ruin their products. The left-leaning American Lung Association and the Union of Concerned Scientists are opposed too, since it will increase auto emissions. The Natural Resources Defense Council and the Sierra Club agree, on top of growing scientific evidence that corn ethanol provides little or no net reduction in CO2 over the gasoline it displaces.

The biggest losers in this scheme are U.S. oil refiners. Liability for any problems arising from ethanol blending rests with them, because Congress refused to grant legal immunity for selling a product that complies with the mandates that it ordered. The refiners are also set to pay stiff fines for not fulfilling Congress's mandates for second-generation cellulosic ethanol. But the cellulosic ethanol makers themselves already concede that they won't be able to churn out enough of the stuff -- 100 million gallons next year, 250 million gallons in 2011 -- to meet the targets that Congress wrote two years ago.

So successful but politically unpopular businesses will be punished for not buying a product that does not exist -- from companies that haven't yet found a way to succeed despite generous political and taxpayer advantages. The next step is to use cap and trade to make green alternatives look artificially good by comparison. Even then they'll probably still be bottomless money pits.

To recap: Congress and the ethanol lobby argue that if some outcome would be politically nice, it should be mandated (details to follow). Then a new round of market interventions is necessary to fix the economic harm resulting from the previous requirements, while creating more damage in the process. Ethanol is one of the most shameless energy rackets going, in a field with no shortage of competitors.

7. CLIMATE SCEPTICS FIGHT TIDE OF ALARMISM (IN AUSTRALIA)

<http://www.smh.com.au/opinion/climate-sceptics-fight-tide-of-alarmism-20090313-8xsh.html?page=-1> 9.

As the Rudd Government's job-killing carbon emissions trading plans come under fire, a conference of sceptical scientists met in New York this week to discuss developments bolstering the case against human-caused global warming. A disproportionate number of Australian scientists who lead the charge against climate alarmism spoke at the conference organised by the Heartland Institute, a US free-market think tank. Among them were the James Cook university paleoclimate scientist Dr Bob Carter, the former head of the Australian Greenhouse Office, David Evans, and Bill Kininmonth, the former head of the Australian National Climate Centre. "Each of the Australians were there because they have something special to offer," said Carter yesterday on the phone from Connecticut.

Evans told the conference the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change relied on the existence of a "hot spot" in the upper troposphere over the tropics, predicted by computer models. But it did not exist. Kininmonth said predictions that global temperature "might pass a 'tipping point' and even go into a phase of 'runaway global warming' are an outcome of the flawed computer models and are not a realistic future scenario". Carter told the conference that climate change has always occurred and by focusing on futile attempts to stop it by reducing carbon dioxide emissions, we have lost sight of the need to adapt. Countries need to "be better prepared to understand, cope with and adapt to the damaging effects of natural climatic events and trends".

Carter declared the conference mood optimistic but a downbeat Vaclav Klaus, president of the European Union and the Czech Republic, said sceptics had made little headway. At the World Economic Forum in Davos in January, he was the only person in a private session of European leaders who expressed doubts about anthropogenic global warming. "The environmentalists don't want to change the climate. They want to change us and our behaviour," he told the Heartland conference. "Their ambition is to control and manipulate us. Therefore, it shouldn't be surprising they recommend preventing [climate change], not adaptive policies. Adaptation would be a voluntary behaviour. "Environmentalism has replaced socialism as the totalitarian threat to freedom in the 21st century, he said. "Environmentalists do not want to reveal their true plans and ambitions: to stop economic development and return mankind centuries back."

The Heartland conference has received little coverage in Australia, and the odd New York Times report has dwelled on sneering dismissal from Greenpeace campaigners. But as sober analysis of developments in climate science filters out and economies decline, there are signs public perception is changing. Klaus cited a poll that showed only 11 per cent of Czechs believe humans have a significant influence on warming. A Lowy Institute poll last year found climate change had dropped down the list of policy priorities from equal first place to fifth, with Australians caring more about jobs. An Ipsos MORI poll found most Britons are not convinced climate change is caused by humans. In October, a poll commissioned by US conservation groups found only 18 per cent of respondents strongly believed climate change is "real, human-caused and harmful".

Carter described the most powerful speaker as Arthur Robinson, a professor of chemistry and co-founder of the Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine. In a wake-up call to Christian groups who have rushed to embrace climate alarmism, Robinson pointed out the world's poor will bear the brunt of carbon prohibition policies. He described as "technological genocide" efforts to deny cheap energy, in the form of coal-fired power plants, to the Third World. "Billions of people who live at the lowest level of human existence will

suffer greatly from the rationing of energy, and this, in turn, will lead to the death of hundreds of millions. "Banning the use of DDT for mosquito eradication was the first "example of genocide by the removal of technology, [resulting] in the deaths of 30 to 40 million people and [leaving] half a billion infected with malaria"

The Massachusetts Institute of Technology climatologist Richard Lindzen told the conference: "Being sceptical about global warming does not by itself make one a good scientist, nor does endorsing global warming make one a poor scientist. One of the most difficult things is to realise that most of the atmospheric scientists who I respect do endorse global warming. [But] the science they do that I respect is not about global warming. Endorsing global warming just makes their life easier." He also told the conference, in excerpts posted on YouTube, "Most arguments about global warming boil down to science versus authority. For much of the public, authority will generally win, since they do not wish to deal with science. Those who are committed to warming alarm as either a vehicle for a post-modern coup d'etat or for illicit profits will obviously try to obfuscate matters. "But how can the courageous independent scientists in New York compete for attention with climate hysteria coming from such world leaders as Prince Charles, who in Rio de Janeiro this week claimed: "We have less than 100 months to alter our behaviour before we risk catastrophic climate change." Australia's future head of state is on a 10-day eco-tour to South America, aimed at boosting his popularity. He will travel in a luxury private Airbus, delivering a carbon footprint estimated at more than 300 tonnes. It just shows that what counts with climate hysterics is not the greenness of the planet but the brownie points they gain.

8. LA NATURA, NON L'ATTIVITA DELL'UOMO, GOVERNA IL CLIMA

*S. Fred Singer, Talk at Conferenza sui cambiamenti climatici
Museo Nazionale della Scienza, Leonardo da Vinci, Milano, March 30, 2009*

The single most important issue is whether climate change is natural or human caused. On this question the scientific community is clearly divided. The United Nations IPCC claims to be 90 to 99% certain that the warming seen in the last century is human-caused, by the emission of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse (GH) gases. The equally competent NIPCC (Non-Governmental International Panel on Climate Change), which is an independent group of climate scientists, claims that the cause is primarily natural. If NIPCC is correct, then any effort to control the emission of CO₂ is pointless, counterproductive, and very expensive. It's all pain and no gain.

Deciding between these two possibilities presents a difficult scientific problem. In principle, both options are plausible. Certainly, CO₂ is a GH gas and has been increasing in the atmosphere since the beginning of the Industrial Revolution. Few will dispute the fact that this rise in CO₂ levels of approximately 35% is human-caused from the burning of fossil fuels and also from deforestation.

But we also know that climate changes naturally, both warming and cooling on many different time scales. The seasonal warming from winter to summer is of course well understood and is caused by the tilt of the earth's axis of rotation with respect to the plane of the earth's orbit around the sun. We also understand, more or less, the astronomically determined timing of the 17 ice ages of the past 2 million years, each lasting about 100,000 years and separated by warm interglacial periods of roughly 10,000-year duration. Since the end of the last Ice Age about 12,000 years ago, we have been in the so-called Holocene interglacial period.

But climate also varies on time scales of decades and centuries. Those are not well understood, although many believe that they are related to changes of solar activity, such as the 11-year sunspot cycle and longer periods of oscillation of the sun. In particular, we have known for about 25 years that there is also a 1500-year cycle, first discovered in Greenland ice cores and soon found in all sorts of other places such as deep sea sediments, stalagmites, etc. [See here the book "Unstoppable Global Warming -- Every 1,500 Years" by S. Fred Singer and Dennis T. Avery, 2007].

So which is the more important cause: the human release of GH gases or natural cycles? This important scientific question is certainly not settled, in spite of what you may read or hear. But how can you decide? One cannot go by the majority view: science does not work like politics. Important advances in science always come from a minority that disagrees with the accepted wisdom. Sometimes it is only a single scientist who turns out to be correct.

The popular press often points to the melting of glaciers or the shrinking of sea ice, and implies that this has a human cause. But clearly, this is not correct and just bad logic. Any kind of warming, no matter what the cause, will produce melting of ice.

Nor can we use the fact that there is a rough correlation between temperature increase and increase in CO₂. During much of the 20th century, from 1940 to 1975, the climate cooled while CO₂ levels rose. And during the past decade, climate has again been cooling in spite of rising CO₂.

The answer is to look at the *pattern* of warming trends and see if it agrees with what GH models predict. We have done this using the results of the IPCC itself, as published in the most recent report of 2007. The models all predict the existence of a 'hotspot' – a maximum warming trend in the tropical region at an altitude of about 10 km. The observations from weather balloons show the opposite result, a slight cooling trend. The data from weather satellites generally support the balloon data. We believe that this disagreement between calculated fingerprints and observed fingerprints of observed temperature trends is the strongest argument against any appreciable human contribution to climate.

Two important scientific questions remain:

- *What is the reason for the disagreement between GH models and observations?* We believe that the models cannot properly simulate the real atmosphere and do not take account of the existence of a 'negative feedback,' coming from atmospheric water vapor, which reduces the GH warming effect of CO₂.
- *What is actually causing the climate to warm and cool on a decadal and century time scale?* The climate models cannot provide an answer to this, but observations of the sun show a strong correlation with solar activity, as measured by magnetic effects, aurora, and cosmic rays. All of these indicate changes in solar activity. At the same time we can see changes in earth's climate.

To sum up: We believe that the observational evidence strongly supports natural causes for climate change and shows that human influences are not important. It now becomes essential to convince the public, the media, and politicians of these facts before policy decisions are taken that would harm the world economy and depress the standard of living of world population.