

Submission from the Lavoisier Group to the Garnaut Climate Change Review

APPENDIX A

U.S. Senate Report: Over 400 Prominent Scientists Disputed Man-Made Global Warming Claims in 2007 *Senate Report Debunks “Consensus”*

Report Released on December 20, 2007

U.S. Senate Environment and Public Works Committee (Minority)

INTRODUCTION:

Over 400 prominent scientists from more than two dozen countries recently voiced significant objections to major aspects of the so-called “consensus” on man-made global warming. These scientists, many of whom are current and former participants in the UN IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change), criticized the climate claims made by the UN IPCC and former Vice President Al Gore.

The new report issued by the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee’s office of the GOP Ranking Member details the views of the scientists, the overwhelming majority of whom spoke out in 2007.

Even some in the establishment media now appear to be taking notice of the growing number of skeptical scientists. In October, the Washington Post Staff Writer Juliet Eilperin conceded the obvious, writing that climate skeptics “appear to be expanding rather than shrinking.” Many scientists from around the world have dubbed 2007 as the year man-made global warming fears “bite the dust.” ([LINK](#)) In addition, many scientists who are also progressive environmentalists believe climate fear promotion has “co-opted” the green movement. ([LINK](#))

This blockbuster Senate report lists the scientists by name, country of residence, and academic/institutional affiliation. It also features their own words, biographies, and weblinks to their peer reviewed studies and original source materials as gathered from public statements, various news outlets, and websites in 2007. This new “consensus busters” report is poised to redefine the debate.

Many of the scientists featured in this report consistently stated that numerous colleagues shared their views, but they will not speak out publicly for fear of retribution. Atmospheric scientist Dr. Nathan Paldor, Professor of Dynamical Meteorology and Physical Oceanography at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, author of almost 70 peer-reviewed studies, explains how many of his fellow scientists have been intimidated.

“Many of my colleagues with whom I spoke share these views and report on their inability to publish their skepticism in the scientific or public media,” Paldor wrote. *[Note: See also July 2007 Senate report detailing how skeptical scientists have faced threats and intimidation - [LINK](#)]*

Scientists from Around the World Dissent

This new report details how teams of international scientists are dissenting from the UN IPCC’s view of climate science. In such nations as [Germany](#), [Brazil](#), the [Netherlands](#), [Russia](#), [New Zealand](#) and [France](#), nations, scientists banded together in 2007 to oppose climate alarmism. In addition, over 100 prominent international scientists sent an open letter in December 2007 to the UN stating attempts to control climate were “futile.” ([LINK](#))

Paleoclimatologist Dr. Tim Patterson, professor in the department of Earth Sciences at Carleton University in Ottawa, recently converted from a believer in man-made climate change to a skeptic. Patterson noted that the notion of a “consensus” of scientists aligned with the UN IPCC or former Vice President Al Gore is false. “I was at the Geological Society of America meeting in Philadelphia in the fall and I would say that people with my opinion were probably in the majority.”

This new committee report, a first of its kind, comes after the UN IPCC chairman Rajendra Pachauri implied that there were only “about a dozen” skeptical scientists left in the world. ([LINK](#)) Former Vice President Gore has claimed that scientists skeptical of climate change are akin to “flat Earth society members” and similar in number to those who “believe the moon landing was actually staged in a movie lot in Arizona.” ([LINK](#)) & ([LINK](#))

The distinguished scientists featured in this new report are experts in diverse fields, including: climatology; oceanography; geology; biology; glaciology; biogeography; meteorology; oceanography; economics; chemistry; mathematics; environmental sciences; engineering; physics and paleoclimatology. Some of those profiled have won Nobel Prizes for their outstanding contribution to their field of expertise and many shared a portion of the UN IPCC Nobel Peace Prize with Vice President Gore.

Additionally, these scientists hail from prestigious institutions worldwide, including: Harvard University; NASA; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR); Massachusetts Institute of Technology; the UN IPCC; the Danish National Space Center; U.S. Department of Energy; Princeton University; the Environmental Protection Agency; University of Pennsylvania; Hebrew University of Jerusalem; the International Arctic Research Centre; the Pasteur Institute in Paris; the Belgian Weather Institute; Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute; the University of Helsinki; the National Academy of Sciences of the U.S., France, and Russia; the University of Pretoria; University of Notre Dame; Stockholm University; University of Melbourne; Columbia University; the World Federation of Scientists; and the University of London.

The voices of many of these hundreds of scientists serve as a direct challenge to the often media-hyped “consensus” that the debate is “settled.”

A May 2007 Senate report detailed scientists who had recently converted from believers in man-made global warming to skepticism. [*See May 15, 2007 report: Climate Momentum*

Shifting: Prominent Scientists Reverse Belief in Man-made Global Warming - Now Skeptics: Growing Number of Scientists Convert to Skeptics After Reviewing New Research □ ([LINK](#))
- In addition, an August 2007 report detailed how proponents of man-made global warming fears enjoy a monumental funding advantage over skeptical scientists. ([LINK](#))]

The report counters the claims made by the promoters of man-made global warming fears that the number of skeptical scientists is dwindling.

Examples of “consensus” claims made by promoters of man-made climate fears:

Former Vice President Al Gore (November 5, 2007): “There are still people who believe that the Earth is flat.” ([LINK](#)) Gore also compared global warming skeptics to people who ‘believe the moon landing was actually staged in a movie lot in Arizona’ (June 20, 2006 - [LINK](#))

CNN’s Miles O’Brien (July 23, 2007): The scientific debate is over.” “We’re done.” O’Brien also declared on CNN on February 9, 2006 that scientific skeptics of man-made catastrophic global warming “are bought and paid for by the fossil fuel industry, usually.” ([LINK](#))

On July 27, 2006, Associated Press reporter Seth Borenstein described a scientist as “one of the few remaining scientists skeptical of the global warming harm caused by industries that burn fossil fuels.” ([LINK](#))

Dr. Rajendra Pachauri, Chairman of the IPCC view on the number of skeptical scientists as quoted on Feb. 20, 2003: “About 300 years ago, a Flat Earth Society was founded by those who did not believe the world was round. That society still exists; it probably has about a dozen members.” ([LINK](#))

Agence France-Press (AFP Press) article (December 4, 2007): The article noted that a prominent skeptic “finds himself increasingly alone in his claim that climate change poses no imminent threat to the planet.”

Andrew Dessler in the eco-publication Grist Magazine (November 21, 2007): “While some people claim there are lots of skeptical climate scientists out there, if you actually try to find one, you keep turning up the same two dozen or so (e.g., Singer, Lindzen, Michaels, Christy, etc., etc.). These skeptics are endlessly recycled by the denial machine, so someone not paying close attention might think there are lots of them out there -- but that’s not the case.” ([LINK](#))

The Washington Post asserted on May 23, 2006 that there were only “a handful of skeptics” of man-made climate fears. ([LINK](#))

UN special climate envoy Dr. Gro Harlem Brundtland on May 10, 2007 declared the climate debate “over” and added “it’s completely immoral, even, to question” the UN’s scientific “consensus.” ([LINK](#))

ABC News Global Warming Reporter Bill Blakemore reported on August 30, 2006: “After extensive searches, ABC News has found no such [scientific] debate” on global warming. ([LINK](#))

Brief highlights of the report featuring over 400 international scientists:

Israel: Dr. Nathan Paldor, Professor of Dynamical Meteorology and Physical Oceanography at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem has authored almost 70 peer-reviewed studies and won several awards. “First, temperature changes, as well as rates of temperature changes (both increase and decrease) of magnitudes similar to that reported by IPCC to have occurred since the Industrial revolution (about 0.8C in 150 years or even 0.4C in the last 35 years) have occurred in Earth’s climatic history. There’s nothing special about the recent rise!”

Russia: Russian scientist Dr. Oleg Sorochtin of the Institute of Oceanology at the Russian Academy of Sciences has authored more than 300 studies, nine books, and a 2006 paper titled “The Evolution and the Prediction of Global Climate Changes on Earth.” “Even if the concentration of ‘greenhouse gases’ double man would not perceive the temperature impact,” Sorochtin wrote.

Spain: Anton Uriarte, a professor of Physical Geography at the University of the Basque Country in Spain and author of a book on the paleoclimate, rejected man-made climate fears in 2007. “There’s no need to be worried. It’s very interesting to study [climate change], but there’s no need to be worried,” Uriarte wrote.

Netherlands: Atmospheric scientist Dr. Hendrik Tennekes, a scientific pioneer in the development of numerical weather prediction and former director of research at The Netherlands’ Royal National Meteorological Institute, and an internationally recognized expert in atmospheric boundary layer processes, “I find the Doomsday picture Al Gore is painting - a six-meter sea level rise, fifteen times the IPCC number - entirely without merit,” Tennekes wrote. “I protest vigorously the idea that the climate reacts like a home heating system to a changed setting of the thermostat: just turn the dial, and the desired temperature will soon be reached.”

Brazil: Chief Meteorologist Eugenio Hackbart of the MetSul Meteorologia Weather Center in Sao Leopoldo - Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil declared himself a skeptic. “The media is promoting an unprecedented hyping related to global warming. The media and many scientists are ignoring very important facts that point to a natural variation in the climate system as the cause of the recent global warming,” Hackbart wrote on May 30, 2007.

France: Climatologist Dr. Marcel Leroux, former professor at Université Jean Moulin and director of the Laboratory of Climatology, Risks, and Environment in Lyon, is a climate skeptic. Leroux wrote a 2005 book titled *Global Warming - Myth or Reality? - The Erring Ways of Climatology*. “Day after day, the same mantra - that ‘the Earth is warming up’ - is churned out in all its forms. As ‘the ice melts’ and ‘sea level rises,’ the Apocalypse looms ever nearer! Without realizing it, or perhaps without wishing to, the average citizen in bamboozled, lobotomized, lulled into mindless acceptance. ... Non-believers in the greenhouse scenario are in the position of those long ago who doubted the existence of God ... fortunately for them, the Inquisition is no longer with us!”

Norway: Geologist/Geochemist Dr. Tom V. Segalstad, a professor and head of the Geological Museum at the University of Oslo and formerly an expert reviewer with the

UN IPCC: “It is a search for a mythical CO2 sink to explain an immeasurable CO2 lifetime to fit a hypothetical CO2 computer model that purports to show that an impossible amount of fossil fuel burning is heating the atmosphere. It is all a fiction.”

Finland: Dr. Boris Winterhalter, retired Senior Marine Researcher of the Geological Survey of Finland and former professor of marine geology at University of Helsinki, criticized the media for what he considered its alarming climate coverage. “The effect of solar winds on cosmic radiation has just recently been established and, furthermore, there seems to be a good correlation between cloudiness and variations in the intensity of cosmic radiation. Here we have a mechanism which is a far better explanation to variations in global climate than the attempts by IPCC to blame it all on anthropogenic input of greenhouse gases. “

Germany: Paleoclimate expert Augusto Mangini of the University of Heidelberg in Germany, criticized the UN IPCC summary. “I consider the part of the IPCC report, which I can really judge as an expert, i.e. the reconstruction of the paleoclimate, wrong,” Mangini noted in an April 5, 2007 article. He added: “The earth will not die.”

Canada: IPCC 2007 Expert Reviewer Madhav Khandekar, a Ph.D meteorologist, a scientist with the Natural Resources Stewardship Project who has over 45 years experience in climatology, meteorology and oceanography, and who has published nearly 100 papers, reports, book reviews and a book on Ocean Wave Analysis and Modeling: “To my dismay, IPCC authors ignored all my comments and suggestions for major changes in the FOD (First Order Draft) and sent me the SOD (Second Order Draft) with essentially the same text as the FOD. None of the authors of the chapter bothered to directly communicate with me (or with other expert reviewers with whom I communicate on a regular basis) on many issues that were raised in my review. This is not an acceptable scientific review process.”

Czech Republic: Czech-born U.S. climatologist Dr. George Kukla, a research scientist with the Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory at Columbia University, expressed climate skepticism in 2007. “The only thing to worry about is the damage that can be done by worrying. Why are some scientists worried? Perhaps because they feel that to stop worrying may mean to stop being paid,” Kukla told Gelf Magazine on April 24, 2007.

India: One of India’s leading geologists, B.P. Radhakrishna, President of the Geological Society of India, expressed climate skepticism in 2007. “We appear to be overplaying this global warming issue as global warming is nothing new. It has happened in the past, not once but several times, giving rise to glacial-interglacial cycles.”

USA: Climatologist Robert Durrenberger, past president of the American Association of State Climatologists, and one of the climatologists who gathered at Woods Hole to review the National Climate Program Plan in July, 1979: “Al Gore brought me back to the battle and prompted me to do renewed research in the field of climatology. And because of all the misinformation that Gore and his army have been spreading about climate change I have decided that ‘real’ climatologists should try to help the public understand the nature of the problem.”

Italy: Internationally renowned scientist Dr. Antonio Zichichi, president of the World Federation of Scientists and a retired Professor of Advanced Physics at the University of Bologna in Italy, who has published over 800 scientific papers: “Significant new peer-

reviewed research has cast even more doubt on the hypothesis of dangerous human-caused global warming.”

New Zealand: IPCC reviewer and climate researcher Dr. Vincent Gray, an expert reviewer on every single draft of the IPCC reports going back to 1990 and author of The Greenhouse Delusion: A Critique of “Climate Change 2001: “The [IPCC] ‘Summary for Policymakers’ might get a few readers, but the main purpose of the report is to provide a spurious scientific backup for the absurd claims of the worldwide environmentalist lobby that it has been established scientifically that increases in carbon dioxide are harmful to the climate. It just does not matter that this ain’t so.”

South Africa: Dr. Kelvin Kemm, formerly a scientist at South Africa’s Atomic Energy Corporation who holds degrees in nuclear physics and mathematics: “The global-warming mania continues with more and more hype and less and less thinking. With religious zeal, people look for issues or events to blame on global warming.”

Poland: Physicist Dr. Zbigniew Jaworowski, Chairman of the Central Laboratory for the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Radiological Protection in Warsaw: ““We thus find ourselves in the situation that the entire theory of man-made global warming-with its repercussions in science, and its important consequences for politics and the global economy-is based on ice core studies that provided a false picture of the atmospheric CO2 levels.”

Australia: Prize-winning Geologist Dr. Ian Plimer, a professor of Earth and Environmental Sciences at the University of Adelaide in Australia: “There is new work emerging even in the last few weeks that shows we can have a very close correlation between the temperatures of the Earth and supernova and solar radiation.”

Britain: Dr. Richard Courtney, a UN IPCC expert reviewer and a UK-based climate and atmospheric science consultant: “To date, no convincing evidence for AGW (anthropogenic global warming) has been discovered. And recent global climate behavior is not consistent with AGW model predictions.”

China: Chinese Scientists Say CO2 Impact on Warming May Be ‘Excessively Exaggerated’ - Scientists Lin Zhen-Shan’s and Sun Xian’s 2007 study published in the peer-reviewed journal Meteorology and Atmospheric Physics: “Although the CO2 greenhouse effect on global climate change is unsuspectious, it could have been excessively exaggerated.” Their study asserted that “it is high time to reconsider the trend of global climate change.”

Denmark: Space physicist Dr. Eigil Friis-Christensen is the director of the Danish National Space Centre, a member of the space research advisory committee of the Swedish National Space Board, a member of a NASA working group, and a member of the European Space Agency who has authored or co-authored around 100 peer-reviewed papers and chairs the Institute of Space Physics: “The sun is the source of the energy that causes the motion of the atmosphere and thereby controls weather and climate. Any change in the energy from the sun received at the Earth’s surface will therefore affect climate.”

Belgium: Climate scientist Luc Debontridder of the Belgium Weather Institute’s Royal Meteorological Institute (RMI) co-authored a study in August 2007 which dismissed a

decisive role of CO2 in global warming: “CO2 is not the big bogeyman of climate change and global warming. “Not CO2, but water vapor is the most important greenhouse gas. It is responsible for at least 75 % of the greenhouse effect. This is a simple scientific fact, but Al Gore’s movie has hyped CO2 so much that nobody seems to take note of it.”

Sweden: Geologist Dr. Wibjorn Karlen, professor emeritus of the Department of Physical Geography and Quaternary Geology at Stockholm University, critiqued the *Associated Press* for hyping promoting climate fears in 2007. “Another of these hysterical views of our climate. Newspapers should think about the damage they are doing to many persons, particularly young kids, by spreading the exaggerated views of a human impact on climate.”

USA: Dr. David Wojick is a UN IPCC expert reviewer, who earned his PhD in Philosophy of Science and co-founded the Department of Engineering and Public Policy at Carnegie-Mellon University: “In point of fact, the hypothesis that solar variability and not human activity is warming the oceans goes a long way to explain the puzzling idea that the Earth’s surface may be warming while the atmosphere is not. The GHG (greenhouse gas) hypothesis does not do this.” Wojick added: “The public is not well served by this constant drumbeat of false alarms fed by computer models manipulated by advocates.”

###

Background: Only 52 Scientists Participated in UN IPCC Summary

The over 400 skeptical scientists featured in this new report outnumber by nearly eight times the number of scientists who participated in the 2007 UN IPCC Summary for Policymakers. The notion of “hundreds” or “thousands” of UN scientists agreeing to a scientific statement does not hold up to scrutiny. (See report debunking “consensus” [LINK](#)) Recent research by Australian climate data analyst Dr. John McLean revealed that the IPCC’s peer-review process for the Summary for Policymakers leaves much to be desired. ([LINK](#))

Proponents of man-made global warming like to note how the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) and the American Meteorological Society (AMS) have issued statements endorsing the so-called “consensus” view that man is driving global warming. But both the NAS and AMS never allowed member scientists to directly vote on these climate statements. Essentially, only two dozen or so members on the governing boards of these institutions produced the “consensus” statements. This report gives a voice to the rank-and-file scientists who were shut out of the process. ([LINK](#))

The most recent attempt to imply there was an overwhelming scientific “consensus” in favor of man-made global warming fears came in December 2007 during the UN climate conference in Bali. A letter signed by only 215 scientists urged the UN to mandate deep cuts in carbon dioxide emissions by 2050. But absent from the letter were the signatures of these alleged “thousands” of scientists. (See AP article: - [LINK](#))

UN IPCC chairman Rajendra Pachauri urged the world at the December 2007 UN climate conference in Bali, Indonesia to “Please listen to the voice of science.”

The science has continued to grow loud and clear in 2007. In addition to the growing number of scientists expressing skepticism, an abundance of recent peer-reviewed studies have cast considerable doubt about man-made global warming fears. A November 3, 2007 peer-

reviewed study found that “solar changes significantly alter climate.” ([LINK](#)) A December 2007 peer-reviewed study recalculated and halved the global average surface temperature trend between 1980 - 2002. ([LINK](#)) Another new study found the Medieval Warm Period “0.3C warmer than 20th century” ([LINK](#))

A peer-reviewed study by a team of scientists found that “warming is naturally caused and shows no human influence.” ([LINK](#)) - Another November 2007 peer-reviewed study in the journal *Physical Geography* found “Long-term climate change is driven by solar insolation changes.” ([LINK](#)) These recent studies were in addition to the abundance of peer-reviewed studies earlier in 2007. - See “New Peer-Reviewed Scientific Studies Chill Global Warming Fears” ([LINK](#))

With this new report of profiling 400 skeptical scientists, the world can finally hear the voices of the “silent majority” of scientists.

FULL SENATE REPORT: U.S. Senate Report: Over 400 Prominent Scientists Disputed Man-Made Global Warming Claims in 2007

December 20, 2007

This report is in the spirit of enlightenment philosopher Denis Diderot who reportedly said, “Skepticism is the first step towards truth.”

[Disclaimer: The following scientists named in this report have expressed a range of views from skepticism to outright rejection of predictions of catastrophic man-made global warming. As in all science, there is no lock step single view.]

Atmospheric scientist Dr. Nathan Paldor, Professor of Dynamical Meteorology and Physical Oceanography at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem has authored almost 70 peer-reviewed studies and won several awards. “First, temperature changes, as well as rates of temperature changes (both increase and decrease) of magnitudes similar to that reported by IPCC to have occurred since the Industrial revolution (about 0.8C in 150 years or even 0.4C in the last 35 years) have occurred in Earth’s climatic history. There’s nothing special about the recent rise!” Paldor told EPW on December 4, 2007. “Second, our ability to make realizable (or even sensible) future forecasts are greatly exaggerated relied upon by the IPCC. This is true both for the numerical modeling efforts (the same models that yield abysmal 3-day forecasts are greatly simplified and run for 100 years!),” Paldor explained. “Third, the rise in atmospheric CO2 is much smaller (by about 50%) than that expected from the anthropogenic activity (burning of fossil fuels such as oil, coal and natural gas), which implies that the missing amount of CO2 is (most probably) absorbed by the ocean. The oceanic response to increasing CO2 concentration in the atmosphere might be much slower than that of the atmosphere (and is presently very poorly understood). It is quite possible that after an ‘adjustment time’ the ocean (which contains far more CO2 than the atmosphere) will simply increase its biological activity and absorb the CO2 from the atmosphere (i.e. the atmospheric CO2 concentration will decrease),” he added. “Fourth, the inventory of fossil fuels is fairly

limited and in one generation we will run out of oil. Coal and natural gas might take 100-200 years but with no oil their consumption will increase so they probably won't last as long. The real alternative that presently available to humanity is nuclear power (that can easily produce electricity for domestic and industrial usage and for transportation when our vehicles are reverted to run on electricity). The technology for this exists today and can replace our dependence on fossil fuel in a decade! This has to be made known to the general public who is unaware of the alternative for taking action to lower the anthropogenic spewing of CO₂. This transformation to nuclear energy will probably take place when oil reserves dwindle regardless of the CO₂ situation," he wrote. Paldor also noted the pressure for scientists to bow to the UN IPCC view of climate change. "Many of my colleagues with whom I spoke share these views and report on their inability to publish their skepticism in the scientific or public media," he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Dr. Denis G. Rancourt, Professor of Physics and an Environmental Science researcher at the University of Ottawa, believes the global warming campaigns do a disservice to the environmental movement. "Promoting the global warming myth trains people to accept unverified, remote, and abstract dangers in the place of true problems that they can discover for themselves by becoming directly engaged in their workplace and by doing their own research and observations. It trains people to think lifestyle choices (in relation to CO₂ emission) rather than to think activism in the sense of exerting an influence to change societal structures," Rancourt wrote in a February 27, 2007 blog post. Rancourt believes that global warming "will not become humankind's greatest threat until the sun has its next hiccup in a billion years or more (in the very unlikely scenario that we are still around,)" and noted that even if CO₂ emissions were a grave threat, "government action and political will cannot measurably or significantly ameliorate global climate in the present world." Rancourt believes environmentalists have been duped into promoting global warming as a crisis. "I argue that by far the most destructive force on the planet is power-driven financiers and profit-driven corporations and their cartels backed by military might; and that the global warming myth is a red herring that contributes to hiding this truth. In my opinion, activists who, using any justification, feed the global warming myth have effectively been co-opted, or at best neutralized," Rancourt wrote. Rancourt also questioned the whole concept of a global average temperature, noting, "Averaging problems aside, many tenuous approximations must be made in order to arrive at any of the reported final global average temperature curves." He further explained: "This means that determining an average of a quantity (Earth surface temperature) that is everywhere different and continuously changing with time at every point, using measurements at discrete times and places (weather stations), is virtually impossible; in that the resulting number is highly sensitive to the chosen extrapolation method(s) needed to calculate (or rather approximate) the average." "The estimates are uncertain and can change the calculated global warming by as much as 0.5 C, thereby removing the originally reported effect entirely," he added. Finally, Rancourt asserted that in a warm world, life prospers. "There is no known case of a sustained warming alone having negatively impacted an entire population," he said, adding, "As a general rule, all life on Earth does better when it's hotter: Compare ecological diversity and biotic density (or biomass) at the poles and at the equator." Rancourt added, "Global warming is strictly an imaginary problem of the First World middle class." ([LINK](#))

Czech-born U.S. climatologist Dr. George Kukla, a research scientist with the Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory at Columbia University expressed climate skepticism in 2007. "The only thing to worry about is the damage that can be done by worrying. Why are some

scientists worried? Perhaps because they feel that to stop worrying may mean to stop being paid,” Kukla told Gelf Magazine on April 24, 2007. “What I think is this: Man is responsible for a PART of global warming. MOST of it is still natural,” Kukla explained. ([LINK](#)) Kukla “said that the accelerating warming of the Earth is not caused by man but by the regularities of the planets’ circulation around the Sun,” according to a June 4, 2007 article in the *Prague Monitor*. “The changes in the Earth’s circulation around the Sun are now extremely slow. Moreover, they are partially being compensated by the human impact on the climate. I think we will know more in about 50 years,” Kukla said. Kukla is viewed as a pioneer in the study of solar forcing of climate changes. ([LINK](#)) & ([LINK](#))

One of India’s leading geologists, B.P. Radhakrishna, President of the Geological Society of India, expressed climate skepticism in 2007. “There is some evidence to show that our planet Earth is becoming warmer and that human action is probably partly responsible, especially in the matter of greenhouse gas emissions. What is in doubt, however, is whether the steps that are proposed to be taken to reduce carbon emission will really bring down the carbon dioxide level in the atmosphere and whether such attempts, even carried out on a global scale, will produce the desired effect,” Radhakrishna wrote in an August 23, 2007 essay. “We appear to be overplaying this global warming issue as global warming is nothing new. It has happened in the past, not once but several times, giving rise to glacial-interglacial cycles. We appear to be now only in the middle of an interglacial cycle showing a trend toward warming as warming and cooling are global and have occurred on such a scale when humans had not appeared on the planet. If we read geology correctly, the earth we live on is not dead but is dynamic and is continuously changing. The causes of these changes are cosmogenic and nothing we are able to do is likely to halt or reverse such processes,” he explained. “Warming of the climate, melting of glaciers, rise in sea levels and other marked changes in climate - these do not pose immediate threats and there is besides, no way of controlling such changes even if we want to. Exercises at mitigation of these likely disasters are, however, possible and mankind, in all likelihood, will gradually adjust itself to the changed conditions. This has happened before; men and animals have moved to greener pastures and adapted themselves to the changed situations,” he added. ([LINK](#))

Climatologist Dr. John Maunder, past president of the Commission for Climatology who has spent over 50 years in the “weather business” all around the globe, and who has written four books on weather and climate, says “the science of climate change will probably never be fully understood.” “It is not always true that the climate we have now (wherever we live) is the best one ... some people (and animals and crops) may prefer it to be wetter, drier, colder, or warmer,” Maunder wrote on his website updated on November 27, 2007. “Climatic variations and climatic changes from WHATEVER cause (i.e. human induced or natural) clearly create risks, but also provide real opportunities. (For example, the 2007 IPCC report - see below - shows that from 1900 to 2005, significantly increased precipitation has been observed in eastern parts of North and South America, northern Europe, and northern and central Asia),” he explained. ([LINK](#))

Glaciologist Nikolai Osokin of the Institute of Geography and member of the Russian Academy of Sciences dismissed alarmist climate fears of all of the world’s ice melting in a March 27, 2007 article. “The planet may rest assured,” Osokin wrote. “This hypothetical catastrophe could not take place anytime within the next thousand years,” he explained. “Today, scientists say that the melting of the permafrost has stalled, which has been proved by data obtained by meteorological stations along Russia’s Arctic coast,” Olokin added. “The

(recent) period of warming was tangible, but now it may be drawing to a close. Most natural processes on the earth are cyclical, having a shorter or longer rhythm. Yet no matter how these sinusoids look, a temperature rise is inevitably followed by a decline, and vice versa.” ([LINK](#))

Atmospheric Physicist Dr. Garth W. Paltridge, an Emeritus Professor from University of Tasmania, is another prominent skeptic. Paltridge who was a Chief Research Scientist with the CSIRO Division of Atmospheric Research before taking up positions in 1990 as Director of the Institute of Antarctic and Southern Ocean Studies at the University of Tasmania and as CEO of the Antarctic Cooperative Research Center. Paltridge questioned the motives of scientists hyping climate fears. “They have been so successful with their message of greenhouse doom that, should one of them prove tomorrow that it is nonsense, the discovery would have to be suppressed for the sake of the overall reputation of science,” Paltridge wrote in an April 6, 2007 op-ed entitled “Global Warming - Not Really a Done Deal?” Paltridge is best known internationally for his work on atmospheric radiation and on the theoretical basis of climate change. He is a fellow of the Australian Academy of Science. Paltridge also worked with the National Climate Program Office. “Even as it is, the barriers to public dissemination of results that might cast doubt on one aspect or another of accepted greenhouse wisdom are extraordinarily high. Climate scientists rush in overwhelming numbers to repel infection by ideas not supportive of the basic thesis that global warming is perhaps the greatest of the threats to mankind and that it is caused by human folly - the burning of fossil fuels to support our way of life,” Paltridge explained. “In a way, their situation is very similar to that of the software engineers who sold the concept of the Y2K bug a decade ago. The ‘reputation stakes’ have become so high that it is absolutely necessary for some form of international action (any action, whether sensible or not) to be forced upon mankind. Then, should disaster not in fact befall, the avoidance of doom can be attributed to that action rather than to the probability that the prospects for disaster were massively oversold,” he added. “Pity the politicians who (we presume) are trying their best to make an informed decision on the matter. Of course politicians realize that those clamoring for their attention on any particular issue usually have other un-stated agendas. But they may not recognize that scientists too are human and are as subject as the rest of us to the seductions of well-funded campaigns. One of the more frightening statements about global warming to be heard now from the corridors of power is that ‘the scientists have spoken’. Well maybe they have - some of them anyway - but the implication of god-like infallibility is a bit hard to take,” he concluded.

Climate Scientist Dr. Ben Herman, past director of the Institute of Atmospheric Physics and Head of the Department of Atmospheric Sciences at the University of Arizona, questioned how the UN IPCC could express 90% confidence that humans have warmed the planet. “That conclusion was really surprising to me, it having come from a world wide group of supposedly outstanding climate experts,” Herman wrote in an April 6, 2007 article in Climate Science. Herman, who is currently studying several satellite based remote sensing projects to monitor ozone, temperature, water vapor, and aerosols from space, noted that the climate models are not cooperating with predictions of a man-made climate catastrophe. “Now, the models also predict that the mid tropospheric warming should exceed that observed at the ground, but satellite data contradicts this,” Herman wrote. ([LINK](#))

Prof. Francis Massen of the Physics Laboratory in Luxemburg and the leader of a meteorological station examined the UN IPCC’s Summary for Policymakers (SPM). “The SPM conceals that the methane concentration in the atmosphere has been stable for seven

years (and nobody knows exactly why); not one climatic model foresaw this,” Massen wrote in a February 2007 article entitled “IPCC 4AR SPM: Gloom and Doom.” (translated) Massen noted there is an “unrestrained contest among media, environmental groups and politicians” to paint as dire a picture as possible of future climate conditions following the UN summary. Massen called some of the climate reporting “absolute rubbish.” “It seems that in the climatic area a new faith fight has broken out, which has all characteristics of historical Religion,” he added. ([LINK](#))

Chief Meteorologist Eugenio Hackbart of the MetSul Meteorologia Weather Center in Sao Leopoldo - Rio Grande do Sul - Brazil declared himself a skeptic. “The media is promoting an unprecedented hyping related to global warming. The media and many scientists are ignoring very important facts that point to a natural variation in the climate system as the cause of the recent global warming,” Hackbart wrote on May 30, 2007. “I believe we have the duty to inform people about the true facts of global warming. It is interesting that in this global warming era of hysteria we just lived a very cold week with snow in the higher elevation of Southern Brazil and that the next week could be even colder with low temperatures not seen in this part of the globe during the month of May in the last 20 to 30 years. It is not only South Africa that is freezing. South America is under a sequence of cold blasts not seen since the very cold climatic winter of 2000 (La Niña),” Hackbart concluded. In a June 5, 2007 article, Hackbart noted that the “historical cold events in Southern Brazil (in 1957, 1965, 1975, 1984, 1996 and 2006) have another aspect in common. They all took place around the 11-year sun cycle solar minimum. ([LINK](#)) & ([LINK](#))

Ocean researcher Dr. John T. Everett, a former National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) administrator and UN IPCC lead author and reviewer, who led work on five impact analyses for the IPCC including Fisheries, Polar Regions, Oceans and Coastal Zones. Everett, who is also project manager for the UN Atlas of the Oceans, received an award while at NOAA for “accomplishments in assessing the impacts of climate change on global oceans and fisheries.” Everett, who publishes the website <http://www.climatechangefacts.info/index.htm> also expressed skepticism about climate fears in 2007. “It is time for a reality check,” Everett testified to Natural Resources Committee in the U.S. Congress on April 17, 2007. “Warming is not a big deal and is not a bad thing,” Everett emphasized. “The oceans and coastal zones have been far warmer and colder than is projected in the present scenarios of climate change,” Everett said. “In the oceans, major climate warming and cooling is a fact of life, whether it is over a few years as in an El Niño or over decades as in the Pacific Decadal Oscillation or the North Atlantic Oscillation. Currents, temperatures, salinity, and biology changes rapidly to the new state in months or a couple years. These changes far exceed those expected with global warming and occur much faster. The one degree F. rise since about 1860, indeed since the year 1000, has brought the global average temperature from 56.5 to 57.5 degrees. This is at the level of noise in this rapidly changing system,” Everett explained. “I would much rather have the present warm climate, and even further warming, than the next ice age that will bring temperatures much colder than even today. The NOAA PaleoClimate Program shows us that when the dinosaurs roamed the earth, the earth was much warmer, the CO2 levels were 2 to 4 times higher, and coral reefs were much more expansive. The earth was so productive then that we are still using the oil, coal, and gas it generated,” he added. “More of the warming, if it comes, will be during winters and at night and toward the poles. For most life in the oceans, warming means faster growth, reduced energy requirements to stay warm, lower winter mortalities, and wider ranges of distribution,” he explained. “No one knows whether the Earth is going to keep

warming, or since reaching a peak in 1998, we are at the start of a cooling cycle that will last several decades or more,” Everett concluded. **Everett also worked for the National Marine Fisheries Service Division Chief for Fisheries Development in the 1970s and he noted that the concern then was about how predicted global cooling would impact the oceans.** ([LINK](#)) & ([LINK](#))

Physicist Dr. Syun-Ichi Akasofu, the former director of both University of Alaska Fairbanks’ Geophysical Institute and International Arctic Research Center who has twice been named in “1000 Most Cited Scientists,” released a scientific study of the Arctic on March 2007 that concluded the recent warming was likely “natural” and not manmade. ([LINK](#)) Akasofu, an award winning scientist who has published more than 550 professional journal articles and authored or co-authored 10 books, also recently blasted the UN IPCC process. “I think the initial motivation by the IPCC (established in 1988) was good; it was an attempt to promote this particular scientific field,” Akasofu said in an April 1, 2007 interview. “But so many [scientists] jumped in, and the media is looking for a disaster story, and the whole thing got out of control,” Akasofu added. The article continued: “Akasofu said there is no data showing that ‘most’ of the present warming is due to the man-made greenhouse effect, as the members of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change wrote in February. “If you look back far enough, we have a bunch of data that show that warming has gone on from the 1600s with an almost linear increase to the present,” Akasofu said. The article concluded: “Akasofu said scientists who support the man-made greenhouse gas theory disregard information from centuries ago when exploring the issue of global warming. Satellite images of sea ice in the Arctic Ocean have been available in the satellite era only since the 1960s and 1970s. ‘Young researchers are interested in satellite data, which became available after 1975,’ he said. ‘All the papers since (the advent of satellites) show warming. That’s what I call ‘instant climatology.’ I’m trying to tell young scientists, ‘You can’t study climatology unless you look at a much longer time period.’” ([LINK](#))

Physicist Dr. Gerhard Gerlich, of the Institute of Mathematical Physics at the Technical University Carolo-Wilhelmina in Braunschweig in Germany, and Dr. Ralf D. Tscheuschner co-authored a July 7, 2007 paper titled “Falsification of the Atmospheric CO2 Greenhouse Effects Within the Frame of Physics.” The abstract of the paper reads in part, “(a) there are no common physical laws between the warming phenomenon in glass houses and the fictitious atmospheric greenhouse effects; (b) there are no calculations to determine an average surface temperature of a planet; (c) the frequently mentioned difference of 33 C is a meaningless number calculated wrongly; (d) the formulas of cavity radiation are used inappropriately; (e) the assumption of a radiative balance is unphysical; (f) thermal conductivity and friction must not be set to zero, the atmospheric greenhouse conjecture is falsified.” Gerlich and Tscheuschner’s study concluded, “The horror visions of a risen sea level, melting pole caps and developing deserts in North America and in Europe are fictitious falsification of the consequences of fictitious physical mechanisms, as they cannot be seen even in the climate model computations. The emergence of hurricanes and tornados cannot be predicted by climate models, because all of these deviations are ruled out. The main strategy of modern CO2-greenhouse gas defenders seems to hide themselves behind more and more pseudo explanations, which are not part of the academic education or even of the physics training.” ([LINK](#))

Geologist/Geochemist Dr. Tom V. Segalstad, a professor and head of the Geological Museum at the University of Oslo and formerly an expert reviewer with the UN IPCC,

expressed skepticism of climate fears in 2007. A July 7, 2007 article in Canada's *Financial Post* read, "In the real world, as measurable by science, CO₂ in the atmosphere and in the ocean reach a stable balance when the oceans contain 50 times as much CO₂ as the atmosphere. 'The IPCC postulates an atmospheric doubling of CO₂, meaning that the oceans would need to receive 50 times more CO₂ to obtain chemical equilibrium,' explains Prof. Segalstad. 'This total of 51 times the present amount of carbon in atmospheric CO₂ exceeds the known reserves of fossil carbon-- it represents more carbon than exists in all the coal, gas, and oil that we can exploit anywhere in the world.'" The article continued, "Also in the real world, Prof. Segalstad's isotope mass balance calculations -- a standard technique in science -- show that if CO₂ in the atmosphere had a lifetime of 50 to 200 years, as claimed by IPCC scientists, the atmosphere would necessarily have half of its current CO₂ mass. Because this is a nonsensical outcome, the IPCC model postulates that half of the CO₂ must be hiding somewhere, in 'a missing sink.' Many studies have sought this missing sink -- a Holy Grail of climate science research-- without success. 'It is a search for a mythical CO₂ sink to explain an immeasurable CO₂ lifetime to fit a hypothetical CO₂ computer model that purports to show that an impossible amount of fossil fuel burning is heating the atmosphere,' Prof. Segalstad concludes. 'It is all a fiction.'" ([LINK](#))

Geologist Dr. David Kear, the former director of geological survey at the Department of Science and Industrial Research in New Zealand, called predictions of rising sea level as a result of man-made global warming "science fiction," and said the basic rules of science are being ignored. "When youngsters are encouraged to take part in a school science fair the first thing they are told to do is check the results, then re-check them, something NIWA [National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research] appear to have forgotten to do," Kear said in a April 13, 2007 article. "In looking at the next 50 years, why have they not studied the past 50 years and applied their findings to the predictions? One would think this was a must," Kear explained. The article continued, "First global warming predictions made in 1987 estimated an annual rise in sea levels of 35mm. That scared the world but since then, the figure has continued to be reduced by 'experts.'" Kear concluded, "Personal beliefs on climate change and rising sea levels should be delayed until just one of the many predictions made since 1985 on the basis of carbon additions to the atmosphere comes true." ([LINK](#))

Solar Physicist and Climatologist Douglas V. Hoyt, who coauthored the book *The Role of the Sun in Climate Change*, and has worked at both the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR), has developed a scorecard to evaluate how accurate climate models have been. Hoyt wrote, "Starting in 1997, we created a scorecard to see how climate model predictions were matching observations. The picture is not pretty with most of the predictions being wrong in magnitude and often in sign." ([LINK](#)) A March 1, 2007 blog post in the *National Review* explained how the scoring system works. "[Hoyt] gives each prediction a 'yes-no-undetermined score.' So if the major models' prediction is confirmed, the score at the beginning would be 1-0-0. So how do the models score when compared with the evidence? The final score is 1-27-4. That's one confirmed prediction, 27 disconfirmed, and 4 undetermined," the blog noted. Hoyt has extensively researched the sun-climate connection and has published nearly 100 scientific papers in such areas as the greenhouse effect, aerosols, cloud cover, radiative transfer, and sunspot structure. ([LINK](#)) To see Hoyt's climate model scorecard, go here: ([LINK](#))

Dr. Boris Winterhalter, retired Senior Marine Researcher of the Geological Survey of

Finland and former professor of marine geology at University of Helsinki, criticized the media for what he considered its alarming climate coverage. “It is with great regret that I find media apt to grab any prophesy for catastrophes by ‘reputed scientists’ without hesitation,” Winterhalter wrote on his website. Winterhalter, one of the 60 signatories in a 2006 letter urging withdrawal of Kyoto to Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper, also wrote, “The effect of solar winds on cosmic radiation has just recently been established and, furthermore, there seems to be a good correlation between cloudiness and variations in the intensity of cosmic radiation. Here we have a mechanism which is a far better explanation to variations in global climate than the attempts by IPCC to blame it all on anthropogenic input of greenhouse gases.” “To state that sea level rises or falls due to global change is completely out of proportion. There are far too many factors affecting this planet from the inside and the outside to warrant the idea that man is capable of influencing these natural processes,” he added.

[\(LINK\)](#)

Particle Physicist Jasper Kirkby, a research scientist at CERN, the European Organization for Nuclear Research, believes his research will reveal that the sun and cosmic rays are a “part of the climate-change cocktail.” Kirkby runs a CLOUD (Cosmics Leaving Outdoor Droplets) project that examines how the sun and cosmic rays impact clouds and subsequently the climate. In a February 23, 2007 Canadian National *Post* article, CERN asserted, “Clouds exert a strong influence on the Earth’s energy balance, and changes of only a few per cent have an important effect on the climate.” According to the *National Post* article, “Dr. Kirkby has assembled a dream team of atmospheric physicists, solar physicists, and cosmic ray and particle physicists from 18 institutes around the world, including the California Institute of Technology and Germany’s Max-Planck Institutes, with preliminary data expected to arrive this coming summer. The world of particle physics is awaiting these results with much anticipation because they promise to unlock mysteries that can tell us much about climate change, as well as other phenomena.” Kirkby once said his research into the sun and cosmic rays “will probably account for somewhere between a half and the whole of the increase in the Earth’s temperature that we have seen in the last century.” [\(LINK\)](#)

Solar physicists Galina Mashnich and Vladimir Bashkirtsev, of the Institute of Solar-Terrestrial Physics of the Siberian Division of the Russian Academy of Sciences, believe the climate is driven by the sun and predict global cooling will soon occur. The two scientists are so convinced that global temperatures will cool within the next decade they have placed a \$10,000 wager with a UK scientist to prove their certainty. The criteria for the \$10,000 bet will be to “compare global temperatures between 1998 and 2003 with those between 2012 and 2017. The loser will pay up in 2018,” according to an April 16, 2007 article in *Live Science*. [\(LINK\)](#) Bashkirtsev and Mashnich have questioned the view that the “anthropogenic impact” is driving Earth’s climate. “None of the investigations dealing with the anthropogenic impact on climate convincingly argues for such an impact,” the two scientists noted in 2003. Bashkirtsev and Mashnich believe the evidence of solar impacts on the climate “leave little room for the anthropogenic impact on the Earth’s climate.” They believe that “solar variations naturally explain global cooling observed in 1950-1970, which cannot be understood from the standpoint of the greenhouse effect, since CO₂ was intensely released into the atmosphere in this period.” [\(LINK\)](#)

Physics Professor Emeritus Dr. Howard Hayden of the University of Connecticut and author of “The Solar Fraud: Why Solar Energy Won’t Run the World,” debunked fears of a man-made climate disaster during a presentation in April. “You think SUVs are the cause

of glaciers shrinking? I don't think so," Hayden, who retired after 32 years as a professor, said, according to an April 25, 2007 article in *Maine Today*. "Don't believe what you hear out of Hollywood and Washington, D.C.," Hayden said. According to the article, Hayden argued that "climate history proves that Gore has the relationship between carbon dioxide concentration and global warming backwards. A higher concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, he said, does not cause the Earth to be warmer. Instead," he said, "a warmer Earth causes the higher carbon dioxide levels." Hayden explained, "The sun heats up the Earth and the oceans warm up and atmospheric carbon dioxide rises." According to the article, Hayden "said humans' contribution to global carbon dioxide levels is virtually negligible." Hayden is also the editor of a monthly newsletter called "The Energy Advocate." ([LINK](#))

Internationally renowned scientist Dr. Antonio Zichichi, president of the World Federation of Scientists and a retired Professor of Advanced Physics at the University of Bologna in Italy, who has published over 800 scientific papers, questioned man-made global warming fears. According to an April 27, 2007 article at Zenit.org, Zichichi "pointed out that human activity has less than 10% impact on the environment." The article noted that Zichichi "showed that the mathematical models used by the [UN's] IPCC do not correspond to the criteria of the scientific method. He said the IPCC used 'the method of 'forcing' to arrive at their conclusions that human activity produces meteorological variations.'" Zichichi said that based upon actual scientific fact "it is not possible to exclude the idea that climate changes can be due to natural causes," and he added that it is plausible that "man is not to blame." According to the article, "He also reminded those present that 500,000 years ago the Earth lost the North and South Poles four times. The poles disappeared and reformed four times, he said. Zichichi said that in the end he is not convinced that global warming is caused by the increase of emissions of 'greenhouse gases' produced through human activity. Climate changes, he said, depend in a significant way on the fluctuation of cosmic rays." Zichichi also signed a December 2007 open letter to the United Nations stating in part "Significant new peer-reviewed research has cast even more doubt on the hypothesis of dangerous human-caused global warming." ([LINK](#)) & ([LINK](#)) & bio: ([LINK](#))

Renowned Astronomer Sir Patrick Moore, a fellow of the UK's Royal Astronomical Society, host of the BBC's Sky at Night program since 1957 and author of over 60 books on astronomy called global warming concern 'rubbish' in an interview with *The Sun* in 2005. "I think it's a lot of rubbish! From 1645-1715 the sun was inactive and we had a 'Little Ice Age,'" Moore said. "Then the sun went back to normal and the world warmed up," he concluded. Moore most recently co-authored two books published in 2006: *50 Years in Space: What We Thought Then What We Know Now*; and *Bang! The Complete History of the Universe*. ([LINK](#))

Atmospheric scientist Dr. James P. Koermer, a Professor of Meteorology and the director of the Meteorological Institute at Plymouth State University dismissed man-made global warming fears. "Global warming hysteria is based to a large extent on the unproven predictions of climate models. These numerical models are based on many simplified approximations of very complicated physical processes and phenomena," Koermer wrote to EPW on December 3, 2007. "My biggest concern is their [computer models'] lack of ability to adequately handle water vapor and clouds, which are much more important as climate factors than anthropogenic contributors. Until we can realistically simulate types of clouds, their optical thicknesses, and their altitudes, which we have a difficult time doing for short-term weather forecasts, I can't have much faith in climate models," Koermer wrote. "Another

major reason that I remain skeptical is based on what I know about past climate changes that occurred before man walked on earth. I am more amazed with how relatively stable climate has been over the past 15,000 or so years, versus the large changes that frequently appeared to take place prior to that time. I also can't ignore some of the recent evidence presented by some very well respected astrophysicists on solar variability. Most meteorologists including me have always been taught to treat the sun's output as a constant--now I am not so sure and I am intrigued by their preliminary findings relating to climate," he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Renowned agricultural scientist Dr. Norman Borlaug, known as the father of the "Green Revolution" for saving over a billion people from starvation by utilizing pioneering high yield farming techniques, is one of only five people in history who has been awarded a Nobel Peace Prize, the Presidential Medal of Freedom, and the Congressional Gold Medal. Borlaug also declared himself skeptical of man-made climate fears in 2007. "I do believe we are in a period where, no question, the temperatures are going up. But is this a part of another one of those (natural) cycles that have brought on glaciers and caused melting of glaciers?" Borlaug asked, according to a September 21, 2007 article in *Saint Paul Pioneer Press*. The article reported that Borlaug is "not sure, and he doesn't think the science is, either." Borlaug added, "How much would we have to cut back to take the increasing carbon dioxide and methane production to a level so that it's not a driving force?" We don't even know how much." ([LINK](#))

Astronomer Dr. Jeff Zwerink of the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) studies gamma rays, black holes, and neutron stars and has declared himself a skeptic of man-made climate fears. "Many natural phenomena significantly affect the global climate. Atmospheric conditions are impacted by tectonic activity, erosion, and changes in Earth's biomass, for example," Zwerink wrote on December 18, 2006. "While politicians and activists focus on the effects of fossil fuel burning the breeding and domestication of cows and cultivation of rice, for example, actually does more harm than driving too many SUV's," Zwerink added. ([LINK](#))

Computer modeler Dr. Donald DuBois, who holds a PhD in Philosophy of Science, has spent most of his career modeling computer networks for NASA's International Space Station, GE Space Systems, the Air Force, and the Navy. DuBois is very skeptical of climate computer models predicting doom. "I know something about how misleading models can be, and the fact that their underlying assumptions can completely predetermine the results of the model. If the major climate models that are having a major impact on public policy were documented and put in the public domain, other qualified professionals around the world would be interested in looking into the validity of these models," DuBois wrote to EPW on May 17, 2007. "Right now, climate science is a black box that is highly questionable with unstated assumptions and model inputs. It is especially urgent that these models come out in the open considering how much climate change legislation could cost the United States and the world economies. Ross McKittrick's difficulty in getting the information from [Michael] Mann on his famous 'hockey stick' [temperature] curve is a case in point which should be a scandal not worth repeating. The cost of documenting the models and making them available would be a trifle; the cost of not doing so could be astronomical," DuBois wrote. "I headed up a project to model computer networks (to see how they will perform before they are built) for NASA's International Space Station (including the ground stations around the globe). If I had suggested a \$250 million network for the ISS and said that I was basing this recommendation on my modeling but the models were not available for inspection, I would have been laughed

out of the auditorium in Houston.”

Anton Uriarte, a professor of Physical Geography at the University of the Basque Country in Spain and author of a book on the paleoclimate, rejected man-made climate fears. “It’s just a political thing, and the lies about global warming are contributing to the proliferation of nuclear energy,” Uriarte said according to a September 2007 article in the Spanish newspaper *El Correo*. “There’s no need to be worried. It’s very interesting to study [climate change], but there’s no need to be worried,” Uriarte wrote. “Far from provoking the so-called greenhouse effect, [CO₂] stabilizes the climate.” Uriarte noted that “the Earth is not becoming desertified, it’s greener all the time.” Uriarte says natural factors dominate the climate system. “The Earth being spherical, the tropics always receive more heat than the poles and the imbalance has to be continually rectified. They change places because of the tilt of the earth’s axis. And, moreover, the planet isn’t smooth, but rough, which produces perturbations in the interchange of air masses. We know the history of the climate very well and it has changed continuously,” he wrote. “It’s evident that the Earth is a human planet, and that being so, it’s quite normal that we influence the atmosphere. It’s something else altogether to say that things will get worse. I believe that a little more heat will be very good for us. The epochs of vegetational exuberance coincided with those of more heat,” he explained. “In warm periods, when there are more greenhouse gases in the atmosphere - more CO₂ and water vapour - climate variability is less. In these periods greenhouse gases, which act as a blanket, cushion the differences between the tropics and the poles. There is less interchange of air masses, less storms. We’re talking about a climate which is much less variable,” he added. (Translation) ([LINK](#))

Professor David Noble of Canada’s York University is a committed environmentalist and a man-made global warming skeptic. Noble now believes that the movement has “hyped the global climate issue into an obsession.” Noble wrote a May 8 essay entitled “The Corporate Climate Coup” which details how global warming has “hijacked” the environmental left and created a “corporate climate campaign” which has “diverted attention from the radical challenges of the global justice movement.” ([LINK](#))

Award-winning quaternary geologist Dr. Olafur Ingolfsson, a professor from the University of Iceland who has conducted extensive expeditions and field research in the both the Arctic and Antarctic, chilled fears that the iconic polar bear is threatened by global warming. Ingolfsson was awarded the prestigious “Antarctic Service Medal of the United States” by the National Science Foundation. “We have this specimen that confirms the polar bear was a morphologically distinct species at least 100,000 years ago, and this basically means that the polar bear has already survived one interglacial period,” Ingolfsson said according to a December 10, 2007 article in the BBC. The article explained, “And what’s interesting about that is that the Eemian - the last interglacial - was much warmer than the Holocene (the present).” Ingolfsson continued, “This is telling us that despite the on-going warming in the Arctic today, maybe we don’t have to be quite so worried about the polar bear. That would be very encouraging.” Ingolfsson is optimistic about the polar bears future because of his research about the Earth’s history. “The polar bear is basically a brown bear that decided some time ago that it would be easier to feed on seals on the ice. So long as there are seals, there are going to be polar bears. I think the threat to the polar bears is much more to do with pollution, the build up of heavy metals in the Arctic. This is just how I interpret it. But this is science - when you have little data, you have lots of freedom,” he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Over 100 Prominent International Scientists Warn UN Against ‘Futile’ Climate Control Efforts in a December 13, 2007 open letter. “Attempts to prevent global climate change from occurring are ultimately futile, and constitute a tragic misallocation of resources that would be better spent on humanity’s real and pressing problems,” the letter signed by the scientists read. ([LINK](#)) **The scientists, many of whom are current and former UN IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) scientists,** sent an open letter to the UN Secretary-General questioning the scientific basis for climate fears and the UN’s so-called “solutions.” “It is not possible to stop climate change, a natural phenomenon that has affected humanity through the ages. Geological, archaeological, oral and written histories all attest to the dramatic challenges posed to past societies from unanticipated changes in temperature, precipitation, winds and other climatic variables,” the scientists wrote. “In stark contrast to the often repeated assertion that the

The scientists, many of whom are current and former UN IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) scientists, sent an open letter to the UN Secretary-General questioning the scientific basis for climate fears and the UN’s so-called “solutions.” “It is not possible to stop climate change, a natural phenomenon that has affected humanity through the ages. Geological, archaeological, oral and written histories all attest to the dramatic challenges posed to past societies from unanticipated changes in temperature, precipitation, winds and other climatic variables,” the scientists wrote. “In stark contrast to the often repeated assertion that the science of climate change is ‘settled,’ significant new peer-reviewed research has cast even more doubt on the hypothesis of dangerous human-caused global warming,” the open letter added. [*EPW Note: Several other recent peer-reviewed studies have cast considerable doubt about man-made global warming fears. For most recent sampling see: New Peer-Reviewed Study finds ‘Solar changes significantly alter climate’ (11-3-07) ([LINK](#)) & “New Peer-Reviewed Study Halves the Global Average Surface Temperature Trend 1980 - 2002” ([LINK](#)) & New Study finds Medieval Warm Period ‘0.3C Warmer than 20th Century’ ([LINK](#)) - New Peer-Reviewed Study Finds: “Warming is naturally caused and shows no human influence.” ([LINK](#)) - A November peer-reviewed study in the journal Physical Geography found “Long-term climate change is driven by solar insolation changes” ([LINK](#))) For a more comprehensive sampling of peer-reviewed studies earlier in 2007 see “New Peer-Reviewed Scientific Studies Chill Global Warming Fears” ([LINK](#)) - For a detailed analysis of how “consensus” has been promoted, see: *Debunking The So-Called “Consensus” On Global Warming - [LINK](#)* -] The scientists’ letter continued: “The United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has issued increasingly alarming conclusions about the climatic influences of human-produced carbon dioxide (CO₂), a non-polluting gas that is essential to plant photosynthesis. While we understand the evidence that has led them to view CO₂ emissions as harmful, the IPCC’s conclusions are quite inadequate as justification for implementing policies that will markedly diminish future prosperity. In particular, it is not established that it is possible to significantly alter global climate through cuts in human greenhouse gas emissions.” “The IPCC Summaries for Policy Makers are the most widely read IPCC reports amongst politicians and non-scientists and are the basis for most climate change policy formulation. Yet these Summaries are prepared by a relatively small core writing team with the final drafts approved line-by-line by government representatives. The great majority of IPCC contributors and reviewers, and the tens of thousands of other scientists who are qualified to comment on these matters, are not involved in the preparation of these documents. The summaries therefore cannot properly be represented as a consensus view among experts,” the letter added. [*EPW Note: Only 52 scientists participated in the UN IPCC Summary for Policymakers in April 2007,**

according to the Associated Press. - [LINK](#) - An analysis by Australian climate researcher **Dr. John Mclean** in 2007 found the UN IPCC peer-review process to be “an illusion.” [LINK](#)] The letter was signed by renowned scientists such as Dr. Antonio Zichichi, president of the World Federation of Scientists; Dr. Reid Bryson, dubbed one of the “Fathers of Meteorology”; Atmospheric pioneer Dr. Hendrik Tennekes, formerly of the Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute; Award winning physicist Dr. Syun-Ichi Akasofu of the International Arctic Research Center, who has twice named one of the “1000 Most Cited Scientists”; Award winning MIT atmospheric scientist Dr. Richard Lindzen; UN IPCC scientist Dr. Vincent Gray of New Zealand; French climatologist Dr. Marcel Leroux of the University Jean Moulin; World authority on sea level Dr. Nils-Axel Morner of Stockholm University; Physicist Dr. Freeman Dyson of Princeton University; Physicist Dr. Zbigniew Jaworowski, chairman of the Scientific Council of Central Laboratory for Radiological Protection in Poland; Paleoclimatologist Dr. Robert M. Carter of Australia; Former UN IPCC reviewer Geologist/Geochemist Dr. Tom V. Segalstad, head of the Geological Museum in Norway; and Dr. Edward J. Wegman, of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences. Other scientists (not already included in this report) who signed the letter include: **Don Aitkin, PhD**, Professor, social scientist, retired Vice-Chancellor and President, University of Canberra, Australia; **Geoff L. Austin, PhD**, FNZIP, FRSNZ, Professor, Dept. of Physics, University of Auckland, New Zealand; **Chris C. Borel, PhD**, remote sensing scientist, U.S.; **Dan Carruthers, M.Sc.**, wildlife biology consultant specializing in animal ecology in Arctic and Subarctic regions, Alberta, Canada; **Hans Erren, Doctorandus**, geophysicist and climate specialist, Sittard, The Netherlands; **William Evans, PhD**, Editor, American Midland Naturalist; Dept. of Biological Sciences, University of Notre Dame, U.S.; **R. W. Gauldie, PhD**, Research Professor, Hawai’i Institute of Geophysics and Planetology, School of Ocean Earth Sciences and Technology, University of Hawai’i at Manoa; **Albrecht Glatzle, PhD**, sc.agr., Agro-Biologist and Gerente ejecutivo, INTTAS, Paraguay; **Fred Goldberg, PhD**, Adj Professor, Royal Institute of Technology, Mechanical Engineering, Stockholm, Sweden; **Louis Hissink M.Sc. M.A.I.G.**, Editor AIG News and Consulting Geologist, Perth, Western Australia; **Andrei Illarionov, PhD**, Senior Fellow, Center for Global Liberty and Prosperity, U.S.; founder and director of the Institute of Economic Analysis, Russia; **Jon Jenkins, PhD**, MD, computer modelling - virology, Sydney, NSW, Australia; **Olavi Kärner, Ph.D.**, Research Associate, Dept. of Atmospheric Physics, Institute of Astrophysics and Atmospheric Physics, Toravere, Estonia; **Jan J.H. Kop, M.Sc.** Ceng FICE (Civil Engineer Fellow of the Institution of Civil Engineers), Emeritus Professor of Public Health Engineering, Technical University Delft, The Netherlands; **Professor R.W.J. Kouffeld**, Emeritus Professor, Energy Conversion, Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands; **Salomon Kroonenberg, PhD**, Professor, Dept. of Geotechnology, Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands; **The Rt. Hon. Lord Lawson of Blaby**, economist; Chairman of the Central Europe Trust; former Chancellor of the Exchequer, U.K.; **Douglas Leahey, PhD**, meteorologist and air-quality consultant, Calgary, Canada; **William Lindqvist, PhD**, consulting geologist and company director, Tiburon, California, U.S.; **A.J. Tom van Loon, PhD**, Professor of Geology (Quaternary Geology), Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznan, Poland; former President of the European Association of Science Editors; [Horst Malberg, PhD](#), Professor for Meteorology and Climatology, Institut für Meteorologie, Berlin, Germany; **Alister McFarquhar, PhD**, international economist, Downing College, Cambridge, U.K.; **Frank Milne, PhD**, Professor, Dept. of Economics, Queen’s University, Canada; **Asmunn Moene, PhD**, former head of the Forecasting Centre, Meteorological Institute, Norway; **Alan Moran, PhD**, Energy Economist, Director of the IPA’s Deregulation Unit, Australia; **John Nicol, PhD**, physicist, James Cook University, Australia; **Mr. David Nowell, M.Sc.**, Fellow of the Royal Meteorological Society,

former chairman of the NATO Meteorological Group, Ottawa, Canada; **Brian Pratt, PhD**, Professor of Geology, Sedimentology, University of Saskatchewan, Canada; **Harry N.A. Priem, PhD**, Emeritus Professor of Planetary Geology and Isotope Geophysics, Utrecht University; former director of the Netherlands Institute for Isotope Geosciences; **Colonel F.P.M. Rombouts**, Branch Chief - Safety, Quality and Environment, Royal Netherlands Air Force; **R.G. Roper, PhD**, Professor Emeritus of Atmospheric Sciences, School of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, Georgia Institute of Technology, U.S.; **Arthur Rorsch, PhD**, Emeritus Professor, Molecular Genetics, Leiden University, The Netherlands; **Rob Scagel**, M.Sc., forest microclimate specialist, principal consultant, Pacific Phytometric Consultants, B.C., Canada; **Gary D. Sharp, PhD**, Center for Climate/Ocean Resources Study, Salinas, CA, U.S.; **L. Graham Smith, PhD**, Associate Professor, Dept. of Geography, University of Western Ontario, Canada; [Peter Stilbs](#), TeknD, Professor of Physical Chemistry, Research Leader, School of Chemical Science and Engineering, KTH (Royal Institute of Technology), Stockholm, Sweden; **Len Walker, PhD**, power engineering, Pict Energy, Melbourne, Australia; **Stephan Wilksch, PhD**, Professor for Innovation and Technology Management, Production Management and Logistics, University of Technology and Economics Berlin, Germany; and **Raphael Wust, PhD**, Lecturer, Marine Geology/Sedimentology, James Cook University, Australia. Also, “Other professional persons knowledgeable about climate change who expressed support for the open letter to the UN Secretary General” included meteorological researcher and spotter for the National Weather Service **Allan Cortese**; Water resources engineer **Don Farley**; **Dr. David A. Gray** of Messiah College, a former researcher in electromagnetic waves in the atmosphere; **Barrie Jackson**, associate professor of Chemical Engineering at Queen’s University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada; **Raymond J. Jones, PhD**, FATSE, OAM. retired, Agronomist, Townsville, Australia; **J.A.L. Robertson**, M.A. (Cantab.), F.R.S.C., nuclear-energy consultant, Deep River, ON, Canada; **J.T. Rogers, PhD**, FCAE, nuclear engineer; energy analyst, Ottawa, Canada; **John K. Sutherland, PhD** in Geology (Manchester University), New Brunswick, Canada; **Noor van Anandel, PhD** Energy Physics, Burgemeester Stroinkstraat, The Netherlands; **Arthur M. Patterson**, P.Eng, Geological Engineer. Extensive experience in the Canadian Arctic; **Agronomist Pat Palmer** of New Zealand; and **Alois Haas** emeritus Prof. PhD, nuclear chemistry. ([LINK](#)) (See attachment one for full text of letter and complete list of signatories at end of this report.)

Dutch Geologist Dr. Chris Schoneveld, a retired exploration geophysicist, has become an outspoken skeptic regarding the human influence on climate over the past four years. “If global warming is just a consequence of natural climatic fluctuations similar to well-documented, geologically caused climate changes, wouldn’t we rather adapt to a warming world than to spend trillions of dollars on a futile exercise to contain carbon dioxide emissions?” Schoneveld wrote in the October 1, 2007 *International Herald Tribune*. “As long as the causes of the many climate changes throughout the Earth’s history are not well understood, one cannot unequivocally separate natural causes from possibly man-made ones. The so-called scientific consensus discourages healthy debate between believers in global warming and skeptics. There has never been a UN-organized conference on climate change where skeptics were invited for the sake of balance to present their case,” he explained. ([LINK](#)) Schoneveld also critiqued the UN IPCC process on February 3, 2007. “Who are the geologists that the IPCC is relying on? Is the IPCC at all concerned about the frequency and recurrence of ice ages? Who are the astronomers that advise the IPCC on other cause of possible climate change (sun spots or earth’s elliptical orbit, tilt and wobble of its axis) so as to ascertain that we are not just experiencing a normal trend related to interglacial warming or variation in solar radiation?” he asked. ([LINK](#))

Atmospheric scientist Dr. Hendrik Tennekes, a scientific pioneer in the development of numerical weather prediction and former director of research at The Netherlands' Royal National Meteorological Institute, and an internationally recognized expert in atmospheric boundary layer processes, took climate modelers to task for their projections of future planetary doom in a February 28, 2007 post on Climate Science. "I am of the opinion that most scientists engaged in the design, development, and tuning of climate models are in fact software engineers. They are unlicensed, hence unqualified to sell their products to society. In all regular engineering professions, there exists a licensing authority. If such an authority existed in climate research, I contend, the vast majority of climate modelers would vainly attempt certification. Also, they would be unable to obtain insurance against professional liability," Tennekes said. ([LINK](#)) Tennekes also unleashed on the promoters of climate fears in a January 31, 2007 article. "I worry about the arrogance of scientists who claim they can help solve the climate problem, provided their research receives massive increases in funding", he wrote. "I am angry about the Climate Doomsday hype that politicians and scientists engage in. I am angry at Al Gore, I am angry at the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists for resetting its Doomsday clock, I am angry at Lord Martin Rees for using the full weight of the Royal Society in support of the Doomsday hype, I am angry at Paul Crutzen for his speculations about yet another technological fix, I am angry at the staff of IPCC for their preoccupation with carbon dioxide emissions, and I am angry at Jim Hansen for his efforts to sell a Greenland Ice Sheet Meltdown Catastrophe," he explained. ([LINK](#)) Tennekes has also blasted Gore and the UN in the Dutch De Volkskrant newspaper on March 28, 2007. "I find the Doomsday picture Al Gore is painting - a six-meter sea level rise, fifteen times the IPCC number - entirely without merit," Tennekes wrote. "I protest vigorously the idea that the climate reacts like a home heating system to a changed setting of the thermostat: just turn the dial, and the desired temperature will soon be reached. We cannot run the climate as we wish," Tennekes said. "Whatever the IPCC staff thinks, it is not at all inconceivable that decreasing solar activity will lead to some cooling ten years from now," he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Chemical engineer Thomas Ring, who has a degree from Case Western Reserve University, declared "we should not fear global warming" in 2007. "Warming of the Earth has never been catastrophic; in fact, humankind has always fared better in warmer than cooler periods, with less hardship and illness and improved agriculture," Ring wrote on November 28, 2007. Ring called for "solid, objective and unbiased research, rather than fear-mongering based on a nonscientific 'consensus.'" "What's responsible for prior periods of warmth in 600 BC, 1000 and 1912 to 1943, all when there was no or little man-made CO₂? It's most likely the sun, whose radiation varies to the fourth power of its temperature," he wrote. "Atmospheric water vapor is, however, 0.9 percent, 25 times as much as CO₂. Water vapor is a "radiator" that is three times more powerful than CO₂, but its larger effect has been ignored in the global warming debate," he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Harvard-educated Physicist Arthur E. Lemay, a renowned computer systems specialist, declared his climate skepticism in 2007. "Recent studies show that there are far better explanations for the earth's warming before 1998. The variations in the sun's radiant energy and production of cosmic rays are far more persuasive than the greenhouse gas theory," Lemay wrote on December 5, 2007 in the *Jakarta Post* during the UN Climate Conference in Bali. "The solar theory explains it, the greenhouse gas theory does not. In science, when observations do not support a theory, it is the theory which needs to be discarded. So, all this blather about reducing CO₂, the Kyoto Protocol and the Bali conference are all a waste of money," Lemay explained. "Of course, the global warming alarmists cannot tolerate the solar

theory because we cannot do anything about it, and no government wants to spend billions of dollars for nothing,” he wrote. “It’s time for Indonesia and other developing countries to demand an explanation as to why CO2 reduction is being mandated when it is not the problem,” he concluded. ([LINK](#)) & ([LINK](#))

[Geophysicist Dr. Claude Allegre, a top Geophysicist and French Socialist who has authored more than 100 scientific articles](#), written 11 books, and received numerous scientific awards including the Goldschmidt Medal from the Geochemical Society of the United States, converted from climate alarmist to skeptic in 2006. Allegre, who was one of the first scientists to sound global warming fears 20 years ago, now says the cause of climate change is “unknown” and accused the “prophets of doom of global warming” of being motivated by money, noting that “the ecology of helpless protesting has become a very lucrative business for some people!” “Glaciers’ chronicles or historical archives point to the fact that climate is a capricious phenomena. This fact is confirmed by mathematical meteorological theories. So, let us be cautious,” Allegre explained in a September 21, 2006 article in the French newspaper *L’EXPRESS*. [The National Post](#) in Canada also profiled Allegre on March 2, 2007, noting, “Allegre has the highest environmental credentials. The author of early environmental books, he fought successful battles to protect the ozone layer from CFCs and public health from lead pollution.” Allegre now calls fears of a climate disaster “simplistic and obscuring the true dangers” and mocks “the greenhouse-gas fanatics whose proclamations consist in denouncing man’s role on the climate without doing anything about it except organizing conferences and preparing protocols that become dead letters.” Allegre, a member of both the French and U.S. Academy of Sciences, had previously expressed concern about man-made global warming. “By burning fossil fuels, man enhanced the concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere which has raised the global mean temperature by half a degree in the last century,” Allegre [wrote](#) 20 years ago. In addition, Allegre was one of 1500 scientists who signed a November 18, 1992 letter titled “World Scientists’ Warning to Humanity” in which the scientists warned that global warming’s “potential risks are very great.” Allegre mocked former Vice President Al Gore’s Nobel Prize in 2007, calling it “a political gimmick.” Allegre said on October 14, 2007, “The amount of nonsense in Al Gore’s film! It’s all politics; it’s designed to intervene in American politics. It’s scandalous.” ([LINK](#))

Astrophysicist Dr. Howard Greyber, a Fellow Royal Astronomical Society and member of the International Astronomical Union, called warming fears “unwarranted hysteria” and chastised a newspaper columnist’s views on global warming. “When [columnist] Thomas Friedman touts carbon dioxide as the cause of global warming in his column, I respond as a physicist that he cannot comprehend that it is still not proven that carbon dioxide emissions actually are causing global warming. Correlation does not prove Causation,” Greyber wrote on September 20, 2007 in the *International Herald Tribune*. “The Earth’s climate changes all the time. Did carbon dioxide emissions cause the Medieval Warm Period, when Vikings raised crops on Greenland’s coast? What caused the cold climate from 1700 to 1850? In 1975, articles were published predicting we were entering a New Ice Age. Reputable scientists oppose this unwarranted alarmist hysteria,” he noted. “Understanding climate change is an extremely difficult scientific problem. Giant computers generating climate models cannot be trusted so far. As any computer person knows, garbage in means garbage out. If research suggests subtle variations in our Sun’s radiation reaching Earth are causing global climate change, what would Friedman recommend?” Greyber concluded. ([LINK](#))

[Astrophysicist Dr. Nir Shaviv, one of Israel’s top, young, award-winning scientists](#) of the Hebrew

University of Jerusalem, recanted his belief that man-made emissions were driving climate change. “Like many others, I was personally sure that CO₂ is the bad culprit in the story of global warming. But after carefully digging into the evidence, I realized that things are far more complicated than the story sold to us by many climate scientists or the stories regurgitated by the media. In fact, there is much more than meets the eye,” Shaviv said in a February 2, 2007 Canadian *National Post* article. According to Shaviv, the CO₂ temperature link is only “incriminating circumstantial evidence.” “Solar activity can explain a large part of the 20th-century global warming” and “it is unlikely that [the solar climate link] does not exist,” Shaviv noted, pointing to the impact cosmic-rays have on the atmosphere. According to the *National Post*, Shaviv believes that even a doubling of CO₂ in the atmosphere by 2100 “will not dramatically increase the global temperature.” “Even if we halved the CO₂ output, and the CO₂ increase by 2100 would be, say, a 50% increase relative to today instead of a doubled amount, the expected reduction in the rise of global temperature would be less than 0.5C. This is not significant,” Shaviv explained. Shaviv also wrote on August 18, 2006 that a colleague of his believed that “CO₂ should have a large effect on climate” so “he set out to reconstruct the phanerozoic temperature. He wanted to find the CO₂ signature in the data, but since there was none, he slowly had to change his views.” Shaviv believes there will be more scientists converting to man-made global warming skepticism as they discover the dearth of evidence. “I think this is common to many of the scientists who think like us (that is, that CO₂ is a secondary climate driver). Each one of us was working in his or her own niche. While working there, each one of us realized that things just don’t add up to support the AGW (Anthropogenic Global Warming) picture. So many had to change their views,” he wrote.

Research physicist Dr. John W. Brosnahan develops remote-sensing instruments for atmospheric science for such clients as NOAA and NASA and has published numerous peer-reviewed research, as well as developed imaging Doppler interferometry for sensing winds, waves, and structure in the atmosphere. “Of course I believe in global warming, and in global cooling -- all part of the natural climate changes that the Earth has experienced for billions of years, caused primarily by the cyclical variations in solar output,” Brosnahan wrote to EPW on December 10, 2007. “I have not seen any sort of definitive, scientific link to man-made carbon dioxide as the root cause of the current global warming, only incomplete computer models that suggest that this might be the case,” Brosnahan explained. “Even though these computer climate models do not properly handle a number of important factors, including the role of precipitation as a temperature regulator, they are being (mis-)used to force a political agenda upon the U.S. While there are any number of reasons to reduce carbon dioxide generation, to base any major fiscal policy on the role of carbon dioxide in climate change would be inappropriate and imprudent at best and potentially disastrous economic folly at the worst,” he concluded.

[Mathematician & Engineer Dr. David Evans, who did carbon accounting for the Australian Government and is head of the group “Science Speak,”](#) recently detailed his conversion to a skeptic. “I devoted six years to carbon accounting, building models for the Australian government to estimate carbon emissions from land use change and forestry. When I started that job in 1999 the evidence that carbon emissions caused global warming seemed pretty conclusive, but since then new evidence has weakened the case that carbon emissions are the main cause. I am now skeptical,” Evans wrote in an April 30, 2007 blog. “But after 2000 the evidence for carbon emissions gradually got weaker -- better temperature data for the last century, more detailed ice core data, then laboratory evidence that cosmic rays precipitate low clouds,” Evans wrote. “As Lord Keynes famously said, ‘When the facts change, I change my mind. What do you

do, sir?” he added. Evans noted how he benefited from climate fears as a scientist. “And the political realm in turn fed money back into the scientific community. By the late 1990s, lots of jobs depended on the idea that carbon emissions caused global warming. Many of them were bureaucratic, but there were a lot of science jobs created too. I was on that gravy train, making a high wage in a science job that would not have existed if we didn’t believe carbon emissions caused global warming. And so were lots of people around me; and there were international conferences full of such people. And we had political support, the ear of government, big budgets, and we felt fairly important and useful (well, I did anyway). It was great. We were working to save the planet! But starting in about 2000, the last three of the four pieces of evidence outlined above fell away or reversed,” Evans wrote. “The pre-2000 ice core data was the central evidence for believing that atmospheric carbon caused temperature increases. The new ice core data shows that past warmings were *not* initially caused by rises in atmospheric carbon, and says nothing about the strength of any amplification. This piece of evidence casts reasonable doubt that atmospheric carbon had any role in past warmings, while still allowing the possibility that it had a supporting role,” he added. “Unfortunately politics and science have become even more entangled. The science of global warming has become a partisan political issue, so positions become more entrenched. Politicians and the public prefer simple and less-nuanced messages. At the moment the political climate strongly supports carbon emissions as the cause of global warming, to the point of sometimes rubbishing or silencing critics,” he concluded. (Evans [bio link](#))

Yury Zaitsev, an analyst with Russia’s Institute of Space Studies, rejected man-made global warming fears in 2007. “Paleoclimate research shows that the chillier periods of the Earth’s history have always given way to warmer times, and vice versa. But it is not quite clear what causes this change,” Zaitsev wrote on September 28, 2007 in the Russian publication *RIA Novosti*. “**Yury Leonov, director of the Institute of Geology at the Russian Academy of Sciences**, thinks that the human impact on nature is so small that it can be dismissed as a statistical mistake,” Zaitsev explained. “Until quite recently, experts primarily attributed global warming to greenhouse gas emissions, with carbon dioxide singled out as the chief culprit. But it transpires that water vapor is just as bad,” he wrote. “Sun-related phenomena have fairly regular and predictable consequences on the Earth. Of course, they exert influence on humans and other species and, to some extent, on the environment, altering atmospheric pressure and temperature. But they are not likely to contribute much to climate change. This is a global process and is the result of global causes. For the time being, we are far from understanding them fully,” he added. ([LINK](#))

[Climate researcher Dr. Tad Murty, former Senior Research Scientist for Fisheries and Oceans in Canada](#) **and former director of Australia’s National Tidal Facility and professor of earth sciences, Flinders University**, reversed himself from believer in man-made climate change to a skeptic. “I started with a firm belief about global warming, until I started working on it myself,” Murty explained on August 17, 2006. “I switched to the other side in the early 1990s when Fisheries and Oceans Canada asked me to prepare a position paper and I started to look into the problem seriously,” Murty explained. Murty was one of the 60 scientists who wrote an April 6, 2006 letter urging withdrawal of Kyoto to Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper which stated in part, “If, back in the mid-1990s, we knew what we know today about climate, Kyoto would almost certainly not exist, because we would have concluded it was not necessary.”

French climatologist Dr. Marcel Leroux, former professor at University of Jean Moulin and former director of the Laboratory of Climatology, Risks, and Environment (CNRS)

in Lyon, is a climate skeptic. Leroux wrote a 2005 book titled *Global Warming - Myth or Reality? - The Erring Ways of Climatology*. “Hardly a week goes by without some new scoop ... filling our screens and the pages of our newspapers,” Leroux wrote in his book. The media promotes the view that “global warming caused by the greenhouse effect is our fault, just like everything else, and the message/slogan/misinformation becomes even more simplistic, ever cruder! It could not be simpler: if the rain falls or draught strikes; if the wind blows a gale or there is none at all; whether it’s heat or hard frost; it’s all because of the greenhouse effect, and we are to blame. An easy argument, but stupid!” he explained. “The Fourth Report of the IPCC might just as well decree the suppression of all climatology textbooks, and replace them in our schools with press *communiqués*. ... Day after day, the same mantra - that ‘the Earth is warming up’ - is churned out in all its forms. As ‘the ice melts’ and ‘sea level rises,’ the Apocalypse looms ever nearer! Without realizing it, or perhaps without wishing to, the average citizen in bamboozled, lobotomized, lulled into mindless acceptance. ... Non-believers in the greenhouse scenario are in the position of those long ago who doubted the existence of God ... fortunately for them, the Inquisition is no longer with us!” he wrote. “The possible causes, then, of climate change are: well-established orbital parameters on the paleoclimatic scale, ... solar activity, ...; volcanism ...; and far at the rear, the greenhouse effect, and in particular that caused by water vapor, the extent of its influence being unknown. These factors are working together all the time, and it seems difficult to unravel the relative importance of their respective influences upon climatic evolution. Equally, it is tendentious to highlight the anthropogenic factor, which is, clearly, the least credible among all those previously mentioned,” he added.

[Climate scientist Dr. Chris de Freitas of the University of Auckland, N.Z.](#), also converted from a believer in man-made global warming to a skeptic. “At first I accepted that increases in human-caused additions of carbon dioxide and methane in the atmosphere would trigger changes in water vapor, etc. and lead to dangerous ‘global warming,’ but with time and with the results of research, I formed the view that, although it makes for a good story, it is unlikely that the man-made changes are drivers of significant climate variation,” de Freitas wrote on August 17, 2006. “I accept there may be small changes. But I see the risk of anything serious to be minute,” he added. “One could reasonably argue that lack of evidence is not a good reason for complacency. But I believe the billions of dollars committed to GW research and lobbying for GW and for Kyoto treaties etc could be better spent on uncontroversial and very real environmental problems (such as air pollution, poor sanitation, provision of clean water and improved health services) that we know affect tens of millions of people,” de Freitas concluded. De Freitas was one of the 60 scientists who wrote an April 6, 2006 letter urging withdrawal of Kyoto to Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper which stated in part, “Significant [scientific] advances have been made since the [Kyoto] protocol was created, many of which are taking us away from a concern about increasing greenhouse gases.”

Atmospheric scientist Dr. Gerhard Kramm of the Geophysical Institute at the University of Alaska Fairbanks expressed climate skepticism in 2007. “The IPCC would never be awarded by the Nobel Prize in Physics because most of the statements of the IPCC can be assessed as physical misunderstanding and physical misinterpretations,” Kramm wrote in a letter to the *Associated Press* on October 21, 2007. “There is no scientific certainty, even though the *Associated Press* distributes this message always every day,” Kramm wrote in his letter, criticizing the news outlet. “The change in the radiative forcing components since the beginning of the industrial era is so small (2 W/m^2 , according to the IPCC 2007) that we have no pyrgeometers (radiometers to measure the infrared radiometer emitted by the

earth and the atmosphere) which are able to provide any empirical evidence of such a small change because their degrees of accuracy are too less,” he wrote. “By far, most of [the IPCC] members can be considered, indeed, as members of a Church of Global Warming. They are not qualified enough to understand the physics behind the greenhouse effect and to prove the accuracy of global climate models (see, for instance, the poor publication record of Dr. [RK] Pachauri, the current Chairman of the IPCC). However, in science it would be highly awkward to vote which results are correct and which are wrong,” he added. “A decrease of the anthropogenic CO₂ emission to the values below of those of 1990 would not decrease the atmospheric CO₂ concentration. This concentration would increase further, however the increase would be lowering. As illustrated in Slide 38, it might be that the atmospheric CO₂ concentration tends to an equilibrium concentration of somewhat higher than 500 ppmv. Here, equilibrium means that the increase of natural and anthropogenic CO₂ emission is equaled by the uptake of CO₂ by vegetation and ocean,” he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Geologist Georgia D. Brown, an instructor of Geology & Oceanography at College of Lake County in Illinois, rejected climate fears and supported the notion of a coming global cool down. “I talk to my students about this topic every semester, not just when we are covering glacial geology, but at different points throughout the term. I want them to know that they shouldn’t take every alarmist claim at face value,” Brown wrote on December 13, 2006. “Fear is a means of controlling a population, and since the cold war has ended, the government needed new fuel for its control fire,” Brown wrote. ([LINK](#))

Physicist Dr. Laurence I. Gould, chair of the Physics Department at the University of Hartford, former chairman of the New England Section of the American Physical Society, and author of numerous peer-reviewed research, challenged climate fears in 2007. “There is (I have found) a huge problem in getting to learn of both sides of the AGW debate. But this ‘debate’ needs to be aired, regardless of what is being presented to scientists and to the public as the ‘truth’ about AGW,” Gould wrote in a September 20, 2007 editorial titled “Global Warming from a Critical Perspective.” “Although I have seen many articles arguing for the reality and danger of anthropogenic greenhouse warming (AGW), I have rarely seen one that presents scientific arguments against the AGW claims,” Gould wrote. “The implication [by many in the media] seems to be that anyone who has a contrary argument is not ‘respectable’ - yet there are many leading climatologists (such as Richard Lindzen of MIT) who have very good arguments disagreeing,” Gould wrote. ([LINK](#)) & ([LINK](#))

Russian scientist Alexander G. Egorov, a researcher with the Arctic and Antarctic Research Institute in Saint Petersburg, called global warming a temporary inconvenience tied to the natural fluctuation of the sun. According to an October 18, 2007 translated article in *Russian Science News*, Egorov believes warming is “not more than a natural variation.” The article explained that Egorov believes “long-term temperature rising to be just an episode of global history, a consequence of natural fluctuations, which depend on changes in solar activity and surface air pressure. The scientist has analyzed data of monthly average values of surface air pressure between November and April 1923-2005 in cellular mesh points, located northwards from 40th parallel of the northern hemisphere.” The article concluded, “If pressure over Atlantic drops, then speed of warm water transfer grows, like in 1920-1940s, when warming was detected in the Arctic. During the 22nd solar cycle, which started in 1986, the pressure over vast territories of the northern hemisphere, including Canada, Greenland, the Arctic Ocean, Eastern Europe, Eastern and Western Siberia, dropped significantly. This stage of natural fluctuations concurs with current climate state, which is usually called the

global warming. However, in the next solar cycle the pressure over the Northern Atlantic may change, causing the end of global warming.” ([LINK](#))

[One of the “Fathers of Meteorology,” Dr. Reid Bryson, the founding chairman of the Department of Meteorology at University of Wisconsin \(now the Department of Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences,](#) was pivotal in promoting the coming ice age scare of the 1970s (See *Time Magazine*’s 1974 article [“Another Ice Age”](#) citing Bryson: & see *Newsweek*’s 1975 article [“The Cooling World”](#) citing Bryson) has now converted into a leading global warming skeptic. On February 8, 2007 Bryson dismissed what he terms “sky is falling” man-made global warming fears. Bryson was on the United Nations Global 500 Roll of Honor and was identified by the British Institute of Geographers as the most frequently cited climatologist in the world. “Before there were enough people to make any difference at all, two million years ago, nobody was changing the climate, yet the climate was changing, okay?” Bryson told the May 2007 issue of *Energy Cooperative News*. “All this argument is the temperature going up or not, it’s absurd. Of course it’s going up. It has gone up since the early 1800s, before the Industrial Revolution, because we’re coming out of the Little Ice Age, not because we’re putting more carbon dioxide into the air,” Bryson said. “You can go outside and spit and have the same effect as doubling carbon dioxide,” he added. “We cannot say what part of that warming was due to mankind’s addition of ‘greenhouse gases’ until we consider the other possible factors, such as aerosols. The aerosol content of the atmosphere was measured during the past century, but to my knowledge this data was never used. We can say that the question of anthropogenic modification of the climate is an important question -- too important to ignore. However, it has now become a media free-for-all and a political issue more than a scientific problem,” Bryson [explained in 2005](#).

UN IPCC reviewer, global warming author, and economist Dr. Hans H.J. Labohm, a lecturer at the Netherlands Defense Academy, started out as a man-made global warming believer but he later switched his view after conducting climate research. Labohm wrote on August 19, 2006, “I started as an anthropogenic global warming believer, then I read the [UN’s IPCC] Summary for Policymakers and the research of prominent skeptics.” “After that, I changed my mind,” Labohm explained. **Labohm co-authored the 2004 book *Man-Made Global Warming: Unraveling a Dogma* with Eindhoven University of Technology emeritus professor of chemical engineer Dick Thoenes who was the former chairman of the Royal Netherlands Chemical Society.** Labohm was one of the 60 scientists who wrote an April 6, 2006 letter urging withdrawal of Kyoto to Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper which stated in part, “‘Climate change is real’ is a meaningless phrase used repeatedly by activists to convince the public that a climate catastrophe is looming and humanity is the cause. Neither of these fears is justified. Global climate changes all the time due to natural causes and the human impact still remains impossible to distinguish from this natural ‘noise.’”

Paleoclimatologist Tim Patterson, professor in the department of Earth Sciences at Carleton University in Ottawa converted from believer in CO₂’s driving the climate change to a skeptic. “I taught my students that CO₂ was the prime driver of climate change,” Patterson wrote on April 30, 2007. Patterson said his “conversion” happened following his research on “the nature of paleo-commercial fish populations in the NE Pacific.” “[My conversion from believer to climate skeptic] came about approximately 5-6 years ago when results began to come in from a major NSERC (Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada) Strategic Project Grant where I was PI (principle investigator),” Patterson explained. “Over the course of about a year, I switched allegiances,” he wrote. “As the proxy

results began to come in, we were astounded to find that paleoclimatic and paleoproductivity records were full of cycles that corresponded to various sun-spot cycles. About that time, [geochemist] Jan Veizer and others began to publish reasonable hypotheses as to how solar signals could be amplified and control climate,” Patterson noted. Patterson says his conversion “probably cost me a lot of grant money. However, as a scientist I go where the science takes me and not where activists want me to go.” Patterson now asserts that more and more scientists are converting to climate skeptics. “When I go to a scientific meeting, there’s lots of opinion out there, there’s lots of discussion [about climate change]. I was at the Geological Society of America meeting in Philadelphia in the fall and I would say that people with my opinion were probably in the majority,” Patterson told the [Winnipeg Sun](#) on February 13, 2007. Patterson, who believes the sun is responsible for the recent warming of the Earth, ridiculed the environmentalists and the media for not reporting the truth. “But if you listen to [Canadian environmental activist David] Suzuki and the media, it’s like a tiger chasing its tail. They try to outdo each other and all the while proclaiming that the debate is over but it isn’t -- come out to a scientific meeting sometime,” Patterson said. In a separate interview on April 26, 2007 with a [Canadian newspaper](#), Patterson explained that the scientific proof favors skeptics. “I think the proof is in the pudding, based on what [media and governments] are saying, [is] we’re about three quarters of the way [to disaster] with the doubling of CO₂ in the atmosphere,” he said. “The world should be heating up like crazy by now, and it’s not. The temperatures match very closely with the solar cycles.” ([LINK](#))

[Physicist Dr. Zbigniew Jaworowski, Chairman of the Central Laboratory for the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Radiological Protection in Warsaw](#), took a scientific journey from a believer of man-made climate change in the form of global cooling in the 1970s all the way to converting to a skeptic of current predictions of catastrophic man-made global warming. “At the beginning of the 1970s I believed in man-made climate cooling, and therefore I started a study on the effects of industrial pollution on the global atmosphere, using glaciers as a history book on this pollution,” Dr. Jaworowski, wrote on August 17, 2006. “With the advent of man-made warming political correctness in the beginning of 1980s, I already had a lot of experience with polar and high altitude ice, and I have serious problems in accepting the reliability of ice core CO₂ studies,” Jaworowski added. Jaworowski, who has published many papers on climate with a focus on CO₂ measurements in ice cores, also dismissed the UN IPCC summary and questioned what the actual level of CO₂ was in the atmosphere in a March 16, 2007 report in *EIR Science* entitled “CO₂: The Greatest Scientific Scandal of Our Time.” “We thus find ourselves in the situation that the entire theory of man-made global warming-with its repercussions in science, and its important consequences for politics and the global economy- is based on ice core studies that provided a false picture of the atmospheric CO₂ levels,” Jaworowski wrote. “For the past three decades, these well-known direct CO₂ measurements, recently compiled and analyzed by Ernst-Georg Beck (Beck 2006a, Beck 2006b, Beck 2007), were completely ignored by climatologists-and not because they were wrong. Indeed, these measurements were made by several Nobel Prize winners, using the techniques that are standard textbook procedures in chemistry, biochemistry, botany, hygiene, medicine, nutrition, and ecology. The only reason for rejection was that these measurements did not fit the hypothesis of anthropogenic climatic warming. I regard this as perhaps the greatest scientific scandal of our time,” Jaworowski wrote. “The hypothesis, in vogue in the 1970s, stating that emissions of industrial dust will soon induce the new Ice Age, seems now to be a conceited anthropocentric exaggeration, bringing into discredit the science of that time. The same fate awaits the present,” he added. Jaworowski believes that cosmic rays and solar activity are major drivers of the Earth’s climate. Jaworowski was one of the 60 scientists who

wrote an April 6, 2006 letter urging withdrawal of Kyoto to Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper which stated in part, “It may be many years yet before we properly understand the Earth’s climate system. Nevertheless, significant advances have been made since the protocol was created, many of which are taking us away from a concern about increasing greenhouse gases.”

A group of German scientists of “several scientific disciplines” formed a new group in 2007 to declare themselves climate change skeptics. The group of scientists issued a proclamation on September 15, 2007 titled “The Climate Manifest of Heiligenroth.” The group, which included prominent scientist Ernst-George Beck who authored a groundbreaking February 2007 paper, entitled “180 Years of Atmospheric CO₂ Analysis by Chemical Methods,” ([LINK](#)) publicly issued six basic points of skepticism about man-made global warming. They stated that their “motivation was to initiate processes against daily campaigns of media and politics concerning climate.” Their six points are: 1) “There is not proven influence on climate by man made emission of CO₂; 2) Scenarios on future climate change derived from computer models are speculative and contradicted by climate history; 3) There has been climate change in all times of Earth history with alternating cold and warm phases; 4) The trace gas CO₂ does not pollute the atmosphere, CO₂ is an essential resource for plant growth and therefore a precondition for life on Earth; 5) We are committing ourselves to an effective preservation of our environment and support arrangements to prevent unnecessary stress on eco systems; and 6) We strongly warn against taking action using imminent climate catastrophe as a vehicle which will not be beneficial for our environment and will cause economic damage.” **The declaration was signed by the following: Dr. Herbert Backhaus; Ernst-Georg Beck; Dieter Ber; Paul Bossert; Brigitte Bossert; Helgo Bran; Gunter Ederer; Werner Eisenkopf; Edgar Gartner; Wilfried Heck; Heinz Hofman; Rainer Hoffman; Ferdinand Furst zu Hohenlohe-Bartenstein; Dieter Kramer; Nikolaus Lentz; Dr. Rainer Six; Uwe Tempel; and Heinze Thieme.** ([LINK](#))

[Paleoclimatologist Dr. Ian D. Clark, professor of the Department of Earth Sciences at University of Ottawa, who has been involved with the International Atomic Energy Agency and co-authored the book *Environmental Isotopes in Hydrogeology*, which won the *Choice Magazine* “Outstanding Textbook” award in 1998,](#) reversed his views on man-made climate change after further examining the evidence. “I used to agree with these dramatic warnings of climate disaster. I taught my students that most of the increase in temperature of the past century was due to human contribution of CO₂. The association seemed so clear and simple. Increases of greenhouse gases were driving us towards a climate catastrophe,” Clark said in a 2005 documentary *Climate Catastrophe Cancelled: What You’re Not Being Told About the Science of Climate Change*. “However, a few years ago, I decided to look more closely at the science and it astonished me. In fact there is no evidence of humans being the cause. There is, however, overwhelming evidence of natural causes such as changes in the output of the sun. This has completely reversed my views on the Kyoto protocol,” Clark explained. “Actually, many other leading climate researchers also have serious concerns about the science underlying the [Kyoto] Protocol,” he added.

Prominent scientist Professor Dr. Nils-Axel Morner, a leading world authority on sea levels and coastal erosion who headed the Department of Paleogeophysics & Geodynamics at Stockholm University, declared in 2007 “the rapid rise in sea levels predicted by computer models simply cannot happen.” Morner called a September 23, 2007 *AP* article predicting dire sea level rise “propaganda.” “The *AP* article must be regarded as

an untenable horror scenario not based in observational facts,” Morner wrote to EPW. “Sea level will not rise by 1 m in 100 years. This is not even possible. Storm surges are in no way intensified at a sea level rise. Sea level was not at all rising ‘a third of a meter in the last century’: only some 10 cm from 1850 to 1940,” he wrote. Morner previously noted on August 6, 2007, “When we were coming out of the last ice age, huge ice sheets were melting rapidly and the sea level rose at an average of one meter per century. If the Greenland ice sheet started to melt at the same rate - which is unlikely - sea level would rise by less than 100 mm - 4 inches per century.” Morner, who was president of the INQUA Commission on Sea Level Changes and Coastal Evolution from 1999 to 2003, has published a new booklet entitled “The Greatest Lie Ever Told,” to refute claims of catastrophic sea level rise. ([LINK](#)) & ([LINK](#))

[Environmental geochemist Dr. Jan Veizer, professor emeritus of University of Ottawa](#), converted from believer to skeptic after conducting scientific studies of climate history. “I simply accepted the [global warming] theory as given,” Veizer wrote on April 30, 2007 about predictions that increasing CO₂ in the atmosphere was leading to a climate catastrophe. “The final conversion came when I realized that the solar/cosmic ray connection gave far more consistent picture with climate, over many time scales, than did the CO₂ scenario,” Veizer wrote. “It was the results of my work on past records, on geological time scales, that led me to realize the discrepancies with empirical observations. Trying to understand the background issues of modeling led to realization of the assumptions and uncertainties involved,” Veizer explained. “The past record strongly favors the solar/cosmic alternative as the principal climate driver,” he added. Veizer acknowledged the Earth has been warming and he believes in the scientific value of climate modeling. “The major point where I diverge from the IPCC scenario is my belief that it underestimates the role of natural variability by proclaiming CO₂ to be the only reasonable source of additional energy in the planetary balance. Such additional energy is needed to drive the climate. The point is that most of the temperature, in both nature and models, arises from the greenhouse of water vapor (model language ‘positive water vapor feedback’),” Veizer wrote. “Thus to get more temperature, more water vapor is needed. This is achieved by speeding up the water cycle by inputting more energy into the system,” he continued. “Note that it is not CO₂ that is in the models but its presumed energy equivalent (model language ‘prescribed CO₂’). Yet, the models (and climate) would generate a more or less similar outcome regardless where this additional energy is coming from. This is why the solar/cosmic connection is so strongly opposed, because it can influence the global energy budget which, in turn, diminishes the need for an energy input from the CO₂ greenhouse,” he wrote.

German scientist Ernst-Georg Beck, a biologist, authored a February 2007 paper entitled 180 Years of Atmospheric CO₂ Analysis by Chemical Methods that found levels of atmospheric CO₂ levels were not measured correctly possibly due to the fact that they measurements did not fit with hypothesis of man-made global warming. The abstract to the paper published in Energy and Environment reads in part, “More than 90,000 accurate chemical analyses of CO₂ in air since 1812 are summarized. The historic chemical data reveal that changes in CO₂ track changes in temperature, and therefore climate in contrast to the simple, monotonically increasing CO₂ trend depicted in the post-1990 literature on climate-change. Since 1812, the CO₂ concentration in northern hemispheric air has fluctuated exhibiting three high level maxima around 1825, 1857 and 1942 the latter showing more than 400 ppm.” The paper concluded: “Most authors and sources have summarized the historical CO₂ determinations by chemical methods incorrectly and promulgated the unjustifiable view that historical methods of analysis were unreliable and produced poor quality results.” ([LINK](#))

Internationally known forecasting pioneer Scott Armstrong of the Wharton School at the Ivy League University of Pennsylvania and his colleague Kesten Green of Monash University in Australia challenged Gore to a \$10,000 bet in June 2007 over the accuracy of climate computer models predictions. “Claims that the Earth will get warmer have no more credence than saying that it will get colder.” According to Armstrong, the author of *Long-Range Forecasting*, the most frequently cited book on forecasting methods, “Of 89 principles [of forecasting], the [UN] IPCC violated 72.” Armstrong and Green also critiqued the *Associated Press* for hyping climate fears in 2007. “Dire consequences have been predicted to arise from warming of the Earth in coming decades of the 21st century. Enormous sea level rise is one of the more dramatic forecasts. According to the *AP*’s Borenstein, such sea-level forecasts were experts’ judgments on what will happen,” Armstrong and Green wrote to EPW on September 23, 2007. “As shown in our analysis, experts’ forecasts have no validity in situations characterized by high complexity, high uncertainty, and poor feedback. To date we are unaware of any forecasts of sea levels that adhere to proper [scientific] forecasting methodology and our quick search on Google Scholar came up short,” Armstrong and Green explained. “Media outlets should be clear when they are reporting on scientific work and when they are reporting on the opinions held by some scientists. Without scientific support for their forecasting methods, the concerns of scientists should not be used as a basis for public policy,” they concluded. ([LINK](#)) Armstrong and Green also co-authored a November 29, 2007 paper with **astrophysicist Dr. Willie Soon** which found that polar bear extinction predictions violate “scientific forecasting procedures.” The study analyzed the methodology of key polar bear predictions and found that the a study had “extrapolated nearly 100 years into the future on the basis of only five years data - and data for these years were of doubtful validity.” The study concluded that “experts’ predictions, unaided by evidence-based forecasting procedures, should play no role in this decision [to list polar bear as endangered]. Without scientific forecasts of a substantial decline of the polar bear population and of net benefits from feasible policies arising from listing polar bears, a decision to list polar bears as threatened or endangered would be irresponsible.” ([LINK](#))

UK Professor Emeritus of Biogeography Philip Stott of the University of London ridiculed the notion of a scientific “consensus” on catastrophic man-made global warming. “In the early 20th century, 95% of scientists believed in eugenics. Science does not progress by consensus, it progresses by falsification and by what we call paradigm shifts,” Stott said on March 14, 2007 during a live debate with other scientists in New York City. “And can I remind everybody that the IPCC that we keep talking about very honestly admits that we know very little about 80% of the factors behind climate change. Well let’s use an engineer; I don’t think I’d want to cross Brooklyn Bridge if it were built by an engineer who only understood 80% of the forces on that bridge,” Stott said. He noted how ridiculous political leaders act when it comes to global warming.” Angela Merkel, the German chancellor, [and] my own good Prime Minister (UK’s Tony Blair), for whom I voted -- let me emphasize - - arguing in public two weeks ago as to who in ‘Annie get the gun style’ could produce the best temperature. ‘I could do two degrees C said Angela [Merkel].’ ‘No, I could only do three [degrees] said Tony [Blair].’ Stand back a minute, those are politicians telling you that they can control climate to a degree Celsius,” Stott said. ([LINK](#))

Swedish Geologist Dr. Wibjorn Karlen, professor emeritus of the Department of Physical Geography and Quaternary Geology at Stockholm University, critiqued the *Associated Press* for hyping climate fears. “Another of these hysterical views of our climate,” Karlen wrote to EPW regarding the September 22, 2007 *AP* article predicting dire sea level

rise. “Newspapers should think about the damage they are doing to many persons, particularly young kids, by spreading the exaggerated views of a human impact on climate,” Karlen explained. “I have used the NASA temperature data for a study of several major areas. As far as I can see the IPCC “Global Temperature” is wrong. Temperature is fluctuating but it is still most places cooler than in the 1930s and 1940s,” Karlen wrote. “The latest estimates of sea level rise are 1.31 mm/year. With this water level increase it will take about 800 years before the water level has increased by 1 m if not conditions change before that (very likely). Society will look very different at that time,” he added. ([LINK](#))

Ecologist Dr. Patrick Moore, a Greenpeace founding member who left the environmental organization because he believed it had become too radical, rejected climate alarmism and lamented the efforts to silence climate skeptics. “It appears to be the policy of the [UK] Royal Society to stifle dissent and silence anyone who may have doubts about the connection between global warming and human activity. That kind of repression seems more suited to the Inquisition than to a modern, respected scientific body,” Moore, the chief scientist for Greenspirit, wrote in a September 21, 2006 letter to the Royal Society accusing it of attempting to silence skeptics. “I am sure the Royal Society is aware of the difference between a hypothesis and a theory. It is clear the contention that human-induced CO2 emissions and rising CO2 levels in the global atmosphere are the cause of the present global warming trend is a hypothesis that has not yet been elevated to the level of a proven theory. Causation has not been demonstrated in any conclusive way,” Moore wrote. ([LINK](#))

Geologist Morten Hald, an Arctic expert at of the University of Tromso in Norway, questioned the reliability of computer models predicting a melting Arctic. “The main problem is that these models are often based on relatively new climate data. The thermometer has only been in existence for 150 years and information on temperature which is 150 years old does not capture the large natural changes,” Hald, who is participating with a Norwegian national team in Arctic climate research, said in a May 18, 2007 article. ([LINK](#)) The article continued, “Professor Hald believes the models which are utilized to make prognoses about the future climate changes consider paleoclimate only to a minor degree.” “Studies of warm periods in the past, like during the Stone Ages can provide valuable knowledge to understand and tackle the warmer climate in the future,” Hald explained.

Paavo Siitam, a retired professor of chemistry, agronomy, biology, and physics, and a researcher in soils and microbiology, critiqued the *Associated Press* for hyping climate fears in 2007. “Despite some doom and gloom predictions, excluding waves washing onto shores by relatively rarely occurring tsunamis and storm-surges, low-lying areas on the face of our planet have NOT yet been submerged by rising oceans... so probably low-lying areas along shorelines of Canada and the USA will be SAFE into foreseeable and even distant futures,” Siitam wrote to EPW on September 22, 2007 regarding an *AP* article predicting dire sea level rise. “By the way, I’d be happy to buy prized oceanfront properties at bargain prices, anywhere in the world, when unwarranted, panic selling begins. The dire predictions will not come true this century,” he added. ([LINK](#))

Meteorologist Grant Dade Texas TV’s KLTV, a member of both the American Meteorological Society and the National Weather Association, dismissed man-made climate fears in 2007. “I think it is about time we see the other side of the Global Warming debate come out,” Dade said on November 8, 2007. “Is the Earth warming? Yes, I think it is. But is man causing that? No. It’s a simple climate cycle our climate goes through over

thousands of years.” Dade critiqued the media for hyping climate fears while ignoring inconvenient facts. “Did you hear about the Arctic ice melting? But you didn’t hear in Antarctica last winter was the most ice ever recorded,” Dade said. “You don’t hear that,” he added. ([LINK](#)) & Click to watch video: ([LINK](#))

Dr. Art Robinson of the Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine declared his climate skepticism in 2007. “Long-term temperature data suggest that the current - entirely natural and not man made - temperature rise of about 0.5 degrees C per century could continue for another 200 years. Therefore, the best data available leads to an extrapolated value of about 1 foot of rise during the next two centuries,” Robinson wrote to EPW on September 23, 2007. “There is no scientific basis upon which to guess that the rise will be less or will be more than this value. Such a long extrapolation over two centuries is likely to be significantly in error - but it is the only extrapolation that can be made with current data. There may be no sea level rise at all. No one knows,” he added. ([LINK](#))

Canadian Geologist Albert F. Jacobs, co-founder of the group Friends of Science, critiqued the *Associated Press* for hyping climate fears in 2007. “Basic to the IPCC case for sea level rise and for the alarmists’ hype is the hypothesis that increasing levels of carbon dioxide will cause increasing amounts of global warming. It should be stressed that this assumption of truth is no more than a hypothesis, which is increasingly being attacked and on which any meaningful discussion has been thwarted by the IPCC’s political masters,” Jacobs wrote to EPW on September 23, 2007. “As far as CO₂ is concerned, basic physics has always been clear about the limitations of higher concentrations of gas to absorb equivalent amounts of heat radiation. ‘Doubling of CO₂’ does none of the things the IPCC’s computer says it does. And that’s all separate from the fact that water vapour is a much greater ‘greenhouse’ driver than carbon dioxide in any case,” Jacobs added. ([LINK](#))

Meteorologist Chuck Wiese lambasted “fancy computer models that can be manipulated” and “are absolutely incorrect and fraudulent.” Wiese called computer model predictions of climate doom a “bunch of baloney.” “The physics of this is in support of anyone who is a skeptic. As I have said, CO₂ is of secondary importance; anything that we did to reduce CO₂ emissions is going to make no change in my opinion that you could really measure in the climate response at all, because other things are going on that just overpower the small contribution you get from CO₂, it does not make a dog’s bit of difference,” Wiese said in a January 18, 2007 radio interview. ([LINK](#))

American Enterprise Institute’s (AEI) Joel Schwartz, who holds a master’s degree in planetary science from the California Institute of Technology, touted a significant 2007 peer-reviewed study as “overturning the UN IPCC ‘consensus’ in one fell swoop.” “New research from Stephen Schwartz of Brookhaven National Lab concludes that the Earth’s climate is only about one-third as sensitive to carbon dioxide as the IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) assumes,” wrote AEI’s Schwartz in an August 17, 2007 blog post. ([LINK](#)) The study’s “result is 63% lower than the IPCC’s estimate of 3 degrees C for a doubling of CO₂ (2.0-4.5 degrees C, 2SD range). Right now we’re about 41% above the estimated pre-industrial CO₂ level of 270 ppm. At the current rate of increase of about 0.55% per year, CO₂ will double around 2070. Based on Schwartz’s results, we should expect about a 0.6 degrees C additional increase in temperature between now and 2070 due to this additional CO₂. That doesn’t seem particularly alarming,” AEI’s Schwartz explained. “In other words, there’s hardly any additional warming ‘in the pipeline’ from previous greenhouse

gas emissions. This is in contrast to the IPCC, which predicts that the Earth's average temperature will rise an additional 0.6 degrees C during the 21st Century even if greenhouse gas concentrations stopped increasing," he added. "Along with dozens of other studies in the scientific literature, [this] new study belies Al Gore's claim that there is no legitimate scholarly alternative to climate catastrophism. Indeed, if Schwartz's results are correct, that alone would be enough to overturn in one fell swoop the IPCC's scientific 'consensus', the environmentalists' climate hysteria, and the political pretext for the energy-restriction policies that have become so popular with the world's environmental regulators, elected officials, and corporations. The question is, will anyone in the mainstream media notice?" AEI's Schwartz concluded.

Chemist Dr. Franco Battaglia, a professor of Environmental Chemistry at the University of Modena in Italy and co-author of a book critical of the modern environmental movement titled "Green Outside, Red Inside: Deception of Environmentalists." The book was co-authored with **Dr. Renato Angelo Ricci, emeritus professor of physics at the University of Padua and honorary president of the Italian Society of Physics.** Battaglia dismissed man-made global warming fears as "trivial." Battaglia mocked that notion that we live in "a world where the colorless, odorless, tasteless, harmless CO₂ provides food for plants and therefore our food was at the same rank of radioactive waste." "A world where a trivial global warming is currently less than what [Viking] Erik the Red faced when he colonized Greenland" during the Medieval Warm Period," Battaglia wrote on September 2, 2007 in the Italian newspaper Il Giornale. "Our energy needs put CO₂ into the atmosphere (at least until we decide to produce at 100% over nuclear), he explained. Battaglia also referred to the Kyoto Protocol as "stupid." (translated) ([LINK](#))

Climate scientist Luc Debontridder of the Belgium Weather Institute's Royal Meteorological Institute (RMI) co-authored a study in August 2007 which dismissed a decisive role of CO₂ in global warming. The press release about the study read, "CO₂ is not the big bogeyman of climate change and global warming. This is the conclusion of a comprehensive scientific study done by the Royal Meteorological Institute, which will be published this summer. The study does not state that CO₂ plays no role in warming the earth." "But it can never play the decisive role that is currently attributed to it," Luc Debontridder said according to the August 2007 release. "Not CO₂, but water vapor is the most important greenhouse gas. It is responsible for at least 75 % of the greenhouse effect. This is a simple scientific fact, but Al Gore's movie has hyped CO₂ so much that nobody seems to take note of it," Debontridder explained. "Every change in weather conditions is blamed on CO₂. But the warm winters of the last few years (in Belgium) are simply due to the 'North-Atlantic Oscillation'. And this has absolutely nothing to do with CO₂," he added. ([LINK](#))

Australian climate data analyst Dr. John McLean authored a September 2007 study which found the UN IPCC peer-review process is "an illusion." A September 2007 analysis of the IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) scientific review process entitled "Peer Review? What Peer Review?" revealed very few scientists are actively involved in the UN's peer-review process. According to McLean's analysis, "The IPCC would have us believe that its reports are diligently reviewed by many hundreds of scientists and that these reviewers endorse the contents of the report. Analyses of reviewer comments show a very different and disturbing story." The paper continued, "In [the IPCC's] Chapter 9, the key science chapter, the IPCC concludes that 'it is very highly likely that greenhouse gas forcing has been the dominant cause of the observed global warming over the

last 50 years.’ The IPCC leads us to believe that this statement is very much supported by the majority of reviewers. The reality is that there is surprisingly little explicit support for this key notion. Among the 23 independent reviewers just 4 explicitly endorsed the chapter with its hypothesis, and one other endorsed only a specific section. Moreover, only 62 of the IPCC’s 308 reviewers commented on this chapter at all.” The analysis concluded, “The IPCC reports appear to be largely based on a consensus of scientific papers, but those papers are the product of research for which the funding is strongly influenced by previous IPCC reports. This makes the claim of a human influence self-perpetuating and for a corruption of the normal scientific process.” ([LINK](#))

Canadian climatologist Dr. Timothy Ball, formerly of the University of Winnipeg, who earned his PhD from the University of London, called fears of man-made global warming “the greatest deception in the history of science” in a February 5, 2007 op-ed in Canada Free Press. “Believe it or not, Global Warming is not due to human contribution of Carbon Dioxide (CO₂). This, in fact, is the greatest deception in the history of science. We are wasting time, energy and trillions of dollars while creating unnecessary fear and consternation over an issue with no scientific justification,” Ball wrote. “The world has warmed since 1680, the nadir of a cool period called the Little Ice Age (LIA) that has generally continued to the present. These climate changes are well within natural variability and explained quite easily by changes in the sun. But there is nothing unusual going on,” Ball explained. “As [MIT’s Richard] Lindzen said many years ago, ‘the consensus was reached before the research had even begun.’ Now, any scientist who dares to question the prevailing wisdom is marginalized and called a skeptic, when in fact they are simply being good scientists. This has reached frightening levels with these scientists now being called climate change denier with all the holocaust connotations of that word. The normal scientific method is effectively being thwarted,” Ball concluded. Ball also explained that one of the reasons climate models are failing is because they overestimate the warming effect of CO₂ in the atmosphere. Ball described how CO₂’s warming impact diminishes. “Even if CO₂ concentration doubles or triples, the effect on temperature would be minimal. The relationship between temperature and CO₂ is like painting a window black to block sunlight. The first coat blocks most of the light. Second and third coats reduce very little more. Current CO₂ levels are like the first coat of black paint,” Ball explained in a June 6, 2007 article in Canada Free Press. ([LINK](#))

Climate data analyst Stephen McIntyre of ClimateAudit.org, one of the individuals responsible for debunking the infamous “Hockey Stick” temperature graph, exposed a NASA temperature data error in 2007 which led to 1934 -- not the previously hyped 1998 -- being declared the hottest in U.S. history since records began. Revised NASA temperature data now reveals four of the top ten hottest years in the U.S. were in the 1930’s while only three of the hottest years occurred in the last decade. [Note: 80% of man-made CO₂ emissions occurred after 1940. ([LINK](#))] “NASA has yet to own up fully to its historic error in misinterpreting US surface temperatures to conform to the Global Warming hypothesis, as discovered by Stephen McIntyre at ClimateAudit.org,” reported an August 17, 2007 article in American Thinker. ([LINK](#)) McIntyre has also harshly critiqued the UN IPCC process. “So the purpose of the three-month delay between the publication of the (IPCC) Summary for Policy-Makers and the release of the actual WG1 (Working Group 1 report) is to enable them to make any ‘necessary’ adjustments to the technical report to match the policy summary. Unbelievable. Can you imagine what securities commissions would say if business promoters issued a big promotion and then the promoters made the ‘necessary’ adjustments to the qualifying reports and financial statements so that they matched the promotion. Words fail

me,” McIntyre explained January 2007. ([LINK](#))

A [Panel of Broadcast Meteorologists](#) Rejected Man-Made Global Warming Fears in 2007 - Claimed 95% of TV Meteorologists Skeptical. “You tell me you’re going to predict climate change based on 100 years of data for a rock that’s 6 billion years old?” **Meteorologist Mark Johnson** said. Johnson dismissed the 2007 UN IPCC summary for policymakers, “Consensus does not mean fact. ... Don’t drink the Kool-Aid.” **Meteorologist Mark Nolan** said, “I’m not sure which is more arrogant - to say we caused [global warming] or that we can fix it.” Johnson and Nolan were joined on the panel by fellow **Ohio meteorologists Dan Webster, Dick Goddard, and John Loufman** in dismissing fears of global warming, according to Crain’s Cleveland publication on February 13, 2007. “Mr. Webster observed that in his dealings with meteorologists nationwide, ‘about 95%’ share his skepticism about global warming,” the paper reported. Goddard noted that scientists have flip-flopped on climate issues before. “I have a file an inch thick from 30 years ago that says the planet was cooling,” Goddard explained. Webster jokingly referenced former Vice President Gore. “Where’s Al Gore now? You can bet he’s not in New York, where they’ve got nearly 12 feet of snow right now,” Webster joked to the crowd of several hundred.

Polar expert Ivan Frolov, the head of Russia’s Science and Research Institute of Arctic and Antarctic Regions, said atmospheric temperature would have to much higher to make continental glaciers melt. “Many hundred years or 20-30 degree temperature rise would have made glaciers melt,” Frolov said in a December 14, 2006 Russian news article. ([LINK](#)) Frolov noted that currently Greenland’s and Antarctic glaciers have the tendency to grow. The article explained, “Frolov says cooling and warming periods are common for our planet - temperature fluctuations amounted to 10-12 degrees. However, such fluctuations haven’t caused glaciers to melt. Thus, we shouldn’t be afraid they melt today.”

Atmospheric scientist Dr. William R. Cotton of the Department of Atmospheric Science at Colorado State University, an internationally respected expert in the aerosol effects on weather and climate, called claims that man-made global warming was causing any recent abnormal weather an “abuse of limited scientific knowledge.” Cotton, who has been extensively cited in the peer reviewed literature, rejected global warming alarmism on October 17, 2006 in Climate Science. “Climate variability has been with Earth for eons. Greenhouse warming is only one factor affecting climate change. There are many other factors some associated with human activity, many not, and not all processes associated with climate variability have been quantitatively identified,” Cotton said. “Therefore I am skeptical about claims of forecasts of what the climate will be like in say, 5, 10 years or more. I also view claims that a few years of abnormal weather (like intense hurricane landfalls, severe storms and floods, and droughts) to be caused by human activity as abuse of limited scientific knowledge.” ([LINK](#))

Bernie Rayno, Senior Meteorologist with AccuWeather, said in February 2007, “Our climate has been changing since the dawn of time. There is not enough evidence to link global warming to greenhouse gases.” “We as humans thought we were causing a cooling cycle,” Rayno said, referring to the fears of a coming ice age in the 1970s. “It’s interesting to watch the media flip back and forth on this,” he added.

VK Raina, India’s leading Glaciologist, questioned the assertion that global warming was melting glaciers in India. “Claims of global warming causing glacial melt in the Himalayas are based on wrong assumptions,” Raina told the Hindustan Times on February

11, 2007. The paper continued, “Raina told the Hindustan Times that out of 9,575 glaciers in India, till date, research has been conducted only on about 50. Nearly 200 years data has shown that nothing abnormal has occurred in any of these glaciers. It is simple. The issue of glacial retreat is being sensationalized by a few individuals, the septuagenarian Raina claimed. Throwing a gauntlet to the alarmist, he said the issue should be debated threadbare before drawing a conclusion.” ([LINK](#))

IPCC 2007 Expert Reviewer [Madhav Khandekar, a Ph.D meteorologist](#), a scientist with the Natural Resources Stewardship Project who has over 45 years experience in climatology, meteorology and oceanography, and who has published nearly 100 papers, reports, book reviews and a book on Ocean Wave Analysis and Modeling, slammed the UN IPCC process. “To my dismay, IPCC authors ignored all my comments and suggestions for major changes in the FOD (First Order Draft) and sent me the SOD (Second Order Draft) with essentially the same text as the FOD. None of the authors of the chapter bothered to directly communicate with me (or with other expert reviewers with whom I communicate on a regular basis) on many issues that were raised in my review. This is not an acceptable scientific review process,” Khandekar wrote in a May 28, 2007 letter to the editor of Canada’s The Hill Times. “...Adherents of the IPCC science like to insist that the debate over climate change science is over and it is now time for action. I urge [those IPCC supporters] to browse through recent issues of major international journals in climate and related science. Hardly a week goes by without a significant paper being published questioning the science,” Khandekar added. “The science of climate change is continuously evolving. The IPCC and its authors have closed their minds and eyes to this evolving science which points to solar variability as the prime driver of earth’s climate and not the human-added greenhouse gases,” he concluded. ([LINK](#)) Khandekar also further critiqued the UN’s IPCC process in a February 13, 2007 interview in the Winnipeg Sun. “I think the IPCC science is a bit too simplistic,” he explained. “IPCC scientists did not thoroughly analyze why the Earth’s surface temperature -- land and ocean combined -- has increased only modestly in the past 30 years,” Khandekar said. “We have not fully explored why the climate changes from one state to another. It is too premature to say,” he concluded. ([LINK](#)) Khandekar also wrote an August 6, 2007 commentary explaining that the Southern Hemisphere is cooling. “In the Southern Hemisphere, the land-area mean temperature has slowly but surely declined in the last few years. The city of Buenos Aires in Argentina received several centimeters of snowfall in early July, and the last time it snowed in Buenos Aires was in 1918! Most of Australia experienced one of its coldest months of June this year. Several other locations in the Southern Hemisphere have experienced lower temperatures in the last few years. Further, the sea surface temperatures over world oceans are slowly declining since mid-1998, according to a recent world-wide analysis of ocean surface temperatures,” Dr. Khandekar explained. ([LINK](#))

Award winning Chief [Meteorologist James Spann](#) of Alabama ABC TV affiliate declared that he does “not know of a single TV meteorologist who buys into the man-made global warming hype.” “I have been in operational meteorology since 1978, and I know dozens and dozens of broadcast meteorologists all over the country,” Spann, who holds the highest level of certification from the American Meteorological Society, wrote in a January 18, 2007 blog post. “I do not know of a single TV meteorologist who buys into the man-made global warming hype. I know there must be a few out there, but I can’t find them,” Spann added. “Billions of dollars of grant money is flowing into the pockets of those on the man-made global warming bandwagon. No man-made global warming, the money dries up. This is big money, make no mistake about it. Always follow the money trail and it tells a story... Nothing

wrong with making money at all, but when money becomes the motivation for a scientific conclusion, then we have a problem. For many, global warming is a big cash grab,” Spann said. “[The climate] will always change, and the warming in the last 10 years is not much difference than the warming we saw in the 1930s and other decades. And, lets not forget we are at the end of the ice age in which ice covered most of North America and Northern Europe,” he noted.

[Dr. Habibullo Abdussamatov](#), **head of Space Research for the Pulkovo Observatory in Russia**, pointed to global warming on Mars and the melting ice cap on the red planet as more evidence that the sun was a key driver of climate change. “Mars has global warming, but without a greenhouse and without the participation of Martians,” Abdussamatov said in an interview on January 26, 2007 with Canada’s National Post. “These parallel global warmings -- observed simultaneously on Mars and on Earth -- can only be a straight-line consequence of the effect of the one same factor: a long-time change in solar irradiance,” Abdussamatov explained. “It is no secret that increased solar irradiance warms Earth’s oceans, which then triggers the emission of large amounts of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. So the common view that man’s industrial activity is a deciding factor in global warming has emerged from a misinterpretation of cause and effect relations,” Abdussamatov added. A predicted decline in solar irradiance is going to lead to global cooling by 2015 and “will inevitably lead to a deep freeze around 2055-60,” according to Abdussamatov. Abdussamatov was also featured in a February 28, 2007 article in National Geographic titled ["Mars Melt Hints at Solar, Not Human, Cause for Warming, Scientist Says."](#) where he reiterated his scientific findings that “man-made greenhouse warming has made a small contribution to the warming seen on Earth in recent years, but it cannot compete with the increase in solar irradiance.”

French physicist Dr. Serge Galam, director of research at the National Center of Scientific Research (CNRS) and member of a laboratory of Ecole Polytechnique, expressed man-made global warming skepticism in 2007. “The human cause of global warming is the subject of a consensus of scientists and experts, but not an indisputable diagnosis,” Galam wrote in a February 7, 2007 article in *Le Monde* titled “No Scientific Certainty on Climate.” “The world, our planet, is showing signs of changing its undeniable natural cycles, which also shape the course of all life forms currently on the Earth. These changes are clearly visible, but remain limited for the time being,” Galam explained. He also compared man-made climate fears to ancient pagan fears of nature. “Throughout history, our ancestors were persuaded that the forces of nature obeyed the gods, and that these were the mistakes which made them angry, which appeared then by natural disordered states. For a very long time, it was believed that the gods could be appeased by human and animal sacrifices. Science taught us that that was not founded, and here that this old antiquated belief re-appears with a found vitality, and who in more is pressed on the scientists in the name of science,” he explained. (translated) ([LINK](#))

James Woudhuysen, a professor of Forecasting and Innovation at De Montfort University in Britain, critiqued the environmental movement from a liberal perspective. “Science seems to have become the Great Dictator, and no dissent can be allowed. We refer to this as the New Scientism. We call it new to distinguish it from the old sort - the sort that, ironically enough, was organised by US imperialism in the Cold War,” Woudhuysen wrote on February 5, 2007. “As with the original Cold War scientism, the New Scientism perverts objective science towards questionable political ends,” he wrote. “Ironically, greens now rehabilitate the Cold War scientism of RAND, which they affect to hate so much, so as to

legitimise not the Cold War, but today's war on personal behaviour - the war to colonise people's minds, make them internalise green mores, and make them spend all their time buying (and repairing) windmills, sorting their rubbish, and turning off their consumer electronics equipment. Instead of rationing access to fallout shelters, David Miliband wants a nationwide scheme to ration carbon," he added. Woudhuysen also mocked the UN IPCC's claims of "consensus." "Some have used the IPCC summary to assert that the debate on climate change is over. In part, this stems from the proclamations of the IPCC itself and its supporters. For example, Achim Steiner said that 2 February, the day the summary was published, would be 'remembered as the day the question mark was removed'. Anyone interested in genuine scientific inquiry, not to mention political debate, should always be concerned when question marks are removed," Woudhuysen wrote. "The heart of the problem with today's supposed consensus on climate science is not so much a false claim to knowledge of how climate works, as an assertion that such knowledge can tell us how to live our lives. In this sense, the real consensus on climate change today is more political than scientific. It is a consensus that privileges emotional fears of loss, and which is based on apocalyptic thinking and doubt about humanity's achievements and capabilities," he added. ([LINK](#))

Geologist Peter Sciaky who has served as a chief geologist for companies and written scientific reports, declared himself a skeptic of man-made climate change in 2007.

"Among all my liberal and leftist friends (and I am certainly one of those), I know not a one who does not accept that global warming is an event caused by mankind. I do not know one geologist who believes that global warming is not taking place. I do not know a single geologist who believes that it is a man-made phenomenon," Sciaky wrote in a June 9, 2007 article at CounterPunch.org. "A geologist has a much longer perspective. There are several salient points about our earth that the greenhouse theorists overlook (or are not aware). The first of these is that the planet has never been this cool," Sciaky wrote. "There is abundant fossil evidence to support this--from plants of the monocot order (such as palm trees) in the rocks of Cretaceous Age in Greenland and warm water fossil in sedimentary rocks of the far north. This is hardly the first warming period in the earth's history. The present global warming is hardly unique. It is arriving pretty much 'on schedule.' One thing, for sure, is that the environmental community has always spurned any input from geologists (many of whom are employed by the petroleum industry)," Sciaky wrote. "There are hundreds of reasons--political, pragmatic and economic, health and environmental--for cleaning up our environment, for conservation of energy, for developing alternate fuels, cleaning up our nuclear program, etc. Global warming is not one of them," he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Marine Biologist Daniel Botkin, President of the Center for the Study of the Environment and Professor Emeritus in the department of Ecology, Evolution, and Marine Biology at the University of California, authored the book *Discordant Harmonies: A New Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*. Botkin also dampened global warming fears in 2007. "Global warming doesn't matter except to the extent that it will affect life -- ours and that of all living things on Earth. And contrary to the latest news, the evidence that global warming will have serious effects on life is thin. Most evidence suggests the contrary," Botkin wrote in an October 17, 2007 op-ed in the *Wall Street Journal*. "Case in point: This year's United Nations report on climate change and other documents say that 20%-30% of plant and animal species will be threatened with extinction in this century due to global warming -- a truly terrifying thought. Yet, during the past 2.5 million years, a period that scientists now know experienced climatic changes as rapid and as warm as

modern climatological models suggest will happen to us, almost none of the millions of species on Earth went extinct,” Botkin explained. “We’re also warned that tropical diseases are going to spread, and that we can expect malaria and encephalitis epidemics. But scientific papers by Prof. Sarah Randolph of Oxford University show that temperature changes do not correlate well with changes in the distribution or frequency of these diseases; warming has not broadened their distribution and is highly unlikely to do so in the future, global warming or not,” he wrote. “I’m not a naysayer. I’m a scientist who believes in the scientific method and in what facts tell us. I have worked for 40 years to try to improve our environment and improve human life as well. I believe we can do this only from a basis in reality, and that is not what I see happening now. Instead, like fashions that took hold in the past and are eloquently analyzed in the classic 19th century book *Extraordinary Popular Delusions and the Madness of Crowds*, the popular imagination today appears to have been captured by beliefs that have little scientific basis,” he added. ([LINK](#))

[Nigel Calder](#), former editor of *New Scientist* and co-author with Physicist Henrik Svensmark of a new 2007 book entitled *The Chilling Stars: A New Theory of Climate Change*,” expressed his view that the UN rejects science it sees as “politically incorrect,” and accused the UN of denying that “climate history and related archeology give solid support to the solar hypothesis.” Calder wrote in a February 11, 2007 op-ed in the UK Times, “Twenty years ago, climate research became politicized in favor of one particular hypothesis, which redefined the subject as the study of the effect of greenhouse gases. As a result, the rebellious spirits essential for innovative and trustworthy science are greeted with impediments to their research careers.” Calder concluded, “Humility in face of Nature’s marvels seems more appropriate than arrogant assertions that we can forecast and even control a climate ruled by the sun and the stars.”

[Ivy League Geologist Dr. Robert Giegengack](#), the chair of Department of Earth and Environmental Science at the University of Pennsylvania, believes Gore’s understanding of climate science is so poor that he told his undergrad students at University of Pennsylvania in February 2007, “Every single one of you knows more about [global warming] than Al Gore.” According to the February 2007 edition of Philadelphia Magazine, the Ivy League professor Giegengack voted for Gore for president in 2000 and would probably vote for him again if given the opportunity. But Giegengack’s support of Gore faded when he examined the science presented in Gore’s film: “The glossy production [An Inconvenient Truth] is replete with inaccuracies and misrepresentations, and appeals to public fear as shamelessly as any other political statement that hopes to unite the public behind a particular ideology.” Giegengack, who holds both a master’s degree and a doctorate in geology, explained that the Earth has been warming for about 20,000 years, and humans have only been collecting data for about 200 years. “For most of Earth’s history, the globe has been warmer than it has been for the last 200 years. It has only rarely been cooler,” Giegengack said, noting that the colder periods included ice piled up two miles thick on what is now North America. According to the magazine, “Giegengack tells his students they might want to consider that ‘natural’ climatic temperature cycles control carbon dioxide levels, not the other way around. That’s the crux of his argument with Gore’s view of global warming - he says carbon dioxide doesn’t control global temperature, and certainly not in a direct, linear way.” “Sea level is rising,” Giegengack said. The article continued: “But, he explains, it’s been rising ever since warming set in 18,000 years ago. The rate of rise has been pretty slow - only about 400 feet so far. And recently - meaning in the thousands of years - the rate has slowed even more. The Earth’s global ocean level is only going up 1.8 millimeters per year. That’s less than the thickness of one nickel.

For the catastrophe of flooded cities and millions of refugees that Gore envisions, sea levels would have to rise about 20 feet.” Giegengack explains: “At the present rate of sea-level rise it’s going to take 3,500 years to get up there [to Gore’s predicted rise of 20 feet]. So if for some reason this warming process that melts ice is cutting loose and accelerating, sea level doesn’t know it. And sea level, we think, is the best indicator of global warming.” Finally, Giegengack concludes by rejecting the notion that we need to “save” the Earth. “There’s all this stuff about saving the planet. The Earth is fine. The Earth was fine before we got here, and it’ll be fine long after we’re gone.” **Giegengack’s colleague Professor Ed Dohoney** also critiqued former Vice President Al Gore’s climate science presentation. “[Gore’s] got his independent and dependent variables all mixed up,” Dohoney said according to an October 18, 2007 article in The Daily Pennsylvanian. Doheny also mocked Gore by stating, “I didn’t know they gave the Nobel Prize for acting.” ([LINK](#))

AccuWeather Chief Meteorologist Joe Bastardi questioned whether mankind was driving recent warming or whether it was “the pulsing of the sun” in an April 10, 2007 blog titled, “Does the Sun Have the Smoking Gun?” “People are concerned that 50 years from now it will be warm beyond a point of no return. My concern is almost opposite, that it’s cold and getting colder,” Bastardi, who specializes in long-range forecasts, wrote. “You see, the warmer it gets, the tougher it is to get warmer. There will always be a certain set point in a system and unless the amounts of water and land changes, it will try to get back to that set point. The oscillations of water temperatures can distort feedback from the Earth as I believe we are seeing now, and the dance between the tropics and non tropical areas as far as the weather goes is something that one can see in the [19]30s through the [19]50s, but at least to me disappears in the [19]60s through the [19]80s, or when the Pacific is in its warmer cycle, the Atlantic cooler,” Bastardi wrote. He rejected the idea that the CO2 climate connection was the only acceptable view in the climate change debate. “One has to understand that the force feeding of any idea with so many variables in a system is counter to methods long established to prove or disprove theories,” Bastardi explained.

Environmental scientist Dr. David W. Schnare, a senior enforcement counsel at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency who has managed EPA’s Office of Ground-Water and Drinking Water Economic, Legislative and Policy Analysis Branch, proclaimed his man-made climate skepticism in 2007. “When it comes to global warming, I’m a skeptic because the conclusions about the cause of the apparent warming stand on the shoulders of incredibly uncertain data and models,” Schnare wrote on August 10, 2007. “I ‘m a Ph.D. environmental scientist. As a scientist, from time-to-time I must also be a skeptic. It’s in the nature of the job,” he wrote. “The fundamental data set on which the international community has based its models has been challenged and the keepers of the data have had to downward adjust their numbers, the first of several downward adjustments, apparently,” Schnare explained. “As a policy matter, one has to be less willing to take extreme actions when data are highly uncertain. So, for this reason alone, I’m also skeptical about governmental responses,” he added. ([LINK](#))

[Environmental Economist and global warming co-author Dennis Avery's 2006 book, Unstoppable Global Warming: Every 1500 Years](#), details the solar-climate link using hundreds of studies from peer reviewed literature and “shows the earth’s temperatures following variations in solar intensity through centuries of sunspot records, and finds cycles of sun-linked isotopes in ice and tree rings.” “Past climate warmings haven’t correlated with CO2 changes. The Antarctic ice cores show that after the last four Ice Ages, the temperatures warmed 800 years

before the CO2 levels increased in the atmosphere. The warming produced more CO2 in the atmosphere, not the other way around,” said co-author Avery in an April 6, 2007 op-ed. ([LINK](#)) Avery also noted that “70% of the warming we have had since 1850 occurred before 1940 and 80% of the human emitted CO2 occurred after 1940, which tells me that the warming before 1940 was by natural cycle. The warming since 1940 -- 2/10 of a degree Celsius -- I will give Al Gore 1/10 [of a degree Celsius], that is all I can give him (for a human contribution to warming) and I don’t think that’s enough to frighten my school children,” Avery said in an April 28, 2007 CBS Chicago TV special “The Truth About Global Warming.” ([LINK](#)) Avery also explained in an April 25, 2007 op-ed, “We’ve had no warming at all since 1998.” “Remember, too, that each added unit of CO2 has less impact on the climate. The first 40 parts per million (ppm) of human-emitted CO2 added to the atmosphere in the 1940s had as much climate impact as the next 360 ppm,” he added. ([LINK](#))

Aeronautical engineer Eduardo Ferreyra, president and founder of the Argentinean Foundation for a Scientific Ecology, questioned man-made climate fears in 2007. “Wasn’t warming supposed to be ‘global’? As our records shows, Argentina has been cooling since 10 years ago, and the central part of the country since 1987. As Hadley Center’s recently published data shows, the Southern Hemisphere temperatures have been decreasing for the last seven years,” Ferreyra wrote in the *New York Times* blog Dot Earth on December 18, 2007. “2007 has seen media temperatures steadily 2° to 4°C lower than normal average, and our present summer shows a December with a decreasing trend,” Ferreyra explained. “Cold Antarctic Polar Fronts have increased in intensity and frequency. Late frosts as the November 14th, 2007 one caused a 50-80% loss in wheat, corn, and barley crops in the humid Pampas. Similar abnormal cold weather was observed in the rest of South America, South Africa, New Zealand and big areas in Australia. So, where is global warming? Or these are just natural variations (when it is cooling) but when there is a slight increase in temperature then it is human induced “global warming”?” Ferreyra wrote. ([LINK](#)) & ([LINK](#))

Climatologist Brian Fuchs of the National Drought Mitigation Center at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln said in February 2007 that it was “up in the air” how long the current warming trend would continue. Fuchs also replied “probably not” when asked if human emissions are solely to blame for global warming. ([LINK](#))

Meteorologist Robert Cohen, a member of the American Meteorological Society who also has a Masters in physical oceanography, called the UN IPCC process “scientific socialism” on March 5, 2007 and declared that the “idea of a consensus in the meteorological community is false.” “Research has also shown that slight changes in energy from the sun can significantly affect the earth, particularly in terms of clouds, which are a weak link in the global warming models. The level and amount of cloud can determine whether temperatures will warm as the cloud layer limits heat dissipation to space or whether temperatures will cool as the sun’s incoming energy is reflected back to space before reaching the Earth’s surface,” he wrote. “I do not agree with all of the IPCC conclusions and know through peer discussions that the idea of a consensus in the meteorological community is false,” Cohen said. He added: “Is it worth destroying our economy and lifestyle based on an unproven theory which does not correlate with historical observations?” ([LINK](#)) “Much of the ‘proof’ of agw (anthropogenic global warming) is based on models that can not recreate the historical record. There is a wealth of observations that disprove these models, but that is ignored in the media,” he wrote on August 13, 2007.

Dr. Paul Reiter, a malaria expert formerly of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and professor of entomology and tropical disease with the Pasteur Institute in Paris, participated in the UN IPCC process and now calls the concept of consensus on global warming a “sham.” Professor Reiter, an expert in malaria, had to threaten legal action to have his name removed from the IPCC. “That is how they make it seem that all the top scientists are agreed,” he said on March 5, 2007. “It’s not true.” Reiter has written more than 30 papers in peer-reviewed journals. ([LINK](#)) Reiter also wrote on January 11, 2007: “For years, the public has been fed a lousy diet of climate doom and gloom, cooked and served by alarmists who use the language of science to push their agenda. Now, every politician of every stripe must embrace the ‘climate consensus’ or be branded a callous skeptic. For twelve years, my colleagues and I have protested against the unsubstantiated claims that climate change is causing the disease [of malaria] to spread. We have failed miserably to alter the situation. Recently, the Associated Press quoted an entomologist who claimed there is an unprecedented outbreak of malaria in Karatina, Kenya, at 1,868 meters (6,130 feet). The heart-rending article began: ‘The soft cries of children broke the morning stillness, as parents brought them into the hillside hospital, one by one ... drained by a disease once unknown in the high country of Kenya.’ But there is nothing new about malaria in Karatina. Between World War I and the 1950s, there were ten disastrous epidemics in the region, and they extended much higher into these hills,” Reiter wrote. “We have done the studies and challenged the alarmists - but they continue to ignore the facts, and perpetuate the lies,” he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Lord Christopher Monckton, the Viscount Monckton of Brenchley, a climate researcher, found 31 errors and exaggerations in the UN IPCC 4th assessment summary in February 2007. The IPCC quietly made the corrections without public admission of guilt, according to Lord Christopher Monckton. “The UN has still not corrected or apologized for the ‘hockey-stick,’ by which it falsely abolished the Mediaeval Warm Period, when temperatures were 2 or 3C warmer than today, and disaster failed to ensue. But it has been forced to correct several schoolboy howlers - though it has not had the honesty to announce publicly and clearly that it has done so,” Monckton said in March 2007. Monckton echoed UK Lord Nigel Lawson’s call that the IPCC be disbanded. “It is too politicized and too incompetent to serve any useful purpose,” Monckton said. ([LINK](#))

Soil scientist Don Barron presented his research in Minnesota on March 13, 2007 that details his view that global warming is natural and not driven by anthropogenic emissions. Barron cited numerous scientific studies and concluded by asking, “Global warming or Gospel by Gore? You decide.” ([LINK](#))

Former Colorado State Climatologist Dr. Roger Pielke, Sr., presently senior scientist at the University of Colorado in Boulder, chastised the news media for promoting the idea that the UN IPCC Summary for Policymakers is written by the scientists. “The media is in error when it states that, ‘The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change -made up of thousands of scientists from around the world - reported earlier this month they are more certain than ever that humans are heating earth’s atmosphere through the burning of fossil fuels...,’” Pielke, Sr. wrote on March 9, 2007. “Are there really ‘thousands of scientists’ who wrote this report? Hardly. The IPCC is actually led and written by just a few dozen scientists,” Pielke Sr. added. ([LINK](#)) Pielke, Sr. believes land use changes play a key role in impacting temperatures and believes the IPCC fails to recognize this factor. “In terms of climate change and variability on the regional and local scale, the IPCC Reports, the CCSP Report on surface and

tropospheric temperature trends, and the U.S. National Assessment have overstated the role of the radiative effect of the anthropogenic increase of CO₂ relative to the role of the diversity of other human climate forcing on global warming, and more generally, on climate variability and change,” Pielke, Sr.’s blog states on the “Main Conclusions” page. ([LINK](#)) In a May 10, 2007 blog post, Pielke wrote that the UN was “disingenuous” with many of their claims. “Since about 2002 there has been NO statistically significant global average warming in the lower and middle troposphere and since about 1995 there has been NO statistically significant cooling in the stratosphere. The IPCC SPM conclusion that ‘warming of the climate system is unequivocal’ is wrong as it ignores the lack of such warming in recent years by these other metrics of climate system heat changes,” Pielke explained. “Perhaps global warming will begin again. However, the neglect to include the recent lack of tropospheric warming and stratospheric cooling (both of which are predicted to continue quasi-linearly for the coming decades by the multi-decadal global climate models, except for major volcanic eruptions) results in a seriously biased report by the IPCC. It has been disappointing that the media so far has chosen to parrot the statements in the IPCC SPMs rather than do investigative reporting on these issues,” he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Meteorologist Bill Steffen of Grand Rapids, Michigan noted that CO₂ is not the only factor to consider in climate change. “There are at least several causes of recent ‘global warming’ . Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) gets most of the attention, but there are other factors. A minor effect is the lack of a substantial volcano in recent years. The last volcano to pump a lot of dirt into the upper atmosphere was Mt. Pinatubo in the Philippines in 1991,” Steffen wrote in a January 28, 2007 blog post. ([LINK](#))

Mathematician David Orrell dismissed long-term climate models as unreliable. “The track record of any kind of long-distance prediction is really bad, but everyone’s still really interested in it. It’s sort of a way of picturing the future. But we can’t make long-term predictions of the economy, and we can’t make long-term predictions of the climate,” Orrell said in an April 3, 2007 article in Canada’s National Post. The National Post article explained Orrell’s views: “And so scientists use theoretical concepts like ‘flux adjustments’ to make the models agree with reality. When models about the future climate are in agreement, ‘it says more about the self-regulating group psychology of the modeling community than it does about global warming and the economy.’” ([LINK](#))

Biochemistry researcher Dr. Thomas Lavin, who is a physician who holds patents regarding physical, chemical, and biological sciences and has conducted peer-reviewed research and experiments, expressed climate skepticism in 2007. “I first published a peer reviewed paper in 1981, and have been looking at data for 30 years,” Lavin wrote to EPW on December 13, 2007. “I am somebody who has designed experiments and looked at data. And if you simply freeze Al Gore’s movie when he introduces the CO₂ and temperature relationship through geologic time, and look at the graph, the temperature goes up before the CO₂ in every one of the six or seven elevations recorded geologically. And this time gap is on the order of a few hundred years,” Lavin explained. “Add this to the NASA temperature revision [making 1934 the hottest year in the U.S.] and then add that many of the climate models which predict doom use the old, unrevised NASA data, and you have total garbage in/ garbage out,” he wrote. “Before we start regulating who gets to build a factory, and who gets to fly on a private jet, or drive to work, I think the data has to be real and convincing,” he added. “This episode in history I think will go down as marking the reverse of Galileo and Copernicus, the end of the Age of Reason, and it’s frightening,” Lavin concluded.

Australian engineer Dr. Peter Harris authored an August 20, 2007 paper entitled “Probability of Sudden Global Cooling.” The study Harris authored found that “the data... clearly shows the nominal 100KY cycle for glaciation and the interglacial phases and it shows that we have reached the end of the typical interglacial cycle and are due for a sudden cooling climate change. Based on this analysis we can say that there is a probability of 94% of imminent global cooling and the beginning of the coming ice age.” He added, “By observation of a number of natural internal processes we can find further support for the coming change and I have referred before to the confirmed slowdown of the Gulf Stream, the effect of major endothermic polar ice melt and forecast reduction in solar activity after 70 years of extreme activity not seen for 8000 years before. The Stratosphere is cooling and ice is building on the South Pole. Climate is becoming unstable. Most of these major natural processes that we are witnessing now are interdependent and occur at the end of each interglacial period, ultimately causing sudden long term cooling.” ([LINK](#))

French scientist Vincent Courtillot is the director of the Institute de Physique du Globe de Paris, a member of the Academy of Sciences, a geomagnetism scientist, and president of the Geomagnetism and Paleomagnetism Section of the American Geophysical Union. Courtillot is also a climate skeptic. Courtillot joined his fellow colleagues at the French Academy of Sciences in a scientific debate. Courtillot explained in an October 15, 2007 article in *Le Figaro* that “it is important that [climate skeptics] can express themselves.” Courtillot represented the skeptical arguments along with geophysicist **Louis Le Mouël of the Institute de Physique du Globe de Paris. Claude Allègre, prominent climate skeptic, French Socialist, and award winning geophysicist also supported the skeptics’ team.** The article, titled “Climate: Polemic Between Academics” in *Le Figaro* reported, “Louis Le Mouël represented the path of ‘skeptics,’ highlighting the role of variations in activity of the sun, volcanism, cosmic rays or magnetism, rather than changes in CO2 of human origin, to explain variations in temperature.” ([LINK](#))

Frederic Fluteau, a geomagnetism scientist with the Institute de Physique du Globe de Paris, co-authored a paper published on January 30, 2007 in the *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*. The paper, co-authored with geomagnetism scientist Yves Gallet and scientist Agnes Genevey of the Centre de Research at the Restauration des Musées, found, “Much of the observed increase in global surface temperature over the past 150 years occurred prior to the 1940s and after the 1980s. The main causes invoked are solar variability, changes in atmospheric greenhouse gas content or sulfur due to natural or anthropogenic action, or internal variability of the coupled ocean-atmosphere system.” The paper also found that “a proposed mechanism involves variations in the geometry of the geomagnetic field (f.i. tilt of the dipole to lower latitudes), resulting in enhanced cosmic-ray induced nucleation of clouds. No forcing factor, be it changes in CO2 concentration in the atmosphere or changes in cosmic ray flux modulated by solar activity and geomagnetism, or possibly other factors, can at present be neglected or shown to be the overwhelming single driver of climate change in past centuries.” Le Mouël also served as one of the co-authors. ([LINK](#))

Meteorologist Jesse Ferrell of AccuWeather praised the new skeptical UK documentary *The Great Global Warming Swindle* in an April 2, 2007 blog post. “I will say that this movie has blown the entire [climate] debate open again, or should,” Ferrell wrote. “Many people have made up their minds without seeing or hearing all the evidence. If you’ve seen Al Gore’s *An Inconvenient Truth* then you should take the time to watch *The Great Global Warming Swindle*,” he added. ([LINK](#))

The New Zealand Climate Science Coalition released seven “pillars of wisdom” to counter the UN IPCC climate report. As detailed in the Dominion Post on April 5, 2007, the coalition of prominent scientific skeptics includes: **Dr. Vincent Gray, an expert reviewer for the IPCC and most recently a visiting scholar at the Beijing Climate Centre; Dr Gerrit van der Lingen, a geologist and paleoclimatologist and former director of Geoscience Research and Investigations New Zealand; Professor Augie Auer (deceased June 2007) of Auckland, past professor of atmospheric science, University of Wyoming, and previously MetService chief meteorologist; Professor Bob Carter, a New Zealand-trained geologist with extensive research experience in palaeoclimatology, now at the Marine Geophysical Laboratory, James Cook University, Townsville; Warwick Hughes, a New Zealand earth scientist living in Perth; and Roger Dewhurst, of Katikati, a consulting environmental geologist and hydrogeologist.**

The seven “pillars of wisdom” are:

1. Over the past few thousand years, the climate in many parts of the world has been warmer and cooler than it is now. Civilizations and cultures flourished in the warmer periods.
2. A major driver of climate change is variability in solar effects, such as sunspot cycles, the sun’s magnetic field and solar particles.

These may account in great part for climate change during the past century. Evidence suggests warming involving increased carbon dioxide exerts only a minor influence.

3. Since 1998, global temperature has not increased. Projection of solar cycles suggests that cooling could set in and continue to about 2030.
4. Most recent climate and weather events are not unusual; they occur regularly.

For example, in the 1930s the Arctic experienced higher temperatures and had less ice than now.

5. Stories of impending climate disaster are based almost entirely on global climate models.

Not one of these models has shown that it can reliably predict future climate.

6. The Kyoto Protocol, if fully implemented, would make no measurable difference to world temperatures.

The trillions of dollars that it will cost would be far better spent on solving known problems such as the provision of clean water, reducing air pollution, and fighting malaria and Aids.

7. Climate is constantly changing and the future will include coolings, warmings, floods, droughts, and storms.

The best policy is to make sure we have in place disaster response plans that can deal with weather extremes and can react adaptively to longer-term climate cooling and warming trends. ([LINK](#))

#

Emeritus Professor Lance Endersbee, a former dean of engineering and pro-vice

chancellor at Monash University, accused the scientific leaders of trying to stifle debate over the causes of climate change. ([LINK](#)) According to a April 5, 2007 article in the Sydney Morning Herald, Professor Endersbee says it is highly probable that increased electromagnetic radiation of the sun is behind global warming. “There are several disturbing aspects of the IPCC report which indicate that the conclusions are based on serious misconceptions about the behavior of the Earth,” Prof Endersbee said. “The report reflects little understanding of the dynamic relation between the Earth, the Sun and the Cosmos. In these circumstances it is incredible that some leaders of scientific societies and academies have tried to use their authority to demand acceptance of the IPCC report,” Endersbee added. In a follow-up interview on July 6, 2007 on Australia’s ABC Western Queensland’s Morning Program, Endersbee explained the earth is an electrical conductor moving through the magnetic flux of the sun. “So we have these electric currents being created within the earth in response to the electro-magnetic radiation of the sun and that is the main driver of climate change on earth - it’s not man,” he explained. Endersbee believes that the world has been warming naturally due to this increased magnetic flow from the sun that started around the year 1700. “And now we’re starting to depict that it seems to be reaching an end of that cycle and it does seem as though the earth may be cooling down,” he said. Endersbee also said carbon trading schemes were being set up by governments for political reasons, not scientific reasons. “What terrifies me is the way the state governments in Australia [with] their emissions trading are contemplating using the superannuation funds to invest in carbon trading - they’re going to lose their money!” He further explained, “Scholarship is being driven by media and media attention and this is a terrifying state of affairs. You can get all the money in the world if the research you’re doing is related to climate change... if you say climate change isn’t caused by man it’s caused by the sun, it doesn’t get any money at all.” ([LINK](#))

Mathematical researcher Douglas J. Keenan, a former Morgan Stanley employee and current independent mathematical researcher, who has authored numerous peer-reviewed studies, accused the UN of “fabrications” and “discovered that the sources used by the Intergovernmental Panel for Climate Change (IPCC) have disregarded the positions of weather stations.” Keenan accused the UN of “intentionally using outdated data on China from 1991 and ignoring revised data on the country from 1997.” ([LINK](#)) “One of the big problems in global warming studies, and in science generally, is that research data is often not available to outsiders. Instead, researchers tend to hoard the data for themselves and their friends (who are reluctant to be critical),” Keenan on April 4, 2007. ([LINK](#)) Keenan wrote in a March 28, 2007 blog, “The problems with the peer review process have implications for our understanding of global warming (as well as for science generally). Once something has been published in a peer-reviewed journal-particularly a prestigious journal-it tends to be considered as established, possibly even heralded as ‘truth’. This means that other researchers will often rely on its conclusions, with little, if any, further checking. The extent to which this happens varies among different branches of science. It seems to be especially so in the study of global warming.” Keenan continued, “The primary body tasked with advising government policy makers about global warming is the IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change). Policy makers generally regard the IPCC as authoritative. The IPCC bases its analyses on peer-reviewed research, but it does no checking of that research itself. Yet most peer-reviewed research is not properly checked prior to its publication. In other words, most of the research that is relied upon by the IPCC, and thus government policy makers, has never been properly checked. That probably seems incredible; it is unfortunately true.” ([LINK](#))

Chief Meteorologist Craig James, of a Michigan NBC TV affiliate, questions the computer

model predictions of climate doom. James, who was elected a fellow of the American Meteorological Society for outstanding contribution to the atmospheric sciences, wrote in a February 14, 2007 blog post, “It seems to make sense, CO2 is a greenhouse gas and if the amount of CO2 in the atmosphere increases, the temperature should increase. Unfortunately, it is not that simple. If CO2 was the only thing that changed and there were no other what are called ‘forcings’ and ‘feedbacks’, then maybe it would be simple.” “It seems to me there is plenty of room for skepticism about the scenarios painted by the models based on purely scientific grounds. Anyone who takes the time and effort to study the issue would not make the incredible statement that skeptics are on a par with ‘Holocaust Deniers’ as Ellen Goodman did in a Boston Globe [article](#) a couple of weeks ago,” James wrote. According to James, computer models do not include volcanoes, which cool the atmosphere, and “the models do not properly account for the role clouds may play in a warmer world. We don’t clearly understand whether they produce a positive or negative feedback (additional warming or cooling).” ([LINK](#)) James probed the heart of the argument for man-made global warming when he asked in a June 4, 2007 blog, “Is it good science to never once mention the problems with the General Circulation Models (GCMs)?” “The rationale seems to be that the models produce the kind of warming we see only when you include an increasing amount of CO2 into the atmosphere. The warming cannot be reproduced by natural processes alone in the models. That’s because the models do not handle those natural processes correctly. They either don’t include or are woefully inadequate in their handling of major climate forcings such as the Pacific Decadal Oscillation, the Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation, El Nino, La Nina, water vapor, cloud feedbacks, etc. This is one case where getting the answer you are looking for in the models occurs for the wrong reason. There may have to be a snowstorm in Miami before it is no longer politically incorrect to say such a thing in public. Actually, the snowstorm would probably be blamed on global warming too,” he explained. ([LINK](#)) James also wrote a blog post detailing how the IPCC downplays cold weather is a bigger killer than hot weather. James’s April 4, 2007 blog was titled “Heat and Cold Related Deaths.” “[This paper](#) from WebMD states: ‘Cold-related deaths are far more numerous than heat-related deaths in the United States, Europe, and almost all countries outside the tropics,’ James wrote. ([LINK](#)) James summed up his view in a May 28, 2007 blog: “The more I study this subject and become increasingly aware of the failings of the computer models, the more I think you can trust the Old Farmer’s Almanac on what next year’s winter will be like more than you can trust the climate models.” ([LINK](#))

Prize-winning Geologist Dr. Ian Plimer, a professor of Earth and Environmental Sciences at the University of Adelaide in Australia, rejected alarmist views of climate science in an article in the *Sydney Morning Herald* on April 6, 2007. “The Earth’s temperature rose by 0.7 per cent in the 20th century, but there was also an increase in piracy. Does that mean piracy causes global warming?” Plimer asked. “There is new work emerging even in the last few weeks that shows we can have a very close correlation between the temperatures of the Earth and supernova and solar radiation. What if global warming has nothing to do with human activity? What happens if the astronomers are right, and the world is actually entering a cooling period?” Plimer questioned. “We geologists have seen climate change for 4500 million years. Tell us something new,” he added. ([LINK](#))

Meteorologist Jim Clark declared he did not agree with what has been labeled the “consensus” view on global warming in a March 30, 2007 radio interview. Clark, an on-air weather forecaster since 1983, said, “The amount of human impact on climate change seems to be pretty small and seems very unlikely to be a disaster.” “Climate is something that has

always been changing on the planet. It fluctuates, it goes up and down. I have always thought of climate that is not homeostasis. So much of the current debate, it just strikes me as very odd, especially in the popular media where the headlines screamed the debate is over. Well, there never was a debate about whether the globe was warming. The real debate has always been the amount of the human effect on the climate,” Clark said. ([LINK](#))

Indur M Goklany, Ph.D, who has represented the United States at the International Panel on Climate Change and in the negotiations leading to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, also scrutinized the UN’s IPCC Summary for Policymakers (SPM) released in 2007. “Once one gets past the opaque verbiage of the SPM, it is clear that most of the negative impacts listed in the SPM are overstated, while the positive impacts are understated,” Goklany noted in an April 9, 2007 critique. ([LINK](#)) Goklany managed the US Environmental Protection Agency’s fledgling emissions-trading program in the 1980s. “These [IPCC] studies estimate impacts for 2085 using technologies from the 1990s or earlier. This is like estimating today’s food production and levels of hunger using technologies from the 1910s! You are bound to underestimate food production and overestimate hunger. In developing countries prevalence of chronic hunger declined from 37% to 17% between 1970 and 2001, despite an 83% increase in population, in substantial part because of new technologies,” Goklany added. “Similarly, human health impacts are often estimated assuming that adaptive capacities are fixed as of the start date of the analysis. Under such a methodology the mortality and morbidity rates from water related diseases in the U.S., for example, would be the same in 2000 as in 1900. But in fact, these rates have declined by 99% or more during the 20th century for disease such as typhoid, paratyphoid, dysentery, malaria, etc.,” Goklany noted.

Global warming author and economist Dr. Thomas Gale Moore is a former professor at Michigan State University, a senior fellow at the Hoover Institute, and author of the book *Climate of Fear: Why We Shouldn’t Worry about Global Warming*. “I don’t argue that we’re having global warming, but I find the effects are going to be small,” Moore said according to the September/October 2005 issue of *Stanford Magazine*. The article explained that Moore “insists that Americans in particular will benefit from a warmer climate in many ways, including longer growing seasons and reduced heating costs.” ([LINK](#))

Meteorologist Joseph Conklin launched a skeptical website called Climatepolice.com on February 25, 2007. “The goal of the website is to show the public that other research on climate change exists and the debate is not over,” Conklin said. Conklin, who specializes in analysis of surface weather observations, also operates NiceWeather.com, a website specializing in monthly weather forecasts. “Scientific research should be apolitical. Extremist groups have promoted global warming as their primary political issue. I want this website to help correct that,” Conklin added. ([LINK](#)) On August 10, 2007 Conklin wrote: “A few months ago, a study came out that demonstrated global temperatures have leveled off. But instead of possibly admitting that this whole global warming thing is a farce, a group of British scientists concluded that the real global warming won’t start until 2009.” ([LINK](#))

Dr. David Wojick is a UN IPCC expert reviewer, who earned his PhD in Philosophy of Science and co-founded the Department of Engineering and Public Policy at Carnegie-Mellon University. “In point of fact, the hypothesis that solar variability and not human activity is warming the oceans goes a long way to explain the puzzling idea that the Earth’s surface may be warming while the atmosphere is not. The GHG (greenhouse gas) hypothesis

does not do this,” Wojick, who specializes in mathematical logic, wrote in a May 2, 2005 commentary. “The public is not well served by this constant drumbeat of false alarms fed by computer models manipulated by advocates,” he explained. ([LINK](#))

Oxford-educated economist Tony Gilland is the science and society director of the UK based Institute of Ideas. Gilland, who initiated the UK’s Science Education Project, declared the debate about global warming far from over in 2007 and lamented the UN’s politicization. “The UN’s all-powerful climate change panel is no straightforward scientific body. It is a deeply political organization that was born out of disenchantment with progress,” Gilland wrote in a June 28, 2007 essay. “The IPCC, an unelected body, holds an unprecedented influence on the lives of everyone on the planet - and any attempt to question this body’s legitimacy or actions is shouted down as ‘denial’ of the scientific facts,” he explained. “It is striking how many in the scientific community have become extremely intolerant of dissent,” Gilland added. “The way in which politicians, the media and civil society have come to hang on the latest pronouncements of the IPCC demonstrates how this political failure has allowed a scientific conceptualization of a political problem to become institutionalized across the globe, to the point where conceiving of it differently has become almost unimaginable,” he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Analytical chemist Hans Schreuder who publishes the UK based website ILoveMyCarbonDioxide.com, rejected man-made global warming fears in 2007. “Any and all arguments put forward by the perceived consensus of scientists who still have their names engraved on the IPCC report are based on nothing more than theory and best fit computer modeling. Normally varying weather patterns are ‘blamed’ on AGW (anthropogenic global warming) without any scientific basis and for the sole purpose of scaremongering a gullible public,” Schreuder wrote on December 10, 2007. Schreuder also asserted that “ALL ‘proof’ is based on theories and computer models, not actual direct evidence - cause there ain’t none. ALL the records from the past show clearly that CO2 did NOTHING to ‘drive’ or ‘force’ any temperature changes. If it did, we would be as hot as hell by now and no life would be possible.” ([LINK](#)) & ([LINK](#))

Russian scientist Dr. Oleg Sorochtin of the Institute of Oceanology at the Russian Academy of Sciences has authored more than 300 studies, nine books, and a 2006 paper titled “The Evolution and the Prediction of Global Climate Changes on Earth.” Sorochtin, who has made several Antarctic expeditions, rejected man-made climate fears in 2007. “The temperature increase has a pronounced natural origin and is not determined by the ‘greenhouse effect’ of greenhouse gases,” Sorochtin wrote in an essay on October 9, 2007 in *Ria Novosti*. (translated) “Even if the concentration of ‘greenhouse gases’ double man would not perceive the temperature impact,” Sorochtin wrote. “The real causes of climate change lie in the unevenness of the sun’s radiation, in the precession (amendment of the rotational axis) of the earth, in the instability of the ocean currents in the periodic desalination and salinity of surface waters of the Arctic Sea and the other. The main causes of which are the solar activity and the luminosity. The higher these parameters, the higher the temperature,” Sorochtin wrote. “The highest point of the warming has already occurred,” he wrote. “The low point phase of solar activity, with a sharp decline in temperature will be accompanied; against the year 2041 is expected. The cool climate is at least 50 to 60 years,” he added. ([LINK](#))

Climate change author and engineer Rolf Riehm of Germany wrote the 2007 book

skeptical of man-made global warming titled *Is the climatic Change inevitable? - About the Environmental Hypocrisy*. “Allegedly the temperature of the earth has risen during the past 20 years by about 0.6° C. And carbon dioxide is claimed to be the reason for it. In reality it is not possible to measure the temperature of the earth: One would have to define before in what region, one would have to say if we compare at night or during day-time. If in summer or in winter. If we measure in the Antarctic or in the Sahara!” Riehm wrote in his book. “In reality climate changes occur in cycles of several 1000 years,” he added. Riehm also critiqued former Vice President Al Gore. “Gore has no knowledge of the laws of science. But this does not prevent him from making hundreds of false statements. He showed terrific trick films of the rise of the sea water level and showed how dozens of major towns drowned in the floods,” Riehm wrote.

State of Florida Climatologist Dr. Jim O’Brien, professor emeritus of Florida State University, and who serves as the director of the Center for Ocean-Atmospheric Prediction Studies, critiqued the *Associated Press* for hyping climate fears. “The best measurements of sea level rise are from satellite instrument called altimeters. Currently they measure 14 inches in 100 years. Everyone agrees that there is no acceleration. Even the UN IPCC quotes this,” O’Brien wrote to EPW on September 23 about an *AP* article predicting dire sea level rise. “If you increase the rate of rise by four times, it will take 146 years to rise to five feet. Sea level rise is the ‘scare tactic’ for these guys,” O’Brien added. ([LINK](#))

IPCC reviewer and climate researcher and scientist Dr. Vincent Gray of New Zealand, an expert reviewer on every single draft of the IPCC reports going back to 1990 and author of *The Greenhouse Delusion: A Critique of “Climate Change 2001*, declared, “The claims of the IPCC are dangerous unscientific nonsense” in an April 10, 2007 article. Gray is also a member of The New Zealand Climate Science Coalition. “All [UN IPCC does] is make ‘projections’ and ‘estimates’. No climate model has ever been properly tested, which is what ‘validation’ means, and their ‘projections’ are nothing more than the opinions of ‘experts’ with a conflict of interest, because they are paid to produce the models. There is no actual scientific evidence for all these ‘projections’ and ‘estimates’. It should be obvious that they are ridiculous,” Gray noted. “Global temperatures have not been rising for eight years. New Zealand temperatures in the last 50 years have gone down with volcanoes and up with El Niños but have no signs of ‘warming’. Christchurch has not warmed since 1917. The sea level in Auckland has been much the same since 1960,” Gray added. ([LINK](#)) In a July 3, 2007 blog post, Gray further explained, “I have written many pages of comments on the various IPCC Reports and most of them have been ignored.” “The very few comments made by most of the reviewers suggest that there may be very few actual people who ever read the report itself all the way through except those who write it,” he added. “The [IPCC] ‘Summary for Policymakers’ might get a few readers, but the main purpose of the report is to provide a spurious scientific backup for the absurd claims of the worldwide environmentalist lobby that it has been established scientifically that increases in carbon dioxide are harmful to the climate. It just does not matter that this ain’t so,” he concluded. ([LINK](#)) In a May 28, 2007 letter to Canada’s *The Hill Times*, Gray noted how political the IPCC process has become. “[No one can] deny that the ‘Summary for Policymakers’ is approved line-by-line by the government representatives because the press has recently mentioned that particular conclusions have involved clashes between the Russians, Chinese and Americans. The ‘drafting authors’ job is to write down what they are told to do,” Gray wrote. “...The ‘lead authors’ of the report are all chosen (and usually financed) by government representatives, so they can be relied upon to produce results which the governments like. They do not want another fiasco like the

one in the 1995 report when they had to alter the 'final draft' to comply with the 'Summary for Policymakers.' They have a set of instructions for 'lead authors' which ensures that they toe the line. This year's report is more extreme than before and there is continuous publicity for its extravagant claims. The 'lead authors' are certainly behind this, but an increasing proportion of all the other scientists involved with the report are becoming irritated by the propaganda. It is interesting that this year we have had a succession of 'Summaries for Policymakers' without a single copy of any of the reports upon which they are supposed to be based," he concluded.

Former Harvard University Physicist Dr. Lubos Motl, a string theorist who is currently a professor at Charles University in the Czech Republic, challenged the premise of the CO2 driven climate cycles in a April 9, 2007 blog post. ([LINK](#)) "As we have explained in 2006, Vostok ice core records show that the carbon dioxide concentration averaged over a few centuries has been correlated with temperature at least for half a million of years. However, we know for sure that the temperature was the cause and the CO2 concentration was its consequence, not the other way around. It follows that the greenhouse effect hasn't been important in the last half a million of years," Motl wrote. "For whatever reason, some people are not willing to accept this obvious conclusion. That's why they invent various bizarre verbal constructs to circumvent the otherwise inevitable conclusion," Motl noted. "However, there are other ways to see that the influence of temperature on the concentration of gases has been more important than any influence in the opposite direction. For example, the ice core records show that the concentration of methane was correlated with temperature, too. If the CO2 concentration were the primary cause, we would have no explanation why the CH4 (Methane) concentration was also correlated. In fact, CO2 and CH4 play the very same role in the ice core records. If some combination of them determined the temperature, we would still have no explanation why these two concentrations were correlated with one another," Motl added. ([LINK](#))

Team of Scientists Question Validity of a 'Global Temperature' - From a March 18, 2007 article in *Science Daily*: "Discussions on global warming often refer to 'global temperature.' Yet the concept is thermodynamically as well as mathematically an impossibility, says **Physicist Dr. Bjarne Andresen**, a professor at The Niels Bohr Institute, University of Copenhagen, who has analyzed this topic in collaboration with **professors Christopher Essex from University of Western Ontario and Ross McKittrick from University of Guelph, Canada.**" The Science Daily article reads, "It is impossible to talk about a single temperature for something as complicated as the climate of Earth." "A temperature can be defined only for a homogeneous system. Furthermore, the climate is not governed by a single temperature. Rather, differences of temperatures drive the processes and create the storms, sea currents, thunder, etc. which make up the climate." He explains that while it is possible to treat temperature statistics locally, it is meaningless to talk about a global temperature for Earth. "The globe consists of a huge number of components which one cannot just add up and average. That would correspond to calculating the average phone number in the phone book. That is meaningless. Or talking about economics, it does make sense to compare the currency exchange rate of two countries, whereas there is no point in talking about an average 'global exchange rate.'" The article concludes, "These are but two examples of ways to calculate averages. They are all equally correct, but one needs a solid physical reason to choose one above another. Depending on the averaging method used, the same set of measured data can simultaneously show an upward trend and a downward trend in average temperature. Thus claims of disaster may be a consequence of which averaging method has been used, the

researchers point out.” ([LINK](#))

Geologist Dr. Don J. Easterbrook, Emeritus Professor at Western Washington University, chastised Gore for his scientific inaccuracies. “But there are a lot of inaccuracies in the statements we are seeing, and we have to temper that with real data,” Easterbrook said in a March 13, 2007 *New York Times* article. “[Easterbrook] hotly disputed Mr. Gore’s claim that ‘our civilization has never experienced any environmental shift remotely similar to this’ threatened change.

“Nonsense, Dr. Easterbrook told the crowded session. He flashed a slide that showed temperature trends for the past 15,000 years. It highlighted 10 large swings, including the medieval warm period. These shifts, he said, were up to ‘20 times greater than the warming in the past century.’ Getting personal, he mocked Mr. Gore’s assertion that scientists agreed on global warming except those industry had corrupted. ‘I’ve never been paid a nickel by an oil company,’ Dr. Easterbrook told the group,” the *Times* article explained. ([LINK](#)) Easterbrook rejects the notion that there is a “consensus” on global warming. “There are several hundred thousand scientists in the world. And the people who wrote the [UN IPCC] report that received a lot of publicity in February consisted of 33 policy makers, and the authorship of the entire IPCC report consists of 143 people. And that’s hardly representative of the entire meteorological world,” Easterbrook told Fox News Channel on March 13, 2007. “The validity of a scientific concept is not a matter of how many people vote for it or against it. It’s a matter of the evidence upon which it’s based. And the truth is there is no real tangible evidence of the connection between CO2 and global warming,” he added.

Paleoclimate expert Augusto Mangini of the University of Heidelberg in Germany, criticized the UN IPCC summary. “I consider the part of the IPCC report, which I can really judge as an expert, i.e. the reconstruction of the paleoclimate, wrong,” Mangini noted in an April 5, 2007 article.(translated) “The earth will not die. Our archives show clearly that it has often been warmer, in addition, there have been cooler periods, which occurred just as fast as the current warm phase,” Mangini said. “The statement that the heating up of the climate taking place now is comparable only with the heating up before 120,000 years is simply not correct. We have data, which show that there were periods which were similarly warm or even still warmer than today during the last ten thousand years,” Mangini said. ([LINK](#))

German climate scientist Dr. Hans von Storch, the Director of Institute for Coastal Research of the GKSS Research Centre, a professor at the Meteorological Institute of the University of Hamburg who focuses on climate diagnostics and statistical climatology, and has published 11 books. Storch believes human are influencing climate change, but feels the fear factor has been dramatically overplayed. “We should spend more time talking about adjusting to the inevitable and not about reducing CO2 emissions. We have to take away people’s fear of climate change,” Storch told the German publication *Der Spiegel* on March 16, 2007. Storch dismissed fears of mass deaths from future heat waves caused by global warming. “Such claims are completely idiotic and dubious. What they did was to simply perform an extrapolation based on the mortality rate during the exceptionally hot 2003 summer, which took everyone by surprise and for which we were therefore completely unprepared. But if higher summer temperatures become the norm in the future, people will adjust,” he explained. ([LINK](#)) Storch noted the limitations of science. “We climate researchers can only offer possible scenarios. In other words, things could end up being completely different. But there are undoubtedly parts of the world that will benefit on balance from climate change. Those areas tend to be in the north, where it has been cold and

uncomfortable in the past. But it's considered practically heretical to even raise such issues," he said.

Alabama State Climatologist Dr. John Christy of the University of Alabama in Huntsville and NASA, served as a UN IPCC lead author in 2001 for the 3rd assessment report and detailed how he witnessed scientists distorting the science. "I was at the table with three Europeans, and we were having lunch. And they were talking about their role as lead authors. And they were talking about how they were trying to make the report so dramatic that the United States would just have to sign that Kyoto Protocol," Christy told CNN on May 2, 2007. "One of the statements in the [IPCC Summary for Policymakers] SPM was the statement that, if you boil it down, it says we are 90 percent certain that most of the warming in the last 50 years was due to human effects. I don't agree with that. I think things are much more ambiguous," Christy said. Christy also dismissed Gore's warning of a 20 foot sea level rise to due future global warming. "To come up with 20 feet is really grasping at straws, I think, but it does make a dramatic image. It makes a startling announcement," Christy said. ([LINK](#)) Christy dismissed fears of man-made climate doom. "I don't see a catastrophe developing from our emissions into the air of what should be correctly identified as 'plant food,'" Christy wrote in a February 6, 2007 article. "The climate cannot be predictably managed with such [emission reduction] proposals given the uncertainty of natural variations. For example, to make a 10 percent dent in CO2 would require 1000 nuclear power plants and this would still not make a measurable difference on whatever the climate will do anyway," Christy explained. "I'm full of optimism about the continued growth of wealth and health around the world. This wealth will create cleaner environments even in countries where persistent poverty has destroyed too much habitat and fouled too many rivers," he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Meteorologist Brian van de Graaff attributed recent warming trends to natural variability. "History has taught us that weather patterns are cyclical and although we have noticed a warming pattern in recent time, I don't know what generalizations can be made from this with the lack of long-term scientific data," van de Graaff said in a December 2006 interview. Van de Graaff, who holds the prestigious Seal of Approval from the American Meteorological Society, also noted how global warming has turned into such a heated debate. "Often, it is so politicized and those on both sides don't always appear to have their facts straight," he said. ([LINK](#))

Meteorologist David Aldrich declared, "I am a global warming skeptic" in an April 9, 2007 blog post. "If you have had doubts, you have come to the right place," Aldrich wrote. "Although, I believe man plays a role in climate change through urbanization ("the heat island effect" & development), land use changes, and aerosols and gases -- natural factors are ALSO important, most notably the sun and ocean," Aldrich who is certified by both the American Meteorological Society and the National Weather Association, explained. ([LINK](#)) "There's a different side to what is causing climate change. I think too much emphasis has been put on CO2. I do not believe CO2 is a pollutant. I'm made of CO2, you're made of CO2 ... the ocean is a reservoir of CO2," Aldrich explained in a June 6, 2007 article in City Paper. ([LINK](#))

Renowned hurricane forecaster Dr. William Gray, Emeritus Professor of Atmospheric Science at Colorado State University (CSU), and head of the schools Tropical Meteorology Project, chastised former Vice President Al Gore as "a gross alarmist" in an April 6, 2007 Associated Press interview. "[Gore's] one of these guys that preaches the end-

of-the-world type of things. I think he's doing a great disservice and he doesn't know what he's talking about," Dr. Gray said. The AP article explained, "Gray believes a recent increase in strong hurricanes is not due to global warming but is part of a multi-decade trend of alternating busy and slow periods related to ocean circulation patterns." Gray believes current climate researchers rely too much on computer models. "Us older guys that were around in the pre-satellite, pre-computer age, we had to deal with the real weather. Most of these people don't forecast," he said. "They don't live in a real world. They're living in an imaginary world." ([LINK](#))

Physicist Dr. Freeman Dyson, Professor Emeritus of Physics at the Institute for Advanced Study, in Princeton, is a fellow of the American Physical Society, a member of the US National Academy of Sciences, and a fellow of the Royal Society of London.

Dyson called himself a "heretic" on global warming. "Concerning the climate models, I know enough of the details to be sure that they are unreliable. They are full of fudge factors that are fitted to the existing climate, so the models more or less agree with the observed data. But there is no reason to believe that the same fudge factors would give the right behavior in a world with different chemistry, for example in a world with increased CO₂ in the atmosphere." Dyson said in an April 10, 2007 interview. Dyson is also a fellow of the American Physical Society, a member of the US National Academy of Sciences, and a fellow of the Royal Society of London. ([LINK](#)) "The fuss about global warming is grossly exaggerated," Dyson also wrote in his 2007 book "Many Colored Glass: Reflections on the Place of Life in the Universe." Dyson focuses on debunking climate models predictions of climate doom: "They do not begin to describe the real world that we live in. The real world is muddy and messy and full of things that we do not yet understand. It is much easier for a scientist to sit in an air-conditioned building and run computer models, than to put on winter clothes and measure what is really happening outside in the swamps and the clouds. That is why the climate model experts end up believing their own models."

Paleoclimate scientist Dr. Bob Carter of Australia's James Cook University and former chairman of the earth science panel of the Australian Research Council, who has published numerous peer-reviewed papers, discredited the UN IPCC. "Many distinguished scientists refuse to participate in the IPCC process, and others have resigned from it, because in the end the advice that the panel provides to governments is political and not scientific. Although at least -\$50 billion has been spent on climate research, the science arguments for a dangerous human influence on global warming have, if anything, become weaker since the establishment of the IPCC in 1988," Carter wrote in an April 11, 2007 op-ed in the UK Telegraph. Carter, who has had over 100 papers published refereed scientific journals, continued, "For more than 90 per cent of recent geological time, the cores show that the earth has been colder than today. We modern humans are lucky to live towards the end of the most recent of the intermittent, and welcome, warm interludes. It is a 10,000 year-long period called the Holocene, during which our civilizations have evolved and flourished." "Similar cores through polar ice reveal, contrary to received wisdom, that past temperature changes were followed - not preceded, but followed - by changes in the atmospheric content of carbon dioxide. Yet the public now believes strongly that increasing human carbon dioxide emissions will cause runaway warming; it is surely a strange cause of climate change that naturally postdates its supposed effect?" he added. "So the evidence for dangerous global warming forced by human carbon dioxide emissions is extremely weak. That the satellite temperature record shows no substantial warming since 1978, and that even the ground-based thermometer statistic records no warming since 1998, indicates that a key line of circumstantial evidence

for human-caused change (the parallel rise in the late 20th century of both atmospheric carbon dioxide and surface temperature) is now negated,” Carter concluded. ([LINK](#)) Carter also wrote a June 18, 2007 op-ed detailing even more skepticism on climate fears. “Lower atmosphere satellite-based temperature measurements, if corrected for non-greenhouse influences such as El Niño events and large volcanic eruptions, show little if any global warming since 1979, a period over which atmospheric CO2 has increased by 55 ppm (17 per cent),” Carter wrote. “There are strong indications from solar studies that Earth’s current temperature stasis will be followed by climatic cooling over the next few decades,” he added. ([LINK](#))

Penn State Meteorologist Paul Knight, host and founder of the program “Weather World” expressed skepticism about man-made global warming in 2007. “We have to be very careful about using global temperatures. You have very few people who do it absolutely correctly,” Knight said in a April 20, 2007 interview. “I wish the climate system were simple. It is not. Listen to the facts. There is a fair bit we do not understand,” Knight said. The article continued, “The southern ice cap over Antarctica has actually gotten larger since the 1970s, Knight said. And the overall average temperature on the southern tundra has actually dropped a half degree Celsius over the last two decades. To understand global climate change, the sun must be taken into account, according to Knight. He said much of the warmer temperatures the earth has experienced may be attributed to longer sunspot cycles on the sun. Some scientists argue sunspots may actually make the sun’s powerful rays even stronger during cycles and may cause slightly higher temperatures on Earth.” <http://www.lancasterfarming.com/node/532>

Geophysicist Dr. David Deming, associate professor of arts and sciences at the University of Oklahoma who has published numerous peer-reviewed research articles, dismissed fears of man-made global warming. “Present-day temperatures are not anomalously warm. The best methods we have for estimating past temperatures are borehole temperatures and the elevation of tree lines. Both of these methods indicate temperatures during the High Middle Ages were just as warm as today. Five thousand to 7,000 years ago, temperatures were significantly warmer,” Deming wrote in a January 10, 2007 op-ed in the Edmond Sun. “Ninety percent of the greenhouse effect is due to water vapor. The warming response to the concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere is logarithmic. That means if some global warming does occur, most of it will be at night, at winter, and at high latitudes where humidity is low. These are places and times where warmer temperatures would be beneficial, not detrimental,” Deming wrote. “Neither the Greenland nor the Antarctic ice sheets are undergoing any significant ablation or melting. The polar bear population is stable,” he added. “No one has ever died from global warming. What kills people is cold, not heat. For more than 150 years, it has been documented in the medical literature that human mortality rates are highest in the winter when temperatures are the coldest,” he explained. “In summary, the problem is not one of skepticism, it’s one of ignorance. Global warming hysteria is based on ignorance fueled by speculation and alarmism. The average person is more likely to be struck by a meteorite from outer space than harmed by global warming,” Deming concluded. ([LINK](#))

Dr. Mel Goldstein, a PhD Meteorologist on Connecticut’s TV News Channel 8, questioned the long-range climate models used by the UN’s IPCC. “When you are in the trenches and forecasting each and everyday, you begin to realize the inadequacies of our computer models,” Goldstein wrote in a March 9, 2007 blog. “I become skeptical when atmospheric models are used to project conditions 100 or 200 years from now,” he noted. Goldstein, who established the first and only Bachelor’s degree program in meteorology

at Connecticut Western Connecticut State University and authored the book *The Complete Idiot's Guide to Weather*, also questioned how the IPCC could account for the range of variables that go into long range climate projections. "There are many important variables we just can't handle with confidence. For example in the IPCC report, the cooling effect of clouds is given a low level of scientific understanding (LOSU). The range of possibilities is so great that the highest estimate of reflectivity from clouds can completely balance the highest estimate of warming from carbon dioxide. Then, there is the whole issue of water vapor which is a powerful greenhouse gas. It can range from 0.2 to 2% in the atmosphere. Whereas, carbon dioxide is about .03%. Sadly, we know so little about water vapor and the heat it generates," Goldstein wrote. ([LINK](#)) In a June 29, 2007 blog post, Goldstein continued his critique of the shortcoming of climate predictions. "Long range forecasts are often short on reality. Sure, we have great mathematical equations applied to predicting our weather. But not all is known about our weather. We don't understand how water vapor comes into the equations, and that is a big deal. Heat sources represent other major unknowns, after all, heat drives the atmosphere. We make assumptions about these unknowns, and as long as these fit for the moment, the forecast looks good. But a slight error will only magnify as the forecast is further extended," Goldstein wrote. "We can get an idea of a trend, but specifics 30 days or 90 days out are seldom correct. Most of what we know about the atmosphere was known a hundred years ago. No doubt, technology has advanced faster than our basic understanding of the atmosphere. There are times when even a 24-hour forecast leaves something to be desired," he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Dr. Anthony Lupu, Professor of Atmospheric Science, University of Missouri-Columbia, wrote in a May 18, 2007 email to EPW, "I don't believe that the climate change issue is an emergency, or that there is compelling evidence to blame humanity for the current warming. Warming is undoubtedly occurring, but it may have nothing (0%), or a little (0-10%) to do with human activity." Lupu continued, "There is abundant scientific evidence demonstrating that the climate changes cyclically on time-scales ranging from a few years, to hundreds of thousands of years. There is plenty of evidence to suggest that the climate is not 'stagnant' either. The climate has been relatively cool for the last few hundred years and has warmed to levels which are at or below an inferred maximum approximately 1000 years ago." "There are too many unknowns (e.g., the nature of solar and internal variability). There are too many things we don't understand about the current climate (e.g., the carbon cycle, atmosphere - ocean interactions)," he added. Lupu has also critiqued Gore's movie. "[Gore's] whole tone of this was, 'We've got to make radical changes in our lifestyle, and we have to make them now, and that's because the science on the issue is settled,'" Lupu said in a July 13, 2006 article in the *Columbia Tribune*. "Well that's not entirely the case. The science, for one thing, is not settled." Lupu disputes the reason for warming temperatures and says recent temperatures are within natural variability. "One thing I can agree with Gore on is the world is getting warmer," he said. "One thing I can't agree on is the cause." ([LINK](#))

Dr. Thomas P. Sheahen, an MIT educated physicist, author of the book *An Introduction to High-Temperature Superconductivity*, and writer of the popular newspaper column "Ask the Everyday Scientist," dismisses the idea of a "consensus" on man-made global warming. "We must all remember that scientific truth is not determined by popular vote. The [UN] IPCC is severely tainted by politics," Sheahen wrote to EPW on June 11, 2007. "No one disputes that the Earth has been warming over the last 150 years. The controversy is over whether it's natural or anthropogenic (AGW)," he added. "I have done computer modeling of physical and chemical phenomena, and I know two things very well: first, your outputs

will always be conditioned by the input assumptions you make at the front end; and second, data *always* trumps theory. For a model to be valid, it has to match the data. Given the observations of temperature variations during the 20th century, you really can't make the case that mankind caused such erratic temperature swings," Sheahen concluded.

Dr. Edward J. Wegman, a professor at the Center for Computational Statistics at George Mason University and chair of the National Academy of Sciences' Committee on Applied and Theoretical Statistics, played a prominent role in questioning the statistical validity of Michael Mann's UN promoted "Hockey Stick" temperature graph of last 1000 years of Northern Hemisphere temperatures. Wegman and a panel of statisticians conducted a third-party review the "Hockey Stick." According to a November 28, 2006 article in Canada's National Post, Wegman found that Mann made a basic error that "may be easily overlooked by someone not trained in statistical methodology. We note that there is no evidence that Dr. Mann or any of the other authors in paleoclimate studies have had significant interactions with mainstream statisticians." Wegman found that Mann's "small group of climate scientists were working on their own, largely in isolation, and without the academic scrutiny needed to ferret out false assumptions." "I am baffled by the claim that the incorrect method doesn't matter because the answer is correct anyway. Method Wrong + Answer Correct = Bad Science," Wegman said. ([LINK](#)) Wegman also noted how the peer-review process can be skewed by a cozy group of scientists within a specific field. "Of course, if a given discipline area is small and the authors in the area are tightly coupled, then this process is likely to turn up very sympathetic referees. These referees may have coauthored other papers with a given author. They may believe they know that author's other writings well enough that errors can continue to propagate and indeed be reinforced," Wegman wrote in his report to the U.S. Congress. ([LINK](#))

Dr. Richard Tol, the director of the Centre for Marine and Atmospheric Science, and a prominent economist with Hamburg University in Germany, dismissed the Stern Report on the economics of climate change as "preposterous." Tol, one of the authors of three of the IPCC Working Groups, dismissed the idea that mankind must act now to prevent catastrophic global warming, according a February 2, 2007 article in Canada's National Post. "Tol doesn't think the evidence is in on global warming and its effects, he doesn't think there's reason to rush to action, and he doesn't think that crash programs to curb global warming are called for," the National Post article explained. Tol debunked the Stern review as "alarmist and incompetent." "There is no risk of damage [from global warming] that would force us to act injudiciously," according to Tol. "We've got enough time to look for the economically most effective options, rather than dash into 'actionism,' which then becomes very expensive," he concluded. Tol wrote the critique despite the fact that his work was cited by the Stern Report no less than 63 times. ([LINK](#))

Dr. Duncan Wingham, Professor of Climate Physics at University College London and Director of the Centre for Polar Observation and Modeling, has presented evidence that Antarctic ice is growing. According to a December 15, 2006 article in Canada's National Post, "Early last year at a European Union Space Conference in Brussels, for example, Dr. Wingham revealed that data from a European Space Agency satellite showed Antarctic thinning was no more common than thickening, and concluded that the spectacular collapse of the ice shelves on the Antarctic Peninsula was much more likely to have followed natural current fluctuations than global warming." "One cannot be certain, because packets of heat in the atmosphere do not come conveniently labeled 'the contribution of anthropogenic

warming,’ “ Wingham said, noting that the evidence is not “favorable to the notion we are seeing the results of global warming.” Wingham and his colleagues found that 72% of the ice sheet covering the entire land mass of Antarctica is growing at the rate of 5 millimeters per year. “That makes Antarctica a sink, not a source, of ocean water. According to their best estimates, Antarctica will ‘lower global sea levels by 0.08 mm’ per year” the National Post article reported. ([LINK](#))

The Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change and the website “CO2 Science” was established to debunk man-made climate fears. An April 11, 2007 report noted that current temperatures in Southern Greenland are “1.5°C colder than the peak warmth of Medieval Times.” ([LINK](#)) A June 6, 2007 scientific report by the Center also debunked many of NASA’s James Hansen’s climate claims by finding “**very little evidence to justify [Hansen’s] policy prescriptions for dealing with what he calls a ‘dangerous climate change.’**” ([LINK](#)) The website, run by three scientists, **agronomist Dr. Craig Idso, physicist Dr, Sherwood Idso, and botanist Keith Idso**, documents the scientific evidence countering warming fears and offers evidence that the Earth was as warm or warmer during the Medieval Warm Period. The “Medieval Warm Period Project’s” goal is to show that “approximately one thousand years ago, when the atmosphere’s CO2 concentration was approximately 25% lower than it is currently, earth’s near-surface air temperature was equally as warm as, or even warmer than, it is today, demonstrating that today’s temperatures are not unnatural and need not be due to the historical rise in the air’s CO2 content.” Scientific supporters of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global change include: **Climate expert Donald G. Baker** of the University of Minnesota; **Biologist W. Dennis Clark** of Arizona State University; **Chemist Alan Moghissi** of the Institute for Regulatory Science; **Meteorologist William E. Reifsnyder**; **Physics professor Clinton H. Sheehan** of Ouachita Baptist University in Arkansas; **Zoologist Kenneth E. F. Watt**; and **Horticulturist Sylvan H. Wittwer** of the Michigan State University. ([LINK](#))

Astrophysicist Piers Corbyn of the UK based long-term solar forecast group Weather Action noted the UN’s IPCC fourth assessment had a “serious misrepresentation of solar activity in the Report.” Corbyn also ridiculed the idea that the IPCC summary for policymakers was written by 2500 of the worlds “leading scientists” and said IPCC should instead be called a “The IPCC Report by appointees of many governments.” “In fact the report is drafted and finalized by appointees of Governments who may have little or no expertise in many of the wide ranging fields covered. It should further be noted that the many scientists who undertake diligent measurement and observational or estimation work which is used to indirectly support the report conclusions have generally no expertise or locus around the key subject on which the findings of the report are actually based, namely ‘Climate Models.’ This is the preserve of only a handful of people who generally are in government funded institutions rather than more independent bodies,” Corbyn wrote in an open letter to UK government officials on February 11, 2007. “Perhaps the phrase ‘The (IPCC) Report by appointees of many governments’ would be fairer and should be insisted on, and would not incorrectly imply informed confirmed agreement from many scientists whose work, however excellent, does no such thing,” Corbyn concluded. ([LINK](#)) Corbyn also debunked a 2007 widely publicized no solar-climate link study on July 20, 2007. “In desperate attempts to shore up their crumbling doctrine of man-made climate change, Professor Lockwood and Henry Davenport (Letters, July 14) cherry-pick data themselves. Professor Lockwood’s ‘refutation’ of the decisive role of solar activity in driving climate is as valid as claiming a particular year was not warm by simply looking at the winter half of data. The most significant and persistent

cycle of variation in the world's temperature follows the 22-year magnetic cycle of the sun's activity. So what does he do? He 'finds' that for an 11-year stretch around 1987 to 1998 world temperatures rose, while there was a fall in his preferred measures of solar activity. A 22-year cycle and an 11-year cycle will of necessity move in opposite directions half the time. The problem for global warmers is that there is no evidence that changing CO2 is a net driver for world climate. Feedback processes negate its potential warming effects. Their theory has no power to predict. It is faith, not science. I challenge them to issue a forecast to compete with our severe weather warnings - made months ago - for this month and August which are based on predictions of solar-particle and magnetic effects that there will be periods of major thunderstorms, hail and further flooding in Britain, most notably July 22-26, August 5-9 and August 18-23. These periods will be associated with new activity on the sun and tropical storms. We also forecast that British and world temperatures will continue to decline this year and in 2008. What do the global warmers forecast?" Corbyn wrote. ([LINK](#))

Meteorologist Joseph D'Aleo served as the first Director of Meteorology at The Weather Channel and was the Chief Meteorologist at Weather Services International Corporation and served as chairman of the American Meteorological Society's (AMS) Committee on Weather Analysis and Forecasting. D'Aleo founded a new website and organization skeptical of man-made global warming fears called International Climate and Environmental Change Assessment Project at Icecap.us on April 9, 2007. D'Aleo is a Certified Consultant Meteorologist (CCM) and he was elected a Fellow and a councilor with the AMS. D'Aleo's new website states the affiliated scientists "believe that local problems with the station data and natural cycles such as those in the sun and oceans are also important contributors to the global changes in our climate and weather. We worry the sole focus on greenhouse gases and the unwise reliance on imperfect climate models while ignoring real data may leave civilization unprepared for a sudden climate shift that history tells us will occur again, very possibly soon." D'Aleo wrote on May 17, 2007, "When I started really looking at the data I saw the signatures of urbanization and local land use factor in global temperatures. I also saw that temperatures cycled over time and those cycles correlated far better with the cycles in the sun and ocean temperatures than with greenhouse gases, which would argue for a parallel increase not cyclical warming and cooling." "I have recently done extensive correlative studies that convince me that the sun and oceans are the real drivers and carbon dioxide is a bit player in the scheme of things. I also believe the cyclical warming has peaked as the factors are changing and a cooling has started or will soon do so, depending on what measure you use," he added. Other scientists affiliated with D'Aleo on his Icecap.us website include: Astrophysicist Dr. Sallie Baliunas, Deputy Director of Mount Wilson Observatory; Hurricane expert Dr. William Gray, Associate Professor head of the Tropical Research Project at Colorado State University; Oregon State Climatologist George Taylor of Oregon State University's College of Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences; Marine Biologist Dr. Gary D. Sharp of the Center for Climate/Ocean Resources Study; former radioactive chemist Alan Siddons, Florida State Climatologist Dr. James O'Brien, Director Emeritus of the Center for Ocean-Atmospheric Prediction Studies at Florida State University; Climate scientist Dr. Richard C. Willson of Columbia University's Center for Climate Systems Research. <http://icecap.us>

Oceanographer Dr. Willem de Lange of the department of Earth and Ocean Sciences at the University of Waikato in New Zealand has published numerous peer-reviewed papers in the areas of coastal processes and climatic hazards; tsunami and storm surge prediction and mitigation; wave-induced sediment transport. He has also declared

himself skeptical of man-made climate fears. “The Greenhouse Effect is a climate feedback mechanism - it modifies climate change but does not drive it,” de Lange wrote to EPW on December 18, 2007. “Earth’s climate is a complex system that is continually changing at different temporal and spatial scales - it may change abruptly, or gradually and affect regions or the whole globe. The primary driver of Earth’s Climate at Human time scales is the quantity and quality of Solar radiation - the total amount, and the distribution of radiation across different wavelengths,” de Lange explained. “Humans affect climate in a variety of ways - Human impacts are greatest at the micro-scale (your office), and diminish at larger spatial and temporal scales (impact at a global scale over the last 100 years is small - as far as I can tell it tends to disappear into the measurement errors). Emissions of greenhouse gases are a minor contribution to climate feedback as the Greenhouse Effect operates between physically constrained limits,” he wrote. “Catastrophic climate changes in the next century are unlikely based on observational data,” he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Senior Meteorologist Dr. Joe Sobel of Accuweather, winner of the American Meteorological Society 2005 Award for Broadcaster of the Year, asserted that climate change is nothing new. “The climate is changing. The climate has always changed, that is a fact of the earth’s existence,” Sobel said on January 11, 2007. Sobel has 35 years experience at Accuweather and has also been a member of the American Meteorology Society since 1966. “Only 10,000 years ago -- which is geologically speaking is like [the snap of a finger] -- we were in the midst of an ice age,” Sobel said. “There is not much doubt that climate changes and that climate will continue to change,” Sobel reiterated. “The question is what is causing it. Is it totally a naturally cycle? Is it totally human induced? I suspect the truth lies somewhere in between,” he concluded. ([LINK](#)) Sobel also lamented the National Hurricane Center’s new tropical storm naming policy because he believes it results in false claims of global warming related increases in storms. “Back in the old days... and I’m only talking 5 years or so ago... we did not name sub-tropical storms. Names were only given to storms that were deemed to be truly tropical. In the last few years, there have been a number of sub-tropical storms named. Those named storms go into the total of named storms and obviously increase the number of storms that year and consequently increase the average number of storms per year,” Sobel wrote on May 9, 2007 in his blog. “It has been claimed that global warming is responsible for an increasing number of tropical storms and hurricanes, but here is a reason that the number of storms is increasing that has absolutely nothing to do with global warming. It’s because we are mixing apples and oranges and calling them all apples!” he added. ([LINK](#))

Economist Dr. Owen McShane, chair of the policy panel of the New Zealand based International Climate Science Coalition, slammed “consensus” science on global warming on April 21, 2007. “There is no scientific evidence to justify the wild claims of doom and catastrophe that have made headlines in recent weeks,” McShane said. “All we have is a scenario promoted by government funded scientists who are part of the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), based on computer modeling that has been slammed by many independent climatologists around the world as lacking any scientific validity or credibility,” he said. “People generally seem not to be aware that the UN defines ‘climate change’ as only the effects of climate that result from human activity. It ignores the natural drivers that have governed the global climate for millions of years past. For reasons that have everything to do with politics and nothing to do with science or meteorological observations and records, the present Government committed New Zealand to the Kyoto Protocol that even its most ardent supporters admit will not reduce global warming.”

McShane asserted. “What Kyoto will do, like the sale of indulgences in the Middle Ages, is make people and organizations pay for emissions of carbon dioxide by buying credits from countries like Russia that have vast tracts of forested land,” he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Anthropologist Dr. Benny Peiser of the Faculty of Science of Liverpool John Moores University in the UK who has published peer-reviewed studies, debunked a 2004 study published in *Science* which Gore cited in his movie. The study examined 928 peer-reviewed studies and found a virtual 100% consensus on man-made global warming. But Peiser’s own analysis found that the study’s “entire argument is flawed as the whole ISI data set includes just 13 abstracts (less than 2%) that explicitly endorse what [the author] has called the ‘consensus view.’” “In fact, the vast majority of abstracts do not mention anthropogenic climate change,” Peiser added. ([LINK](#)) Peiser, who edits a climate change Internet newsletter, has also noted that the media ignores the scientists and studies that cast doubt on climate alarmism. “Hardly a week goes by without a new research paper that questions part or even some basics of climate change theory,” Peiser told the New York Times on March 13, 2007. ([LINK](#)) Peiser noted how science has been overtaken with an “apocalyptic” view of the future climate. “Not since the apocalyptic consensus of the Middle Ages has the prognostication of impending doom and global catastrophe on the basis of mathematical modeling been as widely accepted as today,” Peiser noted in an April 18, 2007 presentation to European Parliament on climate change. “Ironically, these apocalyptic predictions of the future are politically sanctioned at the same time as a growing number of scientists are recognizing that environmental and economic computer modeling of an inherently unpredictable future is illogical and futile,” Peiser said. “Over the last 10 years, the editors of the world’s leading science journals such as *Science* and *Nature* as well as popular science magazines such as *Scientific American* and *New Scientist* have publicly advocated drastic policies to curb CO2 emissions. At the same time, they have publicly attacked scientists skeptical of the climate consensus,” Peiser noted. ([LINK](#))

Atmospheric scientist and hurricane expert Dr. Christopher W. Landsea NOAA’s National Hurricane Center who served as a UN IPCC as both an author and a reviewer and has published numerous peer-reviewed research noted that recent hurricane activity is not linked to man-made factors. According to a February 23, 2007 article in Myrtle Beach Online, Landsea explained that “the 1926-1935 period was worse for hurricanes than the past 10 years and 1900-1905 was almost as bad.” Landsea asserted that it is therefore not true that there is a current trend of more and stronger hurricanes. “It’s not a trend, it’s a cycle: 20-45 years quiet, 20-45 years busy,” Landsea said. He did say that a warming world would only make hurricanes “5 percent stronger 100 years from now. We can’t measure it if it’s that small.” The article said Landsea blamed Gore’s *An Inconvenient Truth*, for “persuad[ing] some people that global warming is contributing to hurricane frequency and strength.” ([LINK](#)) Landsea, who was both an author and a reviewer for the IPCC’s 2nd Assessment Report in 1995 and the 3rd Assessment Report

3rd Assessment Report in 2001, resigned from the 4th Assessment Report after becoming charging the UN with playing politics with Hurricane science. “I am withdrawing because I have come to view the part of the IPCC to which my expertise is relevant as having become politicized. In addition, when I have raised my concerns to the IPCC leadership, their response was simply to dismiss my concerns,” Landsea wrote in a January 17, 2005 public letter. “My view is that when people identify themselves as being associated with the IPCC and then make pronouncements far outside current scientific understandings that this will

harm the credibility of climate change science and will in the longer term diminish our role in public policy,” he continued. “I personally cannot in good faith continue to contribute to a process that I view as both being motivated by pre-conceived agendas and being scientifically unsound,” Landsea added. ([LINK](#))

Atmospheric scientist Glen Shaw, a Professor of Physics at the Geophysical Institute at the University of Alaska Fairbanks, who was skeptical of global cooling fears in 1970s, now calls the current warming scare “massively political.” Shaw noted in a April 22, 2007 article in *News Miner* that “a significantly large fraction of the science being done on global climate change is perhaps not wrong, but not enough, a little naive, repetitive and incorporating only a fraction of the complexity required to base policy on.” “And the issue of global warming has become massively political. Special interests abound. Try getting funding while being a skeptic,” he added. Shaw also explained how he ran up against the coming ice age scare three decades ago. “In the 1970s as a young scientist at the Geophysical Institute I wrote passionate letters complaining that for the first time in the geologic era man was changing the atmosphere of the planet. I argued that continued dumping of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere would be associated with a warming of the entire Earth and pled for attention to this matter. The letters were ignored. They were ignored because in the 1970s, *Newsweek*, the *Christian Science Monitor*, the *New York Times*, and countless books and articles were warning of the dangers of global cooling. Things have changed.” Shaw concluded: “There is much more in climate science that we simply do not understand. Believe it or not, nobody has any sustainable theory, other than a few clues, about the causes of the ice ages. They are resonant with some of the orbital movements of the planets, but only roughly so and other things are going on that cause and end these spectacular events. We do not know.” ([LINK](#))

Geologist Dr. Lee C. Gerhard, past director and state geologist with the Kansas Geological Society and a senior scientist emeritus of the University of Kansas and a UN IPCC reviewer, debunked the notion that human CO₂ emissions are driving climate change. “Overall, the earth’s climate has been cooling for 60 million years, but that is only an average -- temperature goes up and down constantly,” Gerhard said in a January article in a *National Policy Analysis* publication. “Depending on the period in earth’s history that is chosen, the climate will either be warming or cooling. Choosing whether earth is warming or cooling is simply a matter of picking end points,” Gerhard stated. Gerhard also noted that CO₂ only represents about ¼ of one percent of the total greenhouse gas effect, “hardly a device to drive the massive energy system of earth’s climate.” ([LINK](#)) Gerhard also wrote on August 17, 2006: “I never fully accepted or denied the anthropogenic global warming (AGW) concept until the furor started after [NASA’s James] Hansen’s wild claims in the late 1980’s. I went to the [scientific] literature to study the basis of the claim, starting at first principles. My studies then led me to believe that the claims were false, they did not correlate with recorded human history.” Gerhard concluded that “the current climate changes were entirely explainable by geologic history.” Gerhard has published more than 150 papers and authored the 2001 book “Geological Perspectives of Global Climate Change.”

Climatologist Dr. Roy W. Spencer, formerly a senior scientist for climate studies at NASA’s Marshall Space Flight Center where he received NASA’s Exceptional Scientific Achievement Medal, and currently principal research scientist at the University of Alabama in Huntsville, questioned how much scientists really know about the climate. “CO₂ concentrations - now running at 380 parts per million (ppm), up about 40 percent in the

last century - are indeed one possible explanation for our current warmth. But we also know that our climate is a nonlinear, dynamic system - which can go through sizeable gyrations all by itself," Spencer wrote in a February 26, 2007 article in the *New York Post*. "The one atmospheric process that has the greatest control on the Earth's climate is the one we understand the least - precipitation," Spencer, currently a principal research scientist at the Global Hydrology and Climate Center of the National Space Science and Technology Center in Huntsville, Alabama, wrote. "In fact, for the amount of solar energy available to it, our climate seems to have a 'preferred' average temperature, damping out swings beyond one degree or so. I believe that, through various negative feedback mechanisms, the atmosphere 'decides' how much of the available sunlight will be allowed in, how much greenhouse effect it will generate in response, and what the average temperature will be," he concluded. Spencer has published more than two dozen scientific papers in peer-reviewed journals. ([LINK](#))

Dr. Kelvin Kemm, formerly a scientist at South Africa's Atomic Energy Corporation who holds degrees in nuclear physics and mathematics, refuted climate alarmism in an op-ed titled "No scientific basis for global warming contention." Kemm was also honored with a 2003 National Science and Technology Forum Award for sustained outstanding contributions to Science and Technology. "The global-warming mania continues with more and more hype and less and less thinking. With religious zeal, people look for issues or events to blame on global warming," Kemm wrote in an April 27, 2007 op-ed in South Africa's *Engineering News*. "Former US Veep Al Gore is being totally simplistic in his movie by just saying that Mount Kilimanjaro's loss of ice-cap volume is a sign of global warming. Most of Al's movie exhibited the same absence of genuine science, and rather presented itself as part of an election campaign," Kemm explained, while noting that warming temperatures did not cause a ice-cap melt on Kilimanjaro. "It is also a scientific fact that there has been no measurable atmospheric warming in the region of Kilimanjaro. Satellites have been measuring the regional temperature since 1979 in the free troposphere between 1 000-m and 8 000-m altitude and they show no troposphere warming in that area. None. So what is causing the ice cap to melt? The answer appears to be trees, or rather lack of them," Kemm wrote. "...Since the locals have cut down so many trees over the last century, there is much less wet air moving up the mountain than there used to be, so less ice forms at the top," he added. ([LINK](#))

Economist David Henderson, a Professor at the Westminster Business School and former Chief economist for the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, derided the UN IPCC process in a presentation in Brussels on April 18, 2007. "I believe that there is a problem of unwarranted trust in the IPCC process and in the role of the Panel itself, a problem which the *Stern Review* shows no awareness of. In peer-reviewed work that the IPCC has drawn on, the authors concerned have failed to make due disclosure of data, sources and procedures, and the IPCC has not required them to do so," Henderson said. Noting that he believed the IPCC "has acquired what is effectively a monopoly position," Henderson said the IPCC was "far from being a model of rigor, inclusiveness and impartiality." "To begin with, the very idea of creating a single would-be authoritative fount of wisdom is itself open to doubt. Even if the IPCC process were indisputably and consistently rigorous, objective and professionally watertight, it is imprudent for governments to place virtually exclusive reliance, in matters of extraordinary complexity where huge uncertainties prevail, on a single source of analysis and advice and a single process of inquiry. Viewed in this light, the very notion of setting consensus as an aim appears as questionable if not ill-judged," he said. Henderson also dismissed the *Stern Review* as "a heavily biased, exercise in speculative

alarmism” and urged governments to “think again” about the focus on CO2 reductions. “Rather than pursuing as a matter of urgency ambitious and costly targets for curbing CO2 emissions, [governments] should take prompt steps to ensure that they and their citizens are more fully and more objectively informed and advised,” he said. ([LINK](#))

IPCC Contributing author Aynsley Kellow of the University of Tasmania declared UN process “goes looking for bad news” on climate. “They really do emphasize the bad news. They’re looking for bad news in all of this,” Kellow, a former professor of Social Sciences at the Australian School of Environmental Studies at Griffith University, said in a April 23, 2007 article in Spiked-Online. Kellow, who was a referee for Chapter 19 in the IPCC’s fourth assessment report which covered “Key Vulnerabilities and Risk Assessment,” questioned the premise of the IPCC’s gloomy future predictions. “The IPCC is assuming rates of economic growth that dwarf the nineteenth-century success of the USA, the twentieth century in Japan and so on. The USA experienced, I think, a nine fold increase in GDP per capita; these are making assumptions about 30-fold increases. So you can question their credibility. But if you do that, you’re questioning the emissions scenarios that are driving the climate models,” Kellow said. The IPCC process is heavily political, according to Kellow. “The scientists are in there but it is, after all, called the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. The scientists are there at the nomination of governments. Governments fund the exercise and sign-off on it ultimately,” Kellow explained. “I’m not holding my breath for this criticism to be taken on board, which underscores a fault in the whole peer review process for the IPCC: there is no chance of a chapter [of the IPCC report] ever being rejected for publication, no matter how flawed it might be,” he added. Kellow also noted that the whole Kyoto Protocol approach to greenhouse gas emissions does not favor developing nations. “The emphasis on CO2 suits largely post-1990 decarbonised European economies worried about justifying high levels of taxation, energy security policies and so on. It doesn’t suit those with ample coal supplies at a quarter of the cost of producing coal in Europe - which includes India and China. There’s a very European slant to Kyoto,” he explained. ([LINK](#))

Harvard-Smithsonian Center Astrophysicist Dr. Willie Soon, co-author of the book “The Maunder Minimum and the Variable Sun-Earth Connection” ([LINK](#)), and **chief science advisor to the Science and Public Policy Institute, authored a comprehensive November 2007 study that was published in the peer-reviewed journal Physical Geography.** The study concluded: “[L]ong-term climate change is driven by solar insolation changes, from both orbital variations and intrinsic solar magnetic and luminosity variations... There is no quantitative evidence that varying levels of minor greenhouse gases like CO2 and CH4 have accounted for even as much as half of the reconstructed glacial-interglacial temperature changes or, more importantly, for the large variations in global ice volume on both land and sea over the past 650 thousand years. ... [C]hanges in solar insolation at climatically sensitive latitudes and zones exceed the global radiative forcings of CO2 and CH4 by several-fold, and ... [therefore] regional responses to solar insolation forcing will decide the primary climatic feedbacks and changes.” ([LINK](#)) **Soon also co-authored a November 2007 study that found mankind’s emissions are not harming the atmosphere. The paper, co-authored with Dr. Art Robinson and Noah Robinson, was published in journal of American physicians and Surgeons** was titled, “Environmental Effects of Increased Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide.” The study reported: “A review of the research literature concerning the environmental consequences of increased levels of atmospheric carbon dioxide leads to the conclusion that in creases during the 20th and early 21st centuries have produced no deleterious effects upon Earth’s weather and climate. Increased carbon dioxide has, however, markedly in

creased plant growth.” The study also found, “There are no experimental data to support the hypothesis that increases in human hydrocarbon use or in atmospheric carbon dioxide and other green house gases are causing or can be expected to cause unfavorable changes in global temperatures, weather, or landscape.” ([LINK](#))

CBS Chicago affiliate Chief Meteorologist Steve Baskerville expressed skepticism that there is a “consensus” about mankind’s role in global warming. “What is the truth about global warming? As you have seen in this program, it depends on who you talk to. As decision makers ponder our future as it relates to climate change, we need to keep asking questions. Because an informed public should have a role in determining the ultimate truth about global warming,” the Emmy Award winning Baskerville concluded in an April 28, 2007 TV special he hosted called “The Truth about Global Warming.” Baskerville’s climate TV special clearly portrayed the science as not settled on man’s role in climate change as he featured interviews with prominent skeptics, including MIT climate scientist Richard Lindzen and environmental economist Dennis Avery, co-author of the 2006 book *Unstoppable Global Warming: Every 1500 Years*. ([LINK](#))

Atmospheric scientist and hurricane expert Dr. Neil Frank, former director of the National Hurricane Center, dismissed fears of catastrophic man-made global warming. “It’s a hoax,” Frank told the *Washington Post* on May 28, 2006 regarding doomsday climate scenarios. According to the article, “[Frank] says cutting carbon emissions would wind up hurting poor people. I ask if he thinks more CO₂ in the air would be a good thing. ‘Exactly! Maybe we’re living in a carbon dioxide-starved world. We don’t know.’” Frank also lamented that the UN’s IPCC does not reach out to many skeptics of global warming like himself. Frank has published a variety of professional papers on tropical meteorology and served the chairman of the International Hurricane Committee. ([LINK](#))

Statistician Dr. Bjorn Lomborg, author of “The Skeptical Environmentalist” and professor at the Copenhagen Business School, questioned former Vice President Al Gore’s scientific presentations. “But if we are to embark on the costliest political project ever, maybe we should make sure it rests on solid ground. It should be based on the best facts, not just the convenient ones,” Lomborg co-wrote in a January 21, 2007 *Wall Street Journal* op-ed titled “Will Al Gore Melt?” Lomborg, who proclaimed he “has provided one of the clearest counterpoints to Mr. Gore’s tune,” accused Gore of “chicken[ing]” out of a debate. “But if we are to follow Mr. Gore’s suggestions of radically changing our way of life, the costs are not trivial,” Lomborg wrote. “In the year 2100, Mr. Gore will have left the average person 30% poorer, and thus less able to handle many of the problems we will face, climate change or no climate change. Clearly we need to ask hard questions. Is Mr. Gore’s world a worthwhile sacrifice? But it seems that critical questions are out of the question,” he continued. “It would have been great to ask [Gore] why he only talks about a sea-level rise of 20 feet. In his movie he shows scary sequences of 20-foot flooding Florida, San Francisco, New York, Holland, Calcutta, Beijing and Shanghai. But were realistic levels not dramatic enough? The U.N. climate panel expects only a foot of sea-level rise over this century. Moreover, sea levels actually climbed that much over the past 150 years. Does Mr. Gore find it balanced to exaggerate the best scientific knowledge available by a factor of 20?” Lomborg wrote. “[Gore] considers Antarctica the canary in the mine, but again doesn’t tell the full story. He presents pictures from the 2% of Antarctica that is dramatically warming and ignores the 98% that has largely cooled over the past 35 years. The U.N. panel estimates that Antarctica will actually increase its snow mass this century. Similarly, Mr. Gore points to shrinking sea ice

in the Northern Hemisphere, but don't mention that sea ice in the Southern Hemisphere is increasing. Shouldn't we hear those facts?" Lomborg added. ([LINK](#)) Lomborg organized some of the world's top Nobel Laureates to form the 2004 Copenhagen Consensus which ranked the world's most pressing problems. The Copenhagen Consensus placed global warming at the bottom of the list in terms of our planet's priorities, behind combating disease, stopping malaria, securing clean water, and building infrastructure to help lift the developing nations out of poverty. ([LINK](#))

Geologist Dr. Simon Brassell, of the Department of Geological Sciences at the Indiana University, noted "climate change is nothing new." According to an October 16, 2006 *Washington Post* article, "Brassell said the evidence of climate change so long ago during a period without humans could influence the modern-day understanding of global warming." "If there are big, inherent fluctuations in the system, as paleoclimate studies are showing, it could make determining the Earth's climatic future even harder than it is," Brassell said. "We're learning our climate, throughout time, has been a wild beast," Brassell added. The study was conducted with the Royal Netherlands Institute for Sea Research and the results were published in the October 2006 issue of *Geology*. ([LINK](#))

Polar bear expert Dennis Compayre, who has studied the bears for almost 30 years in their natural habitat and is working on a new UK documentary about the bears, criticised fears of a potential global warming threat to polar bears. A December 7, 2007 article in the UK *Daily Mail* reported, "Dennis Compayre raises bushy grey eyebrows as he listens to the environmentalists predict the polar bear's demise. 'They (environmentalists) say the numbers are down from 1,200 to around 900, but I think I know as much about polar bears as anyone, and I tell you there are as many bears here now as there were when I was a kid.'" According to the article, Compayre, who was born and raised in the Arctic town, "is among those who eye the new 'experts' in town with deep suspicion. Compayre added, 'Churchill [in Northern Canada] is full of these scientists going on about vanishing bears and thinner bears. They come here preaching doom, but I question whether some of them really have the bears' best interests at heart. The bear industry in Churchill is big bucks, and what better way to keep people coming than to tell them they'd better hurry to see the disappearing bears.'" The article also noted, "To some Churchill residents, who base their opinions on personal experience rather than fancy charts and computer models, [the polar bear's demise] is so much nonsense put about by scaremongers for their own dubious ends." ([LINK](#))

David Dilley, founder of Global Weather Oscillations, Inc., rejects the idea of man-made global warming. Dilley's research found that the current global warming episode is a "Natural Recurring Cycle." "Dilley demonstrated that the current global warming episode is a 'Natural Recurring Cycle,' and that this current cycle will begin to diminish as early as 2015, and no later than 2040," according to an April 6, 2007 press release. "Dilley's 15-years of ongoing climate research have uncovered a very powerful external forcing mechanism that causes shifts in regional weather cycles, and the world's climate. This forcing mechanism is called the 'Primary Forcing Trigger Mechanism,' or PFM. The PFM is a cyclical forcing mechanism that can be forecast years in advance, or even traced back through the earth's climate history. The major influence of the PFM on the earth's climate is that it causes the world's dominating regional high-pressure systems to shift position, or become displaced from their normal seasonal position," noted the press release on the website of Global Weather Oscillations. "Dilley states that the current global warming is without a doubt the result of a known external "natural" forcing cycle. According to Dilley, most

government officials, climatologists and meteorologists are looking only at the increase in temperatures and carbon dioxide (CO₂) levels over the past 50 to 100 years. But when you take into account nearly 40 other global warming episodes over the past 5 thousand years, it becomes very apparent that CO₂ levels cannot be the forcing mechanism that has caused global warming,” the press release stated. ([LINK](#))

Biologist Josef Reichholf, who heads the Vertebrates Department at the National Zoological Collection in Munich, rejected climate fears and asserted global warming will be beneficial to humans and animals, particularly polar bears. Fears of mass species extinctions because of global warming are “nothing but fear-mongering, for which there is no concrete evidence. On the contrary, there is much to be said for the argument that warming temperatures promote biodiversity. There is a clear relationship between biodiversity and temperature. The number of species increases exponentially from the regions near the poles across the moderate latitudes and to the equator. To put it succinctly, the warmer a region is, the more diverse are its species,” Reichholf said in an interview with *Der Spiegel* on May 8, 2007. Reichholf, a professor of ecology and conservation at both of Munich’s two universities, and author of the book *A Short Natural History of the Last Millennium*, continued, “As recently as the 1960s, people were more concerned about a new ice age - - and that would indeed pose a great danger to us. The most catastrophic eras were those in which the weather became worse, not phases of warmer climates. Precisely because we have to feed a growing population on this planet, we should in fact embrace a warmer climate. In warmer regions it takes far less effort to ensure survival,” he said. “How did the polar bear survive the last warm period? Seals are the polar bear’s most important source of food, and the Canadians slaughter tens of thousands of them every spring. That’s why life is becoming more and more difficult for polar bears, and not because it’s getting warmer. Look at the polar bear’s close relative, the brown bear. It is found across a broad geographic region, ranging from Europe across the Near East and North Asia, to Canada and the United States. Whether bears survive will depend on human beings, not the climate,” he said. Fear of spreading malaria is also unfounded, according to Reichholf. “That’s another one of those myths. Many people truly believe that malaria will spread as temperatures rise. But malaria isn’t even a true tropical disease. In the 19th century, thousands of people in Europe, including Germany, the Netherlands and even Scandinavia, died of malaria, even though they had never gone abroad. That’s because this disease was still prevalent in northern and central Europe in previous centuries. We only managed to eliminate malaria in Europe by quarantining the sick, improving hygiene and draining swamps. That’s why I consider it virtually impossible that malaria would return to us purely because of climate change. If it does appear, it’ll be because it has been brought in somewhere,” he said. “There have been much faster climate fluctuations in the past, which did not automatically lead to a global extinction of species. As a biologist, I can tell you that only the fewest animals and plants are accustomed to rigid climate conditions,” he added. ([LINK](#))

Emmy award-winning Chief Meteorologist for an NBC affiliate Bill Meck, who has earned Seals of Approval from both the American Meteorological Society and the National Weather Association, questioned the notion that there is a scientific “consensus” about global warming. “If the science is ‘clear,’ and there is no more ‘debate,’ why is there still a tremendous amount of our tax dollars being allocated to research (and a PR campaign for that matter)? We don’t still go around researching why the Earth is round, or why the sky is blue. If it’s a done deal, why are folks still trying to justify or prove it?” Meck asked in a February 13, 2007 blog. ([LINK](#)) Meck, who produced a TV series called the

“Global Warming Myth,” praised the March 13, 2007 article in the *New York Times* for debunking much of the science presented in Gore’s *An Inconvenient Truth*. “There are many wonderful nuggets of information to pull from [the *New York Times* article], but file away the bits about how there may not be the ‘consensus of scientists’ you so often hear about. Also check the info toward the end about the natural climate cycles. That is my contention all along. There have been natural climate cycles, always have, always will,” Meck explained in a March 12, 2007 blog. “Also take note how there are very few times when the temperature hangs around the ‘average’, it’s either warm or cold balancing out as an ‘average’. Our current warming began at the end of the Little Ice Age, just over 100 years ago, when it was REALLY cold. Our current warm spell is simply balancing it out. Now go enjoy the 70’s in March, guilt free!” he wrote. ([LINK](#))

Dr. Martin Hertzberg, a retired Navy meteorologist with a PhD in physical chemistry, distrusts climate computer models and believes the models do not adequately account for water in the atmosphere. According to the May 14, 2007 issue of *The Nation* magazine, Hertzberg said water in the form of oceans, snow, ice cover, clouds and vapor “is overwhelming in the radiative and energy balance between the Earth and the sun.... Carbon dioxide and the greenhouse gases are, by comparison, the equivalent of a few farts in a hurricane.” The article explained Hertzberg’s views: “Water covers 71 percent of Earth’s surface. Compared with the atmosphere, there’s 100 times more CO₂ in the oceans, dissolved as carbonate. As the post-glacial thaw progresses the oceans warm up, and some of the dissolved carbon emits into the atmosphere, like fizz from soda.” Hertzberg is quoted saying, “The greenhouse global warming theory has it ass backwards. It is the warming of the Earth that is causing the increase of carbon dioxide and not the reverse.” The article noted, “In vivid confirmation of that conclusion, several new papers show that for the last 750,000 years, CO₂ changes have always lagged behind global temperatures by 800 to 2,600 years.” ([LINK](#)) & ([LINK](#))

Climate scientist Dr. Oliver W. Frauenfeld, a co-author of the 2005 book *Shattered Consensus: The True State of Global Warming* and a research scientist at the Cooperative Institute for Research in Environmental Sciences Division of Cryospheric and Polar Processes at the University of Colorado, questions the accuracy of climate models. “Without question, much more progress is necessary regarding our current understanding of climate and our abilities to model it. Before we can accurately understand the midlatitudes’ response to tropical forcing, the tropical forcings themselves must be identified and understood,” Frauenfeld wrote in “*Shattered Consensus*.” Frauenfeld, a Contributing Author to the IPCC Working Group 1 Fourth Assessment Report, added, “Only after we identify these factors and determine how they affect one another, can we begin to produce accurate models. And only then should we rely on those models to shape policy. Until that time, climate variability will remain controversial and uncertain.” ([LINK](#))

Geologist David Archibald of Summa Development Limited in Australia wrote a scientific paper titled “Solar Cycles 24 and 25 and Predicted Climate Response” in *Energy and Environment* in 2006 ([LINK](#)) showing that solar cycles are more important than CO₂ levels. In a May 2007 updated paper, “The Past and Future of Climate” Archibald predicts an “imminent cooling” by 2030 based on solar cycles states. “Most rural temperature records in the United States were set in the 1930s and 1940s. Greenland had its highest recorded temperatures in the 1930s and has been cooler since,” Archibald wrote. “The 1.5° temperature decline from the late 1950s to the mid-70s was due to a weak solar cycle 20

after a strong solar cycle 19,” Archibald explains. Archibald also noted that the Medieval Warm Period was originally recognized by the UN IPCC to have been warmer than current temperatures, but it “become inconvenient to the IPCC, so they haven’t mentioned it since.” Archibald asserted, “Anthropogenic warming is real, it is also miniscule.” He explained, “Since the beginning of the Industrial Revolution, increased atmospheric carbon dioxide has increased the temperature of the atmosphere by 0.1°.” “There is no correlation in the geologic record between atmospheric carbon dioxide and global temperature. The Earth went into an ice age 450 million years ago despite a level of atmospheric carbon dioxide that is ten times what it is today,” Archibald wrote. “There are no deleterious consequences of higher atmospheric carbon dioxide levels. Higher atmospheric carbon dioxide levels are wholly beneficial,” he added. “Anthropogenic Global Warming is so miniscule that the effect cannot be measured from year to year, and even from generation to generation,” he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Physics professor Kjell Aleklett of the Department of Radiation Sciences and the Uppsala Hydrocarbon Depletion Study Group at Uppsala University in Sweden asserts that severe climate change is unlikely before the Earth runs out of fossil fuels. Writing in a June 5, 2007 post at Australia’s Online Opinion, Aleklett suggests that “the combined volumes of these fuels are insufficient to cause the changes in climate.” Aleklett believes that “compared with what has been previously asserted, we are going to be much better off in terms of carbon dioxide emissions” because the Earth is nearing “the maximum production rate for oil, or ‘Peak Oil.’” He concludes by noting “we must discuss and dispute the temperature increases that the IPCC-families indicate and the fossil fuel resources that the IPCC uses in its prognoses. We need new estimates of future temperature increases based on realistic expectations of oil, natural gas and coal use. Only then can we make sensible decisions for our future. The world’s greatest future problem is that too many people must share too little energy.” ([LINK](#))

Anthony Watts, former meteorologist for KHSL-TV, a CBS-TV affiliate in Redding, California, has examined 460 of the 1221 official climatic weather stations in the 48 lower states, and discovered multiple irregularities that are causing temperature data to skew higher than it should. Watts, who publishes a website devoted to investigating surface stations, ([LINK](#)) believes his research casts doubt on NOAA’s current and historical temperature data reports. “I believe we will be able to demonstrate that some of the global warming increase is not from CO2 but from localized changes in the temperature-measurement environment,” Watts told the *Pittsburgh Tribune-Review* on June 17, 2007. Watts examined temperature stations that the National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration’s (NOAA) uses as part of its National Climatic Data Center. The NCDC has about 1,221 mostly rural weather observation stations around the country. Watts, who founded the web site surfacestations.org, has made it his mission to quality check weather stations to see if the data is being accurately captured. ([LINK](#)) Watts noted one such weather station in California was “surrounded by asphalt and concrete, its also within 10 feet of buildings, and within 8 feet of a large metal cell tower that could be felt reflecting sunlight/heat. And worst of all, air conditioning units on the cell tower electronics buildings vent warm air within 10 feet of the sensor.” Watts concluded, “I can tell you with certainty, the temperature data from this station is useless.” Watt’s extensive data research was noted by Meteorologist Joseph Conklin on August 10, 2007: ([LINK](#)) “The (U.S.) National Climate Data Center (NCDC) is in the middle of a scandal. Their global observing network, the heart and soul of surface weather measurement, is a disaster. Urbanization has placed many sites in unsuitable locations - on hot black asphalt, next to trash burn barrels, beside heat exhaust vents, even attached to hot chimneys and above outdoor

grills! The data and approach taken by many global warming alarmists is seriously flawed. If the global data were properly adjusted for urbanization and station siting, and land use change issues were addressed, what would emerge is a cyclical pattern of rises and falls with much less of any background trend.” ([LINK](#))

Dr. Wilson Flood, of the Royal Society of Chemistry and a chemistry education consultant, wrote that it is an “unproven hypothesis that rising greenhouse gas levels are largely responsible for climate change” in a June 27, 2007 letter to the *Scotsman* newspaper. “Further Met Office data also shows that global temperatures have actually fallen slightly in the last decade and have shown no statistically significant rise since 1990. Just to cap it all, NASA studies show that atmospheric levels of the greenhouse gas methane are falling, not rising. All of the above are easily verifiable and fly in the face of the conventional wisdom. But, hey, we shouldn’t let a few inconvenient facts get in the way of what politicians believe, should we?” Flood wrote. ([LINK](#)) In the May 2006 edition of *Education in Chemistry*, Flood explained, “Of all the scientific disciplines, chemistry equips us best to grasp the essentials of the global warming debate. After all global warming comes down to the absorption of infrared radiation by organic molecules, coupled with the mole concept which allows us to convert tonnes of fossil fuels into tonnes of carbon dioxide.” Flood continued, “Those claiming that the effects of global warming from additional greenhouse gases can already be detected, I believe, are deluding themselves. It would take $5.5Wm^{-2}$ to produce a rise of 1K and an 11K rise (sometimes claimed) would need a massive 55W of additional energy for every square metre of the Earth’s surface. There simply is not that amount of energy available still to be absorbed from the Earth’s spectrum, most of which is largely saturated anyway owing to absorption by carbon dioxide and water vapour.” Flood said, “Those who promote apocalyptic global warming claim that the sensitivity is much higher than 0.18K, some claiming 0.75K and even 1.5K.⁶ These claims are mainly based on a postulated magnifying effect of water vapour but, from a consideration of infrared absorption spectroscopy in relation to the spectrum emitted by a body at 288K, it is not clear how such large values can be achieved.” Flood concluded by noting that the proponents of a climate catastrophe are out “to frighten the population.” ([LINK](#))

Senior Meteorologist Peter McGurk, with WSI Corporation, a provider of weather-driven business solutions to such clients as CNN, FOX, NBC, American Airlines, Delta, and FedEx, and formerly a Senior International Meteorologist for the former Weather Services Corporation, dismissed fears of “a global Armageddon in the making.” After analyzing temperature data for U.S. states, McGurk, who holds a Master of Science degree in Geophysics from the University of Chicago, explained in a June 29, 2007 report, “As far as extreme maxima are concerned, not only is the overall average greater during the first half of the last century, but 2/3 of the monthly averages are also greater during the period 1900-1949. Only for the months of March, June, October and December were they warmer during the period 1950-1999.” McGurk concluded, “I suspect that if we were truly headed for a Global Meltdown, that this data would vastly differ than it is currently. Namely, we would be seeing many more record state maxima occurring more frequently during the recent past than the distant past. Additionally, we should not be seeing more state record extreme minima set during the second half of the past century.” He added, “For 3 out of the four seasons there were more record maxima during the first half of the last century and more record minima during the second half of the 1900s. From an extreme state monthly record perspective, hardly a global Armageddon in the making.” ([LINK](#)) & ([LINK](#)) “I don’t feel that climate modeling is advanced enough to tell us with any degree of certainty what our planet’s climate will be like

one to three centuries from now. While I agree that there may have been some slight global warming during the past 150 years, there is still plenty of scientific debate as to what factors are responsible. Certainly the human race does influence the climate here on Earth, but we cannot say with any certainty to what extent this influence is when compared to other natural cycles of climate variability,” McGurk wrote in a May 18 e-mail to EPW.

Chief Meteorologist Tom Chisholm of WMTW ABC Portland, Maine, who has also been on camera on The Weather Channel, wrote in an e-mail to EPW, “Variable processes in nature exist on a continuum. Any statement, concluding an absolute fixed state of variable, dissipative structures is folly.” Chisholm continued, “This is true concerning accelerating and deaccelerating mathematical equations representing the earth’s heat budget. Initializing an absolute measure of the earth’s energy is impossible. Therefore, ‘computer models’ that global warming pundits exercise and represent as predictively accurate, over long periods of time are, at best, suspect.”

Atmospheric Scientist Ross Hays of NASA’s Columbia Scientific Balloon Facility, in Palestine, Texas, declared himself a skeptic. “My belief is the planetary climate system is an ever changing and evolving one. The climate and geological state of the earth did not develop to this point and time and stop the clock,” Hays wrote in a May 18, 2007 e-mail to EPW. Hays, who authored a study on African waves and their development into tropical cyclones, continued, “The climate and the shape of our continents will continue to change. Yes we are in a cycle of warming, and we should protect our planet from pollution, but we will continue to go through cycles and changes no matter what. In the future there will be another cooling phase as our climate continues to take its sinusoidal trek through history.”

Senior Meteorologist Jeff Halblaub of WSI Corporation which provides weather-driven business solutions to such clients as CNN, FOX, NBC, American Airlines, Delta, and FedEx, rejected man-made global warming fears. “It is my firm belief that the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, politicians, some scientists, multinational corporations, environmentalists, moviemakers, and news media are making false claims regarding the effects of humans on the atmosphere,” Halblaub wrote in a May 18, 2007 e-mail to EPW. “As recently as three decades ago, Newsweek Magazine reported cataclysmic climate damage would occur from “global cooling.” Satellite observations, which survey the entire Earth (which is mostly water), show no temperature change at all since the late 1970s. Mankind changes climates on small scales through urban sprawl and other land-use modifications; human impact on global temperatures is miniscule compared to atmospheric, oceanic, geologic, and solar anomalies and phenomena,” Halblaub wrote. “Carbon Dioxide is a ‘trace gas.’ Per unit volume, CO₂ is not even one tenth of one percent of the gases present. Water vapor is up to 114 times more abundant than CO₂. It has a much greater effect as a greenhouse gas. In truth, climate researchers are taking a very small increase in CO₂ and projecting it into the future using climate models. These models cannot even reproduce past climates. The results of these modeling studies are overinflated and inaccurate temperature increases. The ‘debate’ on human-induced global warming is not over; there never was any. The ‘science’ was decided before the research ever began,” he added.

Climatologist Robert Durrenberger, past president of the American Association of State Climatologists, and one of the climatologists who gathered at Woods Hole to review the National Climate Program Plan in July, 1979, rejected man-made climate fears. Durrenberger says Gore’s “misinformed” scientific assertions motivated him to get actively

involved in the climate debate. “Al Gore brought me back to the battle and prompted me to do renewed research in the field of climatology. And because of all the misinformation that Gore and his army have been spreading about climate change I have decided that ‘real’ climatologists should try to help the public understand the nature of the problem. I hope by writing a book that I have contributed to the effort to combat the ‘alarmists’ who are trying to harm this country,” Durrenberger wrote to EPW on May 19, 2007. “Put me on the list of skeptical members,” Durrenberger, who is also a meteorologist, wrote. He also served as a member of a science panel for the National Academy of Sciences.

Meteorologist John Coleman, Founder of The Weather Channel and former meteorologist for ABC’s Good Morning America, slammed the “recent political hype and media frenzy” about man-made global warming fears. “The recent political hype and media frenzy about ‘Global Warming’ is, in my studied opinion, an unprecedented episode of mass extremism and silliness,” Coleman wrote in a May 19, 2007 email to EPW. “I believe that fifty years from now, serious scientists, political leaders and news editors will look back with astonished embarrassment at the irresponsibility of their predecessors. Its not that the Earth’s atmosphere isn’t somewhat warmer in 2007 than it was in 1907. It is. It is not that mankind’s civilization isn’t contributing to warming. It is. But the recent warming trend is not extreme or wildly accelerating or irreversible or destined to destroy our way of life. As I see it, the predictions of future catastrophic consequences of warming are totally without foundation,” Coleman explained. “Much of what minor warming has been underway in recent years is the result of natural fluctuations in the heat output of the Sun and from other natural cycles. Much of the man made warming is from Urban Heat Islands and is well documented. Many other human activities from agriculture to aviation are having some impact on climate. These changes are worthy of study, reasonable concern and corrective action. All of that is taking place. But as for the dire predictions that dominate the political and media coverage today, there are serious doubts in my mind about their validity,” he continued. “The historic data on which many of the ‘studies’ are based seems to have been selected and massaged to produce the investigators biased predetermined conclusions. And, the notion that the historic measurements are accurate within less than a degree of two is questionable. The old instruments were crude by any modern standards. And inference of past temperatures from other environmental traces seem to me to be subject to significant error. All computer forecast models require a basic set of assumptions. In many cases the bias of the investigators seem to have produced assumptions that have little reasonable basis,” he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Chief Meteorologist Bob Breck of WVUE-TV in New Orleans rejected man-made climate fears. “As you well know, those of us older than 50 recall the same type of scare tactics back in the late 60s & 70s. The ‘consensus’ of scientists back then were warning of global cooling and the possible beginning of a new Little Ice Age. How could so many brilliant scientists have been so wrong?” Breck wrote to EPW on May 20, 2007. “The new (translation-younger) ‘consensus’ of scientists want you to believe that they have better data, that they have computer modeling and (worse yet) they’re smarter! They want us to believe that the current warming will continue forever, yet there is nothing in the climatological history of our planet that indicates this will be the case. On the contrary, there is ample evidence to explain the current warming, that CO2 is NOT the driver, and that other factors (deep ocean current cycles, solar energy fluctuations) are more responsible,” Breck explained. “The media has decided that the facts, other than carbon dioxide being the driver, are not sexy enough to warrant any coverage. I hope there are enough members of Congress who remember the global cooling scare of 30-40 years ago,” Breck concluded.

Atmospheric scientist Bruce Schwoegler, former U.S. Navy meteorologist and Boston broadcast meteorologist, rejected man-made climate fears. “It is my contention that too many variables cloud the global warming broth that has boiled over. A rational approach and lower setting on the hot stove political and media agenda is in order,” Schwoegler wrote to EPW on May 29, 2007. Schwoegler, who was awarded the American Meteorological Society’s Outstanding Broadcast Meteorologist service award, is also an investigator with an international team studying environmental impacts of a Caribbean volcano. “Yes, significant global warming is a concern, and there is a likely relationship between human induced impacts and climate change. But has anyone truly ascertained the scope, depth and outcome in our planetary system which is rife with natural checks and balances? Quantifying them and resultant interactions remains mostly a game of my theory versus yours,” he explained. “Urbanization’s heat islands, volcanic activity, solar fluctuations, historical climate cycles, oceanic and green canopy carbon budgets and the magnitude of artificial irrigation are but a few of the more blatant examples of puzzle pieces not yet in place. Even proliferating aircraft contrails and changes in measuring techniques and sites must be considered. All comprise a cloudy soup that should be set to low as I am not yet prepared to eat,” he concluded.

NASA consultant and former space shuttle engineer John L. Casey of the Florida based Verity Management Services Inc. (VMS), has found solar influences on the climate dominate. An April 3, 2007 press release from VMS touted “A new theory for how the sun contributes to the heating and especially the cooling of the Earth.” The release from Casey, who has conducted satellite launch studies for the U.S. Department of Defense, explained, “Discovered in the process of doing research into a book on natural disasters he is writing, the theory uncovered by Casey has identified two important cycles of the sun. One is between 90 and 100 years long and another 207 years long, that he says are the primary cycles for weather patterns in the US and possibly around the globe. ‘The surprise,’ said Casey ‘was the near 100% match between low temperatures and solar activity lows between now and as far back as 900 AD. A correlation this strong is rare and exciting. The data is reliable enough for me to call an end to the current 207 year or ‘Bi-Centennial’ cycle with the next solar sunspot period, and with it the start of a new period of declining temperatures.’ If the theory’s fundamental cycles play out as he predicts, over the next ten years we will be well on our way into a global cool down. He estimates by the peak of the next solar sunspot cycle which he calculates for the year 2012, there should be strong signs the cooler period has started in accordance with the relational cycle theory. He also says signs of a Bi-Centennial cycle changeover are already occurring although modestly. His observations are based on lower sunspot counts and year to year comparisons between 2006 and 2007.”

Veteran climate researcher Erich Roeckner of the Max Planck Institute for Meteorology laments the lack of climate computer model reliability. “Clouds are still our biggest headache,” Roeckner conceded, according to a May 7, 2007 article in *DER SPIEGEL* ([LINK](#)) According to the article, “Even the most powerful computer models are still too imprecise to simulate the details. However, the clouds alone will determine whether temperatures will increase by one degree more or less than the average predicted by the models. This is a significant element of uncertainty. Roeckner is a conscientious man and a veteran of climate research, so he, of all people, should know the limits of simulation programs. Roeckner, who constantly expects surprises, neatly sums up the problem when he says, ‘No model will ever be as complex as nature.’” The *Der Spiegel* article continued, “‘According to our computer model, neither the number nor intensity of storms is increasing,’ says Jochem Marotzke, director of the Hamburg-based Max Planck Institute for Meteorology, one of the world’s

leading climate research centers. ‘Only the boundaries of low-pressure zones are changing slightly, meaning that weather is becoming more severe in Scandinavia and less so in the Mediterranean.’”

Meteorologist Larry Cosgrove said on Fox News Channel on January 19, 2007, “I do not espouse the global kool-aid line of the American Meteorological Society. Now, I like many people, believe in global warming. You can’t refute that. Temperatures are warming around the globe. But, the question is what’s causing it. Is it purely man made as the American Meteorological Society and [the Weather Channel’s Dr. [Heidi] Cullen espouse or is it a combination of events, namely what’s happening on the earth and ‘some help’ so to speak, from man kind?” ([LINK](#))

Nuclear Scientist Dr. Michael R. Fox, who holds a PhD in Physical Chemistry and is a science analyst for the Grassroot Institute of Hawaii, dismisses global warming “hysteria.” “Regrettably, the current hysteria about global warming is based much more on fear, political agendas, and computer models that don’t agree with each other or the climate, rather than hard-nosed evidence and science. The climate forces which have led to the estimated 0.6C degree temperature increase over the past 100 years or more (according to the International Panel on Climate Change) have been assumed to be man-made CO2 emissions from advanced nations including the U.S. We know this can’t be true for several reasons,” Fox wrote on July 18, 2007. “The first is that water vapor provides 95 percent of the total of the greenhouse gases, not CO2. The total of the CO2 represents less than 3 percent of the total. The second is that of the total atmospheric CO2 inventory, the manmade fraction is less than 3 percent of the CO2 total and therefore far less than 1 percent of the total greenhouse gas inventories. Third, studies of the recent climate variations are finding, for example, (See article by J. Oestermans, Science, p. 375, April 29, 2005) that glaciers have been receding since 1750 or so, well before any significant man-made CO2 emissions occurred. The mid 1700s were at the very depths of the Little Ice Age, which we have learned was the coldest climate over the last 5000 years. Obviously, other warming forces were at work before humans had anything to do with it. Now we have learned much more based upon observations of cosmic radiation, their sources, and the sun’s magnetic fields, combined and new discoveries in the laboratory. A new and more comprehensive understanding of our planetary environment has emerged. This gives us a scientifically defensible explanation of both global warming and cooling,” Fox explained. “Thanks to some recent excellent experimental work in physics by those such as Danish scientist Henrik Svensmark, we now know that cosmic rays and some of the debris from nuclear collisions with atoms in the atmosphere are directly involved with the initiating mechanisms of cloud formation. Basically, the more cosmic rays, the more clouds are formed and the cooler the temperature. Since many of the cosmic rays can be deflected by the Sun’s magnet field, the cosmic ray intensity varies inversely with the strength of that field. The stronger the solar magnetic field, the fewer cosmic rays hit the atmosphere, fewer clouds are formed, and the climate becomes warmer. Today the sun’s magnetic field is more than twice as strong as it was at the turn of the last century. During the mid 1700s during the Little Ice Age there was a 70 year period when there were no sunspots (called the Maunder Minimum), and the solar magnetic field was very weak,” Fox added. “What lies ahead are some exciting times in climate physics and our understanding of the environment. Unexplained findings in geological and climate histories are now being explained by these new lines of inquiry. It appears that the Sun’s magnetic field has had a stronger effect on our climate than just the variations in solar irradiance could explain. Political leaders, environmental advocates, and even Oscar-winning documentarians who claim that “the debate of climate science is over”

have been shown once again to be very wrong,” he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Biologist Dr. Jennifer Marohasy, who has been a field biologist in remote parts of Africa and Madagascar and published in international and Australian scientific journals, dismisses climate fears. “I’ve always considered it somewhat pretentious to believe humans can actually stop climate change, given the earth’s climate has always changed,” Marohasy wrote on May 25, 2007 in an article entitled “Cooling Heels on Global Warming.” ([LINK](#)) She also critiqued Gore’s presentation of climate science. “Never once during this so-called documentary does Gore acknowledge that there is potential for an alternative thesis on global warming and the role of carbon dioxide. All dissent is met with ridicule and/or name calling. Al Gore certainly doesn’t appear to understand the potential value of hypotheses testing. Instead Gore reduces global warming to a moral issue and a contest between the good guys, which according to Gore includes all of the world’s climate scientists, and the so-bad so-called skeptics, who he suggests are all hired guns,” Marohasy wrote on September 16, 2006. ([LINK](#)) She has also stated, “As a consequence of the burning of fossil fuels, atmospheric carbon dioxide levels are currently increasing. There is no evidence, however, to suggest this will bring doom or that, by signing the Kyoto Protocol, Australia would make a significant difference to global carbon dioxide levels or to the rate of climate change.” ([LINK](#))

Professor Dr. William J.R. Alexander, Emeritus of the Department of Civil and Biosystems Engineering at the University of Pretoria in South Africa and a former member of the United Nations Scientific and Technical Committee on Natural Disasters, rejected the so-called “consensus” view on global warming. “Mix Al Gore, polar bears, Kilimanjaro, Katrina, the Royal Society, the Stern Review, the 2000 IPCC scientists and what do you get - the end of the world. Should we in Africa start digging our graves or make reservations at the crematorium? Or should we challenge the doomsday scenarios?” Alexander wrote in a May 1, 2007 report. “The claimed increases in surface air temperature resulting from global warming are less than those between breakfast and morning tea on a sunny day. In our part of the world they are also considerably less than those experienced when moving in and out of the shade on a cloudless day,” Alexander explained. “Acting under political pressures of their own making, northern hemisphere scientists have allowed themselves to be forced into a claustrophobic position from which there is no escape. They are now desperately trying to convince the rest of the world of the catastrophic terrestrial consequences of global warming. In the absence of believable evidence of the claimed consequences, they are exercising dangerous practices of attempting to suppress all research that questions human causality. The reprehensible edicts of the Royal Society, the patently dishonest Stern Review and the pompous attempts to prevent the distribution of the DVD on the climate change swindle are evidence of the desperate situation in which the doomsday advocates find themselves,” he added. Alexander also expressed concerns that any so-called “solutions” to global warming will harm the poor. “The World Trade Organization has failed in its attempts to lift trade restrictions imposed by affluent countries. In a recent development, some UK organizations have reduced the importation of perishable agricultural products from Africa using the excuse that this will reduce air pollution. Now the developed countries have the audacity to expect African countries to bow to their pressures based on corrupt science and broken promises of aid, in order to save the world from their imaginary doomsday scenarios. We are not that stupid,” he concluded. ([LINK](#)) Alexander co-authored a June 2, 2007 paper entitled “Linkages between solar activity, climate predictability and water resource development” with **Solar system researcher Frederick Bailey, Hydrogeologist Dr. David B Bredenkamp, Chemical engineer Dr. Alwyn van der Merwe and engineer Nico Willemse.**

The paper read in part: “The analysis of this data demonstrates an unequivocal synchronous linkage between these processes in South Africa and elsewhere, and solar activity. This confirms observations and reports by others in many countries during the past 150 years. It is also shown with a high degree of assurance that there is a synchronous linkage between the statistically significant, 21-year periodicity in these processes and the acceleration and deceleration of the sun as it moves through galactic space. Despite a diligent search, no evidence could be found of trends in the data that could be attributed to human activities.”
([LINK](#))

Geologist Dr. Cliff Ollier, a Research Fellow at the University of Western Australia, has worked internationally as a geologist, geomorphologist, and soil scientist, and has authored ten books and over 300 publications. Ollier dismissed fears of Greenland and Antarctic ice melts in an October 21, 2007 report entitled “THE GREENLAND-ANTARCTICA MELTING PROBLEM DOES NOT EXIST.” Ollier debunked fears of a meltdown promoted by NASA’s James Hansen. “Hansen is a modeller, and his scenario for the collapse of the ice sheets is based on a false model,” Ollier wrote. “Hansen has a model of an ice sheet sliding along an inclined plane, lubricated by meltwater, which is itself increasing because of global warming. The same model is adopted in many copy-cat papers. Christoffersen and Hambrey (2006) and Bamber et al. (2007). A popular article based on the same flawed model appeared in the June 2007 issue of National Geographic, and the idea is present in textbooks such as The Great Ice Age (2000) by R.C.L. Wilson et al.,” Ollier explained. “Hansen’s model, unfortunately, includes neither the main form of the Greenland and Antarctic Ice Sheets, nor an understanding of how glaciers flow. The predicted behaviour of the ice sheets is based on melting and accumulation rates at the present day, and on the concept of an ice sheet sliding down an inclined plane on a base lubricated by meltwater, which is itself increasing because of global warming. The idea of a glacier sliding downhill on a base lubricated by meltwater seemed a good idea when first presented by de Saussure in 1779, but a lot has been learned since then,” he added. “It is not enough to think that present climate over a few decades can affect the flow of ice sheets. Ice sheets do not simply grow and melt in response to average global temperature. Anyone with this naïve view would have difficulty in explaining why glaciation has been present in the southern hemisphere for about 30 million years, and in the northern hemisphere for only 3 million years,” Ollier continued. “Some of the present-day claims that ice sheets ‘collapse’ are based on false concepts. Ice sheets do not melt from the surface down - only at the edges. Once the edges are lost, further loss depends on the rate of flow of the ice. The rate of flow of an ice sheet does not depend on the present climate, but on the amount of ice already accumulated, and that will keep it flowing for a very long time. It is possible that any increase in temperature will cause increased snowfall thereby nourishing the growth of the ice sheet, not diminishing it,” he wrote. “The global warming doomsday writers claim the Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets are melting catastrophically, and will cause a sudden rise in sea level of 5 or more metres. This ignores the mechanism of glacier flow which is by creep. Glaciers are not melting from the surface down, nor are they sliding down an inclined plane lubricated by meltwater. The existence of ice over 3 km thick preserving details of past snowfall and atmospheres, used to decipher past temperature and CO2 levels, shows that the ice sheets have accumulated for hundreds of thousands of years without melting. Variations in melting around the edges of ice sheets are no indication that they are collapsing. Indeed ‘collapse’ is impossible,” he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Atmospheric scientist William R. Kininmonth, who headed Australia’s National Climate

from 1986 to 1998 and coordinated the scientific and technical review of the 1997-98 El Niño event for the World Meteorological Organization and its input to the United Nations Task Force on El Niño, rejected man-made climate fears and asserted warming is natural. “How often does it need to be said that CO₂ is a colourless, odourless gas whose only detrimental characteristic is to form a very weak acid (carbonic acid) when dissolved in water. On the other hand, CO₂ is an essential component of photosynthesis: Increased CO₂ in the atmosphere is an effective fertiliser of the biosphere as shown by horticulturalists artificially increasing the CO₂ content within glasshouses. CO₂ is NOT a pollutant,” Kininmonth said in a May 30, 2007 article. “There is every reason to believe that increasing CO₂ in the atmosphere will have no significant impact on the climate system. The greatest impact of atmospheric CO₂ on the earth’s radiation budget was the first 20 ppmv. After this concentration the source of IR radiation to space from the active CO₂ radiation bands was in the stratosphere, where temperature does not change as the emanation goes to higher and higher altitudes with increasing concentration,” Kininmonth explained. “There is every reason to believe that earth is near an upper temperature limit given its present distribution of land and ocean and the strength of solar irradiance. The earth’s surface is heated by way of solar radiation and back IR radiation emanating from clouds, greenhouse gases and aerosols; it is cooled by conduction, evaporation and IR emission. Solar radiation and conduction are essentially constant and the earth’s surface temperature will vary according to increasing back IR radiation (radiation forcing from CO₂ and water vapour) being offset by surface IR emission and latent heat of evaporation,” he added. “AGW (anthropogenic global warming) is a fiction and a very dangerous fiction,” he concluded. ([LINK](#)) On June 1, 2007, Kininmonth wrote, “Not only is it speculative to claim that humans can in any way influence the course of climate but it is arrogant to suggest that today’s climate is getting worse than it has been in the past. For example, who would prefer to return to pre-industrial conditions as they were during the Little Ice Age? Frost Fairs were common on many rivers of Europe and the London diarist John Evelyn records that in 1683-84 the Thames River froze from late December to early February. Conditions were terrible with men and cattle perishing and the seas locked with ice such that no vessels could stir out or come in. The fowls, fish and exotic plants and greens were universally perishing. Food and fuel were exceptionally dear and coal smoke hung so thickly that one could scarcely see across the street and one could scarcely breathe.” ([LINK](#))

Economist Des Moore, former deputy secretary of the federal Treasury in Australia and current director of the Institute for Private Enterprise, debunked the UK Stern Report’s claims that it is cheaper to act now to confront global warming. “I take a position similar to the Dual Critique of the Stern Review by 14 well-qualified scientists and economists. Their conclusion was that the Review is “flawed to a degree that makes it unsuitable ... for use in setting policy”. I also agree with the not dissimilar conclusion on the IPCC’s February report by ten qualified economists and scientists, including Australian meteorologist, William Kininmonth, in a February 2007 publication by Canada’s Fraser Institute,” Moore wrote in a April 29, 2007 report entitled “How Big Can Global Carbon Markets Get?” “Modelling of possible outcomes reflect assumptions that are not necessarily correct about the weightings given to possible influences, or about the simplifications of highly complex human relationships. My analyses of past scientific predictions also suggest to me that, when looking to the future, science faces modelling problems similar to economics and has made as many if not more erroneous predictions,” Moore explained. “[The UN IPCC Summary for Policymakers] concluded that it is 90 per cent certain that most of the recent warming is due to increased human activity. However, as two Australian economists have pointed out, 90 per cent certainty is the weakest acceptable level of confidence in a hypothesis test. Moreover,

the Summary for Policymakers published by the IPCC on 6 April claims only an 80 per cent chance that warming has caused many of the perceived adverse environmental affects,” Moore wrote. “Although there has been an increase in average global temperatures of about 0.6 a degree over the past 100 years, historical evidence suggests that temperature levels have been as high if not higher in periods in the past and that this did not then have adverse effects on societies. Indeed, rather to the contrary: significant economic and other advances seem to have occurred in past warm periods,” he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Geologist Bob Foster, director of the Lavoisier Group in Australia denounced the UN IPCC reports. “Belief in the mythical stability of past climate has, as its equally-implausible corollary, belief that ‘doing the right thing’ about greenhouse gas emissions can ensure a stable future climate,” Foster wrote in a May 22, 2005 article. “IPCC’s hypothesis of a people-driven climate is said to represent the consensus of 2,500 of the world’s top climate scientists; and it has been embraced unquestioningly by Australia’s governments, Federal and State. The Mediaeval Warm Period and Little Ice Age have been abolished; and IPCC ostentatiously promotes the ‘Mann Hockeystick’ - a thousand-year temperature graph purporting to show a stable pre-industrial climate (handle), disturbed only now by humans burning fossil fuels (blade),” Foster wrote. “The Kyoto Protocol is but King Canute’s first step toward impoverishing the world for no attainable purpose. But an alternative hypothesis offers two natural drivers for our ever-changing climate. Both have an underlying solar/planetary pace-maker, although via very different mechanisms. Humans can’t control the Sun and planets - or climate,” he added. ([LINK](#))

Global warming author and engineer Ray Evans, one of the founders of the Australian Lavoisier Group, published “Nine Facts About Climate Change” in February 2007. “Environmentalism has largely superseded Christianity as the religion of the upper classes in Europe and to a lesser extent in the United States,” Evans writes in his publication. “It is a form of religious belief which fosters a sense of moral superiority in the believer, but which places no importance on telling the truth,” he says. “The science from the anthropogenist’s point of view has collapsed. The carbon-dioxide link is increasingly recognised as irrelevant,” Evans wrote. “CO2 only has a limited greenhouse effect in the atmosphere,” he argues. “A ‘saturation effect’ makes the carbon dioxide reduction road to salvation a ‘completely futile and irrational exercise in faith’” he says. ([LINK](#)) On March 26, 2007, Evan further explained his views. “What is of very great importance to us now is to look for explanations as to why institutions such as the CSIRO so easily and carelessly abandoned reason, and decided to go with the “faith alone” crowd,” he said. “We have quite a way to go before reason can overcome hysteria in this debate,” he added. ([LINK](#))

Meteorologist Rob Roseman of Colorado, who earned a Masters degree in Meteorology, expressed man-made global warming skepticism in 2007. “I don’t think [global warming] is man-made. I could give you, and will give you, just a couple of examples of -- by way of questions -- that will make people question why they think it’s man-made. For some reason we as humans have a tendency to want to believe things that are popular in the media rather than just, say, listen to all of the scientists. Number one, it is not settled science -- I will tell you that; absolutely not settled science,” Roseman said on April 23, 2007 on the Caplis & Silverman Show. “Colorado was covered by thousands of feet of ice at some point. How did that melt unless there were some little guys driving around in cars that we didn’t know about?” Rosemand asked. “500 years ago, the Earth was about 5 degrees warmer than it is now -- especially in North America and Northern Europe. Guess what? Some of the best

climate, the best crop-growing weather and everything else, and the seas weren't 3 feet higher than they are today," he added.

Economist Dr. Robert Higgs, a Senior Fellow for the Independent Institute and who has been a visiting scholar at Oxford University, Stanford University, and a fellow for the National Science Foundation, rejected the notion of a "consensus" on man-made global warming and dismissed the UN IPCC's scientific credentials. "The United Nations (and its committees and the bureaus it oversees) is no more a scientific organization than the U.S. Congress (and its committees and the bureaus it oversees). When decisions and pronouncements come forth from these political organizations, it makes sense to treat them as essentially political in origin and purpose," Higgs wrote on May 7, 2007. "I have thirty-nine years of professional experience -- twenty-six as a university professor, including fifteen at a major research university, and then thirteen as a researcher, writer, and editor -- in close contact with scientists of various sorts, including some in the biological and physical sciences and many in the social sciences and demography. I have served as a peer reviewer for more than thirty professional journals and as a reviewer of research proposals for the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health," Higgs wrote. He then explained how the peer-review process has many flaws. "Personal vendettas, ideological conflicts, professional jealousies, methodological disagreements, sheer self-promotion, and a great deal of plain incompetence and irresponsibility are no strangers to the scientific world; indeed, that world is rife with these all-too-human attributes. In no event can peer review ensure that research is correct in its procedures or its conclusions. The history of every science is a chronicle of one mistake after another," Higgs wrote. ([LINK](#))

Physicist Wm. Robert Johnston, who co-wrote the scientific paper in 2007 "Observations of the Ionospheric Projection of the Plasmopause and Comparisons with Relativistic Electron Measurements" which was submitted to the GRL, expressed his skepticism about global warming in a December 29, 2005 report entitled "What If All the Ice Melts? - Myths and Realities." "The suggestions that human activities will cause significant changes in global temperature and sea level in the next century are flawed predictions which haven't been confirmed by observations. The solutions to this apparently non-existent problem proposed by environmentalists would not have a significant effect on climate, but they would cause a significant amount of human suffering," Johnston wrote. "Note that it has taken 18,000 years to melt 60% of the ice from the last ice age. The remaining ice is almost entirely at the north and south poles and is isolated from warmer weather. To melt the ice of Greenland and Antarctica would take thousands of years under any realistic change in climate. In the case of the East Antarctic Ice Sheet, which accounts for 80% of the Earth's current ice, Sudgen argues that it existed for 14,000,000 years, through wide ranges in global climate," Johnston explained. "It is sad that some youngsters think that burning of hydrocarbons could cause the ice caps to melt and drown cities; it is criminal when teachers don't correct this nonsense," he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Space Physicist Dr. James Wanliss of Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University, who received a prestigious award from National Science Foundation in 2004, rejects man-made climate fears and teaches an honors course titled "The Politics and Science of Fear." "I fear that attempts are being made to purposefully subvert the public understanding of the nature of science in order to achieve political goals," Wanliss said according to a May 12, 2007 article in Florida's *News Journal*. "Science is not about consensus, and to invoke this raises the hackles of scientists such as myself. The lure of politics and publicity is no

doubt seductive, but it nevertheless amazes me that so many scientists have jumped on the bandwagon of consensus science, apparently forgetting or ignoring the sad history of consensus science,” Wanliss explained. “The atmosphere is incredibly complicated, and we know very little about it. We are studying a system which is so big . . . we don’t know what all the variables are,” he said. “You want certainty, but it’s hard to get that,” he said. “Science isn’t about certainty.” Wanliss is heading a team of researchers who will use data gathered from ground- and satellite-based instruments that measure fluctuations in the Earth’s magnetic field. ([LINK](#))

[Oregon State Climatologist George Taylor](#) of **Oregon State University’s College of Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences**, had his job title threatened by the state’s Governor over his skeptical stance on man-made warming fears. Excerpt from a February 8, 2007 article from KGW.com: “[State Climatologist George Taylor] does not believe human activities are the main cause of global climate change...So the [Oregon] governor wants to take that title from Taylor and make it a position that he would appoint. In an exclusive interview with KGW-TV, Governor Ted Kulongoski confirmed he wants to take that title from Taylor.” The article quoted Taylor as stating: “Most of the climate changes we have seen up until now have been a result of natural variations.”

Astronomer and Physicist Dr. Hugh Ross, who has conducted research on quasars and galaxies, expressed global warming skepticism in a December 18, 2006 article entitled “Global Warming -- How Concerned Do We Really Need to be?” “We tend to think Earth’s climate will always be optimal for human civilization if we just take better care of it. But nothing could be further from the truth,” Ross wrote. “When we put emotion and politics aside and take a rational look at our planet’s history, we actually see something quite different. Ice and sediment cores show that over the past four million years, the global climate has oscillated many times. The changes are caused by variations in Earth’s orbit. Each cycle lasts about 100,000 years with an ice age typically taking up 90,000 of those years, and a global warming effect, the other 10,000 years,” Ross explained. “Contrary to the claims of a few high profile politicians, celebrities, and environmentalists, some of our human activities in fact create a cooling effect,” Ross wrote. “The release of aerosols and particulates actually blocks out sunlight and generates light-reflecting cloud layers, especially over densely populated and highly industrialized regions where pollution is loosely, if at all regulated. The bottom line here is that there are dozens of physical, chemical, and biological processes that contribute to both heating and cooling the planet. When any one of these factors gets out of balance with the others, Earth is at risk of losing its optimal climate for human civilization,” Ross added. “This delicate balancing act of multiple and diverse natural processes and human activities gives us reason to be cautious. But to suggest that we can stop global warming by simply cutting back on fossil fuel combustion and altering our industrial processes is naïve at best. If we ignore one or more of certain mechanisms that contribute to either global warming or cooling, our attempted solutions could actually make matters worse,” he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Paleoclimatologist Dr. Fred Michel, Director of the Institute of Environmental Science and Associate Professor of the Department of Earth Sciences at Carleton University in Canada, rejected global warming fears. “Climate hysteria has been known to be a sham all along,” Michel told EPW on May 16, 2007. “As someone who has worked in the arctic on topics such as permafrost, groundwater, and Quaternary glacial history, it has always been quite clear that the climate is constantly changing and that natural processes are able to produce very large changes over very short time periods,” wrote Michel, who has worked

with the International Energy Agency. We need “to return our focus to the important issues that need to be addressed, which includes being aware of the effects of a changing climate whether it be warmer or colder,” he added. ([LINK](#))

State Climatologist Dr. Charles Wax of Mississippi State University and past president of the American Association of State Climatologists, declared his skepticism on warming in 2007. “First off, there isn’t a consensus among scientists. Don’t let anybody tell you there is,” Wax said, according to a May 16, 2007 article. “I don’t know if it’s going to rain Thursday or not. Certainly I don’t know what the temperature is going to be in 2050,” Wax explained. “In 1957, all the thermometers (the government uses to track temperatures) were moved from fields onto airports. It went from the Weather Bureau, which supported agriculture, to the Department of Commerce. Cities are hotter. (If you look at the numbers) you’ll see a major climate change in 1957 alone,” he said. Wax, who chaired the U.S.D.A.’s Southern Region Research Committee for Climatology in Agricultural Production, also explained the geologic history of the Earth. “There was a little ice age from 1400 to 1800. We’re warming back up, but it’s not nearly as warm as it was 2,000 or 7,000 years ago,” he explained. ([LINK](#)) & ([LINK](#))

Chemical Engineer Dr. Tony Burns of the University of New South Wales in Sydney, Australia expressed skepticism of man-made global warming. “The common viewpoint is that man-made carbon dioxide is to blame, but the Earth has been through ice ages and periods of global warming for millions of years,” Burns wrote in an April 2006 essay. “As recently as 1,000 years ago, the Earth was a degree warmer in the ‘Medieval Warm Period’ and the Vikings could grow crops in Greenland,” Burns explained. “No one questions how this could happen so many years before our recent fuel consumption excesses. No one questions why man-made carbon dioxide would have any effect on global warming when it constitutes less than 1 percent of greenhouse gases (the major greenhouse gas is water vapor). No one questions the recent Antarctic ice cores from Dome Concordia, with ice up to 700,000 years old, which show increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide concentration occurring about 1,000 years after global temperature rises, thus suggesting that high carbon dioxide levels are a result of global warming, not a cause,” he added. Burns decried the demonization of climate skeptics. “In 1633, opposition to the common viewpoint could mean death. This was the case with Galileo when he proposed that the Earth revolved around the sun. He was tried for heresy. Of course things are different today. People who question dogma are no longer burnt at the stake. Instead, they’re branded as having suspect motives, as reactionaries or simply as nutcases,” he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Dr. Michael J. Economides, Professor of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering at Cullen College of Engineering at University of Houston and the author of numerous books and over 50 scientific studies, rejected climate fears. “After a desperate literature search over four years, involving as many as 30 engineering and science graduate students, we have yet to come up with one professional paper that shows a quantitative causality between increased carbon dioxide and enhanced global temperature,” Economides, who is a member of the Russian Academy of Natural Sciences, wrote in a April 9, 2007 article in *Energy Tribune*. “This means there is not one paper in the literature of heat transfer or thermodynamics that shows the physics of global warming in a quantified way, using well-known laws or principles. There are, however, many arm-waving and postulating writings, often in the popular press, all referencing the other ‘hundreds of papers,’” Economides explained. ([LINK](#)) & ([LINK](#))

Chemical Scientist Dr. Brian G. Valentine of the U.S. Department of Energy and professor at University of Maryland, has studied computational fluid dynamics and modeling of complex systems and expressed global warming skepticism. “Human development, associated with the continual advance of Civilization on the Earth, has always influenced the local weather; and the degree of influence on local weather is probably proportional to the magnitude of the changes in the Earth’s topography that have resulted from continual human advances,” Valentine wrote to EPW on May 17, 2007. “There is no evidence that any of these changes in local weather have ever resulted in a change to the global climate. My own research has convinced me that excepting for one situation, there have NEVER been ANY influences that have changed the global climate - not solar, not stellar, not variations in Earth’s spin on its axis - nothing - that can be demonstrated beyond reasonable doubt, for which equally valid evidence is available that contradicts the assumption of global climate change,” Valentine explained. “This single exception is the known variation of eccentricity of the Earth’s orbit about the Sun. This is the periodic variation of distance from Earth to the Sun that changes the distance from the Earth to the Sun within Earth’s seasons, and occurs within tens of thousands of year epochs,” he concluded.

Microbiologist Gary Novak publishes a website detailing his skepticism of man-made global warming. “Arctic ice is melting faster than expected, because oceans are heating more than the atmosphere. No atmospheric temperature increase has been found in eight years. Alarmists are not promoting science; they are promoting propaganda justified through a black-box analysis which generates contrived numbers. Science requires evidence and logic,” Novak, who holds a masters degree in microbiology, wrote on his website in 2007. “There is no mechanism for carbon dioxide creating global warming. ‘Greenhouse gases’ absorb all radiation available to them in a few meters. More of the gas cannot absorb more radiation. A thick sheet of plastic does nothing more than a thin sheet. Doubling the CO₂ would only shorten the distance for absorption of radiation from 10 meters to 5 meters, which is not an increase in temperature,” Novak explained. “The real cause of global warming could be an increase in solar energy, as critics generally claim; but there is evidence that it is due to variations in heat from the earth’s core. Ice ages are caused by oceans heating, which appears to result from increased heat from inside the earth. The primary evidence is the exact cycling of ice ages. Environmental factors would not be so precise. Also, the oceans heating more than the atmosphere points to the heat coming from inside the earth. Atmospheric changes can result from variations in solar activity, but they are superficial compared to heat from the earth’s core which drives ice age cycles,” he concluded. ([LINK](#)) & ([LINK](#))

Biologist and Biophysicist Dr. Paulo N. Correa, who has published extensively in scientific journals, co-authored a recent paper entitled “Global Warming: An Official Pseudoscience.” Correa wrote about “mass-hysterias as the pseudoscientific fad of ‘global warming.’” “In the 70s, in the wake of the atmospheric cooling experienced between 1945-1947 and 1972, there was a passing fad of ‘global’ cooling, supposedly buttressed by study of the fossil record and ice samples, which had ‘established’ the existence of cycles of minor ice-ages (see reference to the Milankovitch model below). At that time, the fear was that the earth was just turning the corner into a new ice-age,” Correa wrote. “Just like seawater shows oscillations in temperature or content of sensible heat, the atmosphere, too, is subject to long-term oscillations in energy content, including sensible heat and its measure by temperature. In fact, the evidence indicates that the atmosphere undergoes regular periods of cooling and heating, both near the ground and all the way up, through the troposphere, to the tropopause and the stratosphere. The scientific evidence collected over the past 50 years suggests that

there are periods of cooling and warming superimposed on cycles of various scales, and that these variations are connected, in ways not yet understood, to solar periodicities, geothermal energy, varying atmospheric electricity and latent heat, and varying cloud cover and cloud composition,” he added. ([LINK](#))

Meteorologist Justin Berk asserted that the “majority of TV meteorologists” are skeptical of dire man-made global warming claims. Berk said in a March 30, 2007 article in The Jewish Times, “I truly believe that global warming is more political than anything else. It’s a hot topic. It grabs people’s interest. As a meteorologist, I have studied this a lot and I believe in cutting down pollution and in energy efficiency. But I have a hard time accepting stories how we as individuals can stop climate change. It has happened on and off throughout history. We produce pollution but that is a small piece of the entire puzzle.” Berk continued: “There are cycles of hurricanes and we had a 30-year cycle from the 1930s to the 1950s. Then from the mid-1960s to the 1990s there was low hurricane activity. We knew there would be another round of higher activity in hurricanes and now it’s happening. [But people have] latched onto this topic and it’s been distorted and exploited. I know that a lot of scientists, including the majority of TV meteorologists, agree with me. In the mid-1970s, climate experts said we were heading for an ice age. Thirty years later, they’re saying global warming. If you look at the big picture, we’ve had warming and cooling throughout history. It’s a natural cycle. We haven’t created it and it’s not something we can stop.” ([LINK](#))

Physicist George E. Smith, a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the American Institute of Physics, expressed his climate skepticism in 2007. “There is enough doubt to scuttle any idea that man is causing [global warming],” Smith wrote to EPW on May 27, 2007. “The earth is a giant swamp cooler, with increased warming (mostly in the oceans) leading to increased evaporation, which ultimately leads to more clouds forming somewhere, and hence less solar radiation reaching the ground so it cools down again. So long as we have oceans, we can’t change the temperature of the earth, either up or down, even if we wanted to,” Smith, who received the Distinguished Alumni Award from the University of Auckland, explained. “The so-called global mean temperature is reputed to be 58F versus about 57 F a century ago. So what value would you like it to be and why?” Smith added. In 2005, Smith also detailed his skepticism in a January 2005 Physics Today article. “The largest single repository of CO₂ on Earth is the oceans, and that the solubility of CO₂ in water drops as the water temperature increases. So clearly a mechanism exists whereby increasing ocean water temperatures (which is where most of the solar energy goes) causes increased out-gassing of CO₂ into the atmosphere. Furthermore, Arctic permafrost zones revert to marshy peat bogs when the Arctic warms, and then bacterial activity takes hold and converts decaying ancient vegetation into atmospheric CO₂. Both of those processes are happening right now,” Smith wrote. “The Russian Vostok ice cores going back 420 000 years and the Dome-C ice cores going back 730 000 years show that the Antarctic ice sheet has not melted during that time frame, even in the warmest interglacial periods. The ice cores also show periods of rapid global warming followed by rapidly increasing atmospheric CO₂,” he added. ([LINK](#))

Chemical Engineer Thomas Ring dismissed man-made climate fears on November 28, 2007. “Over many millennia, the Earth’s average temperature has cycled between about 54 Fahrenheit and 72 Fahrenheit. It now is about 60 degrees. Prior to about 1850, we have only proxy information about the Earth’s temperature, but we know it was warm in Roman times (about 600 BC) and around 1000 (when grapes grew in the United Kingdom and Greenland

was rich in vegetation). These warmer periods occurred in the absence of man-made CO₂,” Ring wrote in an article titled “We Should Not Fear Global Warming.” “Since 1850, it has been possible to measure the Earth’s average temperature and atmospheric CO₂ more precisely. From 1850 to 1912, there was a rather stable ‘cool’ period. From 1912 to 1943, when there was little man-made CO₂ emission, it warmed about 1.1 degrees F (remember the heat and drought in the Southwest United States in the 1930s?), and atmospheric CO₂ increased from 0.029 percent to 0.031 percent. From 1943 to 1974, it cooled about 0.6 degrees (while CO₂ increased from 0.031 percent to 0.033 percent), giving rise to a ‘new ice age’ scare,” Ring explained. “Since 1974, it has warmed about 1.3 degrees F, and atmospheric CO₂ increased from 0.033 percent to 0.037 percent, giving rise to the current scare of ‘global warming caused by man-made CO₂,” he added. “What’s responsible for prior periods of warmth in 600 BC, 1000 and 1912 to 1943, all when there was no or little man-made CO₂? It’s most likely the sun, whose radiation varies to the fourth power of its temperature...The major greenhouse gases are CO₂ and water vapor. Current atmospheric CO₂ is a teeny 0.037 percent, and its impact is far less than proportional as its concentration increases. Atmospheric water vapor is, however, 0.9 percent, 25 times as much as CO₂. Water vapor is a ‘radiator’ that is three times more powerful than CO₂, but its larger effect has been ignored in the global warming debate,” he added. “Warming of the Earth has never been catastrophic; in fact, humankind has always fared better in warmer than cooler periods, with less hardship and illness and improved agriculture. We should not fear global warming. We do, however, need solid, objective and unbiased research, rather than fear-mongering based on a nonscientific ‘consensus,’” he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Evolutionary Biologist and Paleozoologist Dr. Susan Crockford of University of Victoria in Canada has published papers in peer-reviewed academic journals and rejected fears that man-made global warming could devastate animal life on Earth. “It is apparent to me that animal species are much more flexible over the long term (centuries and millennia) than we assume based on short-term studies of local populations: most species have the capacity to adjust to abrupt climate or habitat change,” Crockford told EPW on December 1, 2007. “While many individuals, or even entire local populations, may perish in the face of change, others do just fine (this variation in ‘survivability’ among individuals within a population is characteristic of all species). The individuals who survive rebuild the population and the species perpetuates,” Crockford added. “Contrary to popular belief, populations can rebound from quite low levels, as demonstrated by the fact that many population expansions (and introductions by humans) derive from a handful of individuals at best and often, a single pregnant female. Polar bears, for example, survived several episodes of much warmer climate over the last 10,000 years than exists today and if global numbers of bears dropped during these times, they must have rebounded nicely or there would not be so many bears today. Ringed seals, the primary prey of polar bears (and similarly dependant on sea ice), also survived these warm periods and are now very abundant,” she added. “In other words, there is no evidence to suggest that the polar bear or its food supply is in danger of disappearing entirely with increased Arctic warming, regardless of the dire fairy-tale scenarios predicted by computer models: evidence from the past is a kind of ‘ground truth’ we can trust and it tells us that sufficient sea ice will persist, even with significant increases in temperature, to ensure the survival of both polar bears and ringed seals,” she concluded. ([LINK](#))

Meteorologist Herb Stevens, one of the original meteorologists at The Weather Channel and founder of Grass Roots Weather, expressed climate skepticism in 2007. “Based on my background as a scientist, you should also know that I am a firm believer that warming

of our atmosphere is not caused by man. Quite simply, the evidence does not exist to prove a correlation between greenhouse gas emissions and rising atmospheric temperatures... the correlation does not pass muster with the scientific method, and until it does, thousands of other scientists and I continue to look elsewhere for the answers to questions of short and long term climate change,” Stevens wrote on May 17, 2007. “The vast majority of the coverage of global warming suggests catastrophic consequences await in the not too distant future...mind you, all of those predictions for 25, 50, or even 100 years in the future come from computer models, the same technology that quite often can’t get tomorrow’s weather right,” Stevens explained. “It is especially troubling to scientists that the vast majority of spokespersons for global warming have little if any scientific background...politicians, actors, radio and television hosts, and other members of the media, most of whom have journalism backgrounds,” Stevens added. “Unfortunately, due to the one-sidedness of the information barrage, much of our society has bought in to the notion that we are on the road to ruin. Several entities within the winter sports industry have become vocal supporters of the notion of human-induced global warming, and they have scared the heck out of a lot of people in the process,” he concluded.

Meteorologist Arthur T. “Terry” Safford III, a retired Lt Col. of the U.S. Air Force has declared himself a skeptic. “My principal interest in this subject is not so much how climate change affects public policy, but more the scientific aspects. That does bother me greatly. I was always taught that as a pure scientist, you gather the facts, develop some possible explanation, and select the best-tested solution. That is clearly not the norm with (internationally) government-granted scientists or grants from agenda groups. They tend to start with the conclusion and work backwards to the facts. If the facts aren’t convenient, they are adjusted, the sample size reduced, or simply ignored,” Safford wrote to EPW on May 21, 2007. “This is ‘junk’ science, at its worst and needs to be uncovered and exposed. It’s OK, under the First Amendment, if Hollywood advocates junk science, but it is not OK for the meteorological/climatological community. The science of meteorology has enough trouble with its ‘public image’ without destroying its credibility altogether,” Safford explained. “I am a retired synoptic meteorologist from the Air Force for 29 years. I spent the vast majority of that time directly supporting military operations at a number of locations and differing commands in both the Air Force and Army,” he concluded.

The UK-based Scientific Alliance, which bills itself as a “evidence-based approach” to environmental issues and has numerous scientists as members, rejected climate alarm in 2007. “The Scientific Alliance points out that these (the UN IPCC) conclusions are derived from the output of computer models based on an imperfect understanding of the non-linear, chaotic system which is our climate,” stated a May 3, 2007 press release from the group. **Chemist Martin Livermore, director of the Scientific Alliance,** stated in the release, “Politicians and many in the scientific community are putting their faith in the unproven hypothesis that carbon dioxide is the main driver of climate change. They ignore the fact that the formation of clouds - known to have a major influence on climate - is poorly understood. They ignore the major influence of El Niño events, responsible for the record average temperatures in 1998 but the mechanism of which we do not understand. And they ignore the lack of agreement between model predictions and observation in the upper atmosphere and much of the southern hemisphere. This is not a sound basis for the most radical global policy proposals ever seen.” The release continued, “It is clear that there has been a significant warming trend in parts of the world in the last 30 years, particularly in the northern hemisphere. But what has caused these changes, and what will happen over the

next 30 years, is not well understood. To believe that we can control climate with our current level of knowledge is misguided. In the circumstances, the global community should focus its efforts on protecting vulnerable areas while helping to lift people out of the poverty which increases their vulnerability. Putting reduction of carbon dioxide emissions as top priority will do nothing for the world's poorest countries." **Scientists who are members of the Scientific Alliance include: Professor Tom Addiscott of the University of East London, who was awarded the Royal Agricultural Society of England Research Medal, specializes in research about modelling the processes which determine losses of nitrate from the soil; Chemist Dr Jack Barrett of Imperial College has conducted research into spectroscopy and photochemical kinetics and authored several textbooks about Inorganic Chemistry and the Bacterial Oxidation of Minerals; Dr Sonja Boehmer-Christiansen has worked on emission models; Biochemist and microbiologist Professor Vivian Moses of King's College and University College in London; Professor Anthony Trewavas of the Institute of Molecular Plant Sciences at the University of Edinburgh who has authored over 220 papers and two books; and Chemical Engineer Professor William Wilkinson, who was the former deputy chief executive of British Nuclear Fuels and served on the UK Advisory Committee on Research and Development and the Science Research Council.**
<http://scientific-alliance.org/>

Climatologist Dr. David R. Legates, the Delaware State Climatologist and the Director, Center for Climatic Research at the University of Delaware, has authored or coauthored 45 peer-reviewed scientific studies. Legates also expressed climate skepticism in 2007. "Scientific debate continues regarding the extent to which human activities contribute to global warming and what the potential impact on the environment might be. Importantly, much of the scientific evidence contradicts assertions that substantial global warming is likely to occur soon and that the predicted warming will harm the Earth's biosphere," Legates wrote in a May 15, 2007 study entitled "Climate Science: Climate Change and Its Impacts." "Sea levels have been rising - in fact, they have been rising since the end of the last ice age 20,000 years ago - but there is no evidence of an accelerating trend. The complexity of the climate and the limitations of data and computer models mean projections of future climate change are unreliable at best. In sum, the science does not support claims of drastic increases in global temperatures over the 21st century, nor does it support claims of human influence on weather events and other secondary effects of climate change," Legates concluded. Legates has also served as Coordinator of the National Geographic sponsored Delaware Geographic Alliance and served as the Associate Director for the NASA sponsored Delaware Space Grant Consortium. ([LINK](#)) Legates has also clashed with the Governor of Delaware in 2007 because of the Governor disagreed with his skeptical views on global warming. ([LINK](#))

Meteorologists Andre and Sally Bernier of WJW-TV, in Cleveland, Ohio, both reject climate fears. "As two degreed and seasoned meteorologists, we will not be selling our snowblower anytime soon or tempted to try planting a palm tree in our front lawn," the Berniers, who were formerly of The Weather Channel, wrote to EPW on May 21, 2007. "There is simply far too little evidence to support entertaining the notion of anthropogenic causes for any climate shift. The focus has been to unearth as much evidence as possible all the while ignoring any evidence that is contrary to the theory the likes of which is far too significant to cast off," the Berniers explained. "Additionally, to rely and act on computer models which do not even come close to accurately capture the infinitely complex climate system of Earth is nothing short of reckless and irresponsible," they explained. "Thirty years ago headlines frightened everyone with an in imminent ice age. We suspect that fifty years

from now, real science will have cast off and forgotten these claims similar to the realization that Galileo was right after all,” the Berniers concluded.

Yury Izrael, the director of Global Climate and Ecology Institute, a member of the Russian Academy of Sciences and UN IPCC Vice President, rejected man-made global warming fears. “There is no proven link between human activity and global warming,” Izrael, **who also served as former first vice-president of the World Meteorological Organization,** wrote on June 23, 2005 in *RIA Novosti*. “Global temperatures increased throughout the 1940s, declined in the 1970s and subsequently began to rise again. Present-day global warming resembles the 1940s, when ships could easily navigate Arctic passages. However, man’s impact was much smaller at that time. A Russian expedition that recently returned from the central Antarctic says that temperatures are now starting to decrease. These sensational findings are one of Mother Nature’s surprises,” Izrael wrote. “Atmospheric carbon dioxide was 280 PPM (parts per million air molecules) in 1880, and now stands at 378 PPM. It has increased by 31% since the pre-industrial era. This is quite a lot, but temperatures have increased by only 0.6 degrees. Paradoxically, temperatures tended to rise by one to 12 degrees at peak intervals, with carbon-dioxide fluctuations totaling not more than 300 PPM. This contradiction is rather baffling. Therefore I believe that the link between man’s activities and rising temperatures has not been proved completely. Natural factors and the impact of man seem to be interlinked,” he added. “The European Union has established by fiat that a two-degree rise in global temperatures would be quite dangerous. However, this data is not scientifically sound. In ancient times the Earth had periods when maximum CO2 concentrations were 6,000 PPM (in Carboniferous period). But life still goes on,” he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Chemist Dr. Joel M. Kauffman, Emeritus Professor of Chemistry at the University of the Sciences in Philadelphia, rejected the notion that “the vast majority” of scientists believe in man-made global warming. “The truth about this is the opposite; most scientists do not,” Kauffman wrote on September 7, 2007. “CO2 can hardly have been the cause of warming because its level in air has been higher than it is now at least 3 times between 1812 and 1962 as shown by 90,000 direct chemical measurements (Beck, E.-G., 180 Years of Atmospheric CO2 Gas Analysis by Chemical Methods, Energy & Environment, 2007, 18(2), 259-282). Further, there is no recent correlation between CO2 levels and atmospheric temps as you may see easily from a NOAA graph,” he wrote. “With an allowance for such urban heat island effects, the global temperature rise from 1905-1940 was similar to the one from 1970-2003 (www.giss.nasa.gov). Dr. Hansen’s flawed USA ground station temps from 2000-2006 needed a Y2K correction provided by the Canadian Steve McIntyre showing that 1934 was the warmest year of the last 100, not 1998 or 2006,” he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Meteorologist Jim Ott, formerly of WTMJ-TV in Wisconsin, a member of the American Meteorological Society and a former lecturer at University of Wisconsin, expressed climate skepticism in 2007 of climate fears. “There is no question that the past 25 years have been warmer than average. There is also no question that background levels of carbon dioxide, or CO2, in the atmosphere have shown a slow but steady increase since the late 1950s, when measurements were begun in a remote spot in the Hawaiian Islands. That is where the certainty ends and the questions really begin,” Ott, who hold a masters of science, wrote on February 10, 2007. “Evidence buried deeper in the Earth suggests that there may have been four major glaciations in North America, with each period of cooling followed by warming. Theories abound about why the climate changed enough to form the glaciers and then to melt

them, but the fact is no one knows for sure what caused those climate changes. One thing we do know: It wasn't anything that humans did. And if we really don't know the answers, isn't it possible that the same factors that caused those climate changes could become active again?" he wrote. "More questions: If CO2 levels have been increasing since the Industrial Revolution in the 19th century, as many scientists surmise, why have we seen some major changes in weather patterns over that time period that don't fit the global warming theory? For example, why were the 1930s much warmer than the 1960s? And why were some of our most severe winters in the late 1970s and early 1980s? Weren't CO2 levels rising during those times? Obviously, other factors besides man have an impact on climate," he added. "If we conclude that from now on only human activity can affect climate change, we are ignoring factors that we don't understand. Could we be in for some unexpected surprises if we assume that the Earth's climate will only get warmer in the coming decades?" he wrote. "Assuming that 25 years of warmer-than-average weather constitutes a long-term, irreversible climate change ignores other periods of anomalous weather that were only temporary. Assuming that human activity is the only factor that will affect the Earth's climate, and that what is happening now will continue in the future, leaves some big questions unanswered," he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Legendary inventor Ray Kurzweil, described as "an inventor whose work in artificial intelligence has dazzled technological sophisticates for four decades" according to May 2, 2007 CNN article, dismissed former Vice President Al Gore's climate views. "These slides that Gore puts up are ludicrous, they don't account for anything like the technological progress we're going to experience," Kurzweil said, according to the CNN article. The article also noted Kurzweil "invented the flatbed scanner, the first true electric piano, and large-vocabulary speech-recognition software; he's launched ten companies and sold five, and has written five books; he has a BS in computer science from MIT and 13 honorary doctorates." ([LINK](#)) In a June 19, 2006 interview with the *Washington Post*, Kurzweil elaborated more on technology. "None of the global warming discussions mention the word 'nanotechnology. Yet nanotechnology will eliminate the need for fossil fuels within 20 years. If we captured 1% of 1% of the sunlight (1 part in 10,000) we could meet 100% of our energy needs without ANY fossil fuels. We can't do that today because the solar panels are too heavy, expensive, and inefficient. But there are new nanoengineered designs that are much more effective. Within five to six years, this technology will make a significant contribution," he said. "I don't see any disasters occurring in the next 10 years from this. However, I AM concerned about other environment issues. There are other reasons to want to move quickly away from fossil fuels including environmental pollution at every step and the geopolitical instability it causes," he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Meteorologist Augie Auer of the New Zealand Climate Science Coalition, former professor of atmospheric sciences at the University of Wyoming and former MetService chief meteorologist, dismissed climate fears: "People should not allow themselves to be deluded by the computer-modeled speculation with which they are bombarded in the news media these days. Measurements show mankind's contribution to the greenhouse effect through carbon dioxide emissions has been somewhere between miniscule to indiscernible," said Professor Auer in a April 5, 2007 article. "In any case, records tell us that increases in the level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere have followed, not led, natural cyclical increases in Earth's temperature," Prof. Auer added. ([LINK](#)) Auer took to task doomsday computer predictions. "Most of these climate predictions or models, they are about a half a step ahead of PlayStation 3 (video game). They're really not justified in what they are saying. Many of the assumptions going into [the models] are simply not right," Auer said in May 2007 in a New

Zealand radio interview shortly before his death in June 10, 2007. ([LINK](#)) Auer also declared man-made climate fears unfounded. “We’re all going to survive this,” Auer said in a May 19, 2007 article in the Timaru Herald. “If we didn’t have the greenhouse effect the planet would be at minus 18 deg C but because we do have the greenhouse effect it is plus 15 deg C, all the time,” he explained. “We couldn’t do it (change the climate) even if we wanted to because water vapour dominates,” he concluded. ([LINK](#)) [In Memoriam: Auer died on June 10, 2007]

Geologist Dr. Norman J. Page a retired independent geological consultant, rejected climate fears. “It is clear that periodic changes in the suns activity, its size, irradiance and magnetism strongly affect climate and are likely the main driver of climate change,” Page explained in to EPW on May 25, 2007. “The words ‘United States’ are almost invariably followed by ‘the world’s biggest polluter.’ This is not so. The U.S. emits a large amount of CO2 but land use patterns in the United States also absorb large amounts of CO2. The important figure for any country or region is not the total emitted but the net amount after absorption is subtracted from emissions. The data are not robust, but a paper published in Science magazine in 1998 concludes that on balance North America takes up more CO2 than it emits to the tune of about 100 million tons per year while Eurasia actually puts into the atmosphere on balance about 3.5 billion tons CO2. The United States cleans up its own mess while Europe is a massive net polluter,” Page wrote. “Compared to most of earth’s history the earth is now impoverished in CO2. At various times in the last 550 million years CO2 levels have often been four or five times current levels and for some eras 10 to 15 times greater than today. Water vapor is by far the most abundant greenhouse gas while CO2 comprises less than 3% of earth’s greenhouse gases,” Page explained.

Fifteen scientists in the Netherlands signed an open letter declaring “Man is not responsible for global warming” in 2007. “The warming is mainly natural causes,” read the January 11, 2007 open letter signed by the 15 scientists in De Volkskrant, Holland. “Some cite the fact that the climate is currently warming and that the level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is increasing. True - but correlation is never proof of causation. Besides, the climate cooled for much of the 20th century, from 1940 to 1975 -- even while CO2 was increasing rapidly,” the 15 scientists explained. “There are nearly two dozen large models -- each giving a different result, depending on the assumptions fed into the computer,” the letter continued. “In any case, model results are never evidence; only actual observations and data count,” they added. “The current warming may well be part of the natural 1500-year cycle that has been measured in ice cores, ocean sediments, stalagmites, etc., going back nearly a million years,” the scientists concluded. The scientists who signed the open letter included: **Peter Bloemers**, professor of biochemistry, University of Nijmegen; **Adriaan Broere**, an engineer and geophysicist, worked in satellite technology; **Bas van Geel**, paleo-ecology professor, University of Amsterdam; **Hub Jongen**, electrical engineer; **Rob Kouffeld**, professor of energy, TU Delft; **Rob Melon**, professor of molecular recognition, Utrecht University; **Jan Mulderink**, a chemical engineer, former research director AKZO Arnhem, former chairman for the Foundation of Sustainable Chemical Technology in Wageningen; **Harry Priem**, . professor of planetary and isotope geology, former director ZWO / NWO Institute for Isotope - Geophysical Research, a former chairman Royal Dutch Geological organization; **Jan Mulderink**, a chemical engineer, former research director AKZO Arnhem, former chairman Foundation Sustainable Chemical Technology in Wageningen; **Henk Schalke**, former chairman of the management team IUGS-UNESCO; **Olaf Schuiling**, Geochemistry professor, University of Utrecht; Dick Thoenes, em. professor chemical process engineering TU Eindhoven, a former chairman Royal Dutch Chemical Society; and **Jan**

Pieter van Wolfswinkel, a retired mechanical engineering professor, TU Delft. ([LINK](#))

Australian marine scientist Dr. Walter Starck rallied around NASA's top administrator Michael Griffin's skeptical climate comments. "Griffin makes an important distinction between the scientific findings of climate change and dramatic predictions of catastrophic consequences accompanied by policy demands. The former can be evaluated by its evidence, but; the latter rest only on assertions and claims to authority," Starck said in a June 1, 2007 press release. "Alternate predictions of benefits from projected changes have been proposed with comparable authority and plausibility. For example, unless one chooses to define the Little Ice Age as 'normal' and 'optimal' the net effect of any warming has only been beneficial and any anthropogenic contribution very small indeed. Dramatic predictions of imminent disaster have a near perfect record of failure. Griffin's note of caution in the escalating concern over climate change deserves sober consideration," he added. ([LINK](#))

Meteorologist Paul G. Becker, a former chief meteorologist with the Air Force and former Colorado Springs chapter president of the American Meteorological Society, called Gore's view of climate change the "biggest myth of the century." "The most plentiful is water vapor making up 35 to 70 percent of all greenhouse gases. Mankind's total contribution to all greenhouse gases - this includes cars, trucks, manufacturing plants, boats, planes and any pollution producer you can name - the total is less than 1 percent. Mother Nature provides the other 99 percent," Becker wrote in a June 3, 2007 article. "Remember that most of the natural wonders of the world were caused by various ice ages and periods of global warming. We've warmed one-half of a degree in the last century, but Gore has Florida under water in a decade or so when the ice cap melts," he added. ([LINK](#))

Climate scientist Dr. Christopher L. Castro, a Professor of the Department of Atmospheric Sciences at the University of Arizona, expressed skepticism of a global warming catastrophe in 2007. "I believe the balance of evidence from the paleoclimate record, recent climate history (particularly since the 1980s), and the anthropogenic attribution GCM (Global Climate Models) experiments (e.g., Meehl et al. type studies) support the conclusion that recent climate change is due, in part, to anthropogenic forcing," Castro wrote on June 4, 2007. But Castro also said he generally agrees that "other possible forcings to the climate system besides CO₂ (like land-use change, aerosols, etc.) are not accounted for well, if at all" and "models are highly sensitive to parameterized processes, like clouds, convection, and radiation, and these processes can have significant impacts on their results." Castro also said, "GCMs have very limited utility for climate prediction (i.e., seasonal forecasts) or climate projection (i.e., global warming projections) on the regional scale." ([LINK](#))

Climatologist Dr. Robert E. Davis, a Professor at University of Virginia, a former UN IPCC contributor and past president of the Association of American Geographers, and past-chair of the American Meteorological Society's Committee on Biometeorology and Aerobiology, dismissed what he termed "hysteria over global warming." "We keep hearing about historically warm years, warm decades, or warm centuries, uncharacteristically long or severe droughts, etc. for which mankind's striving for a high quality of life is to blame, via the internal combustion engine and its by-product, carbon dioxide. But in reality, in most cases, we have a tragically short record of good observations to really determine how much of a record we're even close to setting," Davis wrote on May 12, 2005. "Be wary of global warming psychics warning us of unprecedented climate shifts -- in most cases, they are only unprecedented because of the short life span of most scientists. Remember one of

the absolutely fundamental and too-often unstated tenets of science -- there's little point in studying anything that doesn't vary during a scientist's lifetime," he added. Davis has written numerous papers on such topics as atmospheric circulation change." ([LINK](#))

Dr. Robert H. Essenhigh, a Bailey Professor of Energy Conversion in the department of Mechanical Engineering at Ohio State University, who has published over 45 peer-reviewed studies, dismissed climate fears. "Man's addition to the carbon-dioxide flux in the atmosphere, by fossil-fuel combustion, is essentially irrelevant," Essenhigh wrote on June 13, 2005. "Of the two main reasons, the first is that nature does a far bigger job in the carbon-dioxide supply rate, and the second is that carbon dioxide is secondary to water as a so-called greenhouse gas. So shouldn't we first try to control water? And behind that again is the alternative warming concept, most generally known as the Arctic Ocean Model, which is considered by many to be the real driver for the temperature oscillations and has been for the last million years or so. So, is the carbon dioxide driving the temperature, as so many people seem to believe? Or, is the temperature driving the carbon dioxide? If it's the latter, then what's the problem with carbon dioxide emissions?" Essenhigh wrote. According to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change - and can it be wrong? - nature's rate of carbon supply to the atmosphere (carried as carbon dioxide) and back out again is about 150 gigatons per year. About 60 gigatons per year come from and go back to vegetation, and 90 gigatons per year are from and to the sea. And from man? That's about 5 or 6 or possibly 7 gigatons per year, which is about the size of the noise in the nature data and is essentially trivial by comparison," he added. "And, of the two gases in the atmosphere that do most of the warming, carbon dioxide, as noted, is secondary. Water is responsible for roughly 80 percent to 85 percent of the absorption and re-radiation, and carbon dioxide is responsible for (most of) the balance of 15 percent to 20 percent," he added. ([LINK](#))

Applied Physicist and Engineer Dr. Jeffrey A. Glassman wrote an October 24, 2006 paper entitled "The Acquittal of Carbon Dioxide." In the abstract of the paper appearing in *Rocket Scientist's Journal*, Glassman wrote, "Carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is the product of oceanic respiration due to the well known but under appreciated solubility pump. Carbon dioxide rises out of warm ocean waters where it is added to the atmosphere. There it is mixed with residual and accidental CO₂, and circulated, to be absorbed into the sink of the cold ocean waters." Glassman further explained, "Next the thermohaline circulation carries the CO₂?rich sea water deep into the ocean. A millennium later it appears at the surface in warm waters, saturated by lower pressure and higher temperature, to be exhausted back into the atmosphere." "Notwithstanding that carbon dioxide is a greenhouse gas, atmospheric carbon dioxide

"Notwithstanding that carbon dioxide is a greenhouse gas, atmospheric carbon dioxide has neither caused nor amplified global temperature increases. Increased carbon dioxide has been an effect of global warming, not a cause. Technically, carbon dioxide is a lagging proxy for ocean temperatures. When global temperature, and along with it, ocean temperature rises, the physics of solubility causes atmospheric CO₂ to increase. If increases in carbon dioxide, or any other greenhouse gas, could have in turn raised global temperatures, the positive feedback would have been catastrophic. While the conditions for such a catastrophe were present in the Vostok record from natural causes, the runaway event did not occur. Carbon dioxide does not accumulate in the atmosphere," he wrote. ([LINK](#))

Dr. A.T.J. de Laat, who specialized in atmospheric composition and climate research at

the Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute, commented in the February 2007 Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society. “The line of reasoning here is that natural factors alone cannot explain the observed twentieth-century temperature variations, while including greenhouse gases does. The logical fallacy is the ‘fallacy of false dilemma/either-or fallacy,’ that is, the number of alternatives are (un)intentionally restricted, thereby omitting relevant alternatives from consideration (Haskins 2006),” de Laat wrote. “That global twentieth-century temperature variations can be explained by using a simple model merely points to a certain consistency between this model or climate model simulations and observations. Furthermore, the fact that the late-twentieth-century warming is unexplained by two factors (solar variations and aerosols) and can be explained by including a third factor (greenhouse gases) does not prove that greenhouse gases are the cause; it just points to a missing process in this model,” he explained. “In fact, this whole line of reasoning does not prove the existence of global warming; it is merely consistent with it. As an example, it is still debated whether or not land surface temperature changes during the twentieth century are affected by anthropogenic non-greenhouse gas processes and whether or not these processes affect surface temperatures on a global scale (Christy et al. 2006; Kalnay et al. 2006; de Laat and Maurellis 2006). There is a risk associated with this line of reasoning in that it suggests that understanding temperature variations of the climate system as a whole is very simple and completely understood, all one has to consider is the amount of incoming and outgoing radiation by changes in atmospheric absorbers and reflectors,” he added. “Notwithstanding the fact that temperature is not a conserved quantity in any physical system, and thus is not the best metric to study energy within the climate system, it also suggests that other processes and nonlinear behavior of the climate system are either nonexistent or do not affect (decadal and global) temperature variations. Presenting climate science this way oversimplifies the complexity of the climate system and possibly overstates our current understanding,” he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Dr. Patrick J. Michaels, Virginia State Climatologist, a UN IPCC reviewer, and University of Virginia professor of environmental sciences, called Gore’s film “science fiction” in a February 23, 2007 article. “The main point of [Gore’s] movie is that, unless we do something very serious, very soon about carbon dioxide emissions, much of Greenland’s 630,000 cubic miles of ice is going to fall into the ocean, raising sea levels over twenty feet by the year 2100,” Michaels wrote. Michaels is a senior fellow in environmental studies at the Cato Institute and author of “Meltdown: The Predictable Distortion of Global Warming by Scientists, Politicians, and the Media.” Michaels continued, “Nowhere in the traditionally refereed scientific literature do we find any support for Gore’s hypothesis. Instead, there’s an un-refereed editorial by NASA climate firebrand James E. Hansen, in the journal *Climate Change* - edited by Steven Schneider, of Stanford University, who said in 1989 that scientists had to choose ‘the right balance between being effective and honest’ about global warming - and a paper in the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* that was only reviewed by one person, chosen by the author, again Dr. Hansen. These are the sources for the notion that we have only ten years to ‘do’ something immediately to prevent an institutionalized tsunami. And given that Gore only conceived of his movie about two years ago, the real clock must be down to eight years! It would be nice if my colleagues would actually level with politicians about various ‘solutions’ for climate change. The Kyoto Protocol, if fulfilled by every signatory, would reduce global warming by 0.07 degrees Celsius per half-century.” ([LINK](#))

Australian Scientist Jonathan Lowe, who specializes in statistical analysis of climate

change and holds masters in science, is currently working on his PhD, expressed climate skepticism. “If CO2 emissions were the major cause of global warming then we would see constant increases in temperature across the day and night as the CO2 blanket keeps the heat inside our atmosphere. Scientific research has shown that this has occurred with both minimum and maximum temperature increasing. We have pointed out time and time again how minimum temperatures are not a good indication of night time warming, especially when it rarely occurs at night,” Lowe wrote of Australian temperatures on his Gust of Hot Air blog on November 7, 2007. “If CO2 was the major cause of global warming then we would see no significant difference in rate of change of temperature anomalies, in other words, all temperatures should increase equally. If the sun was a major cause of global warming then we would see no or limited changes at night, an increase in the rate of change approaching the middle of the day, and then a decreasing rate of change of temperature anomalies when the sun starts to lose its daytime strength,” he explained. “So what do we find when looking at the data?” he asked. “The data points heavily towards sun induced global warming,” he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Tim Thornton, who holds degrees in Meteorology and Computer Science, publishes the website “The Global Warming Heretic.” “If warming is in fact occurring, is it human-induced (i.e. anthropogenic)? There is no -- zero, zilch, nada -- conclusive evidence to this effect, despite what you hear daily from pundits and politicians. It is often asserted, often assumed, but to my knowledge never demonstrated beyond reasonable doubt or on a preponderance of the evidence,” Thornton wrote on May 21, 2007. “It has seemed so clear to me that the global warming (or climate change, or whatever they’re calling it this week) juggernaut has been only 10 percent science mixed with 90 percent politics. If this was a purely scientific issue, why would we see it -- alone of all scientific pursuits -- declared to be ‘settled’ and closed to further inquiry? Why else would the media be giving the time of day to people who say that those who challenge the orthodoxy are the moral equivalent of Holocaust deniers? When some Hollywood climate expert like Leonardo DiCaprio proclaims that humanity possibly faces extinction because of global warming, why doesn’t someone on the pro-AGW side ask him to stop making their cause look bad?” Thornton wrote. ([LINK](#))

[60 Prominent Scientists](#) **came forward in 2006 to question the so-called “consensus” that the Earth faces a “climate emergency.”** The 60 scientists wrote an open letter in 2006 to the Canadian Prime Minister asserting that the science is deteriorating from underneath global warming alarmists. “If, back in the mid-1990s, we knew what we know today about climate, Kyoto would almost certainly not exist, because we would have concluded it was not necessary,” the 60 scientists wrote on April 6, 2006. “Observational evidence does not support today’s computer climate models, so there is little reason to trust model predictions of the future...Significant [scientific] advances have been made since the [Kyoto] protocol was created, many of which are taking us away from a concern about increasing greenhouse gases,” the 60 scientists wrote. “‘Climate change is real’ is a meaningless phrase used repeatedly by activists to convince the public that a climate catastrophe is looming and humanity is the cause. Neither of these fears is justified. Global climate changes all the time due to natural causes and the human impact still remains impossible to distinguish from this natural ‘noise,’” they added. “It was only 30 years ago that many of today’s global-warming alarmists were telling us that the world was in the midst of a global-cooling catastrophe. But the science continued to evolve, and still does, even though so many choose to ignore it when it does not fit with predetermined political agendas,” the 60 scientists concluded. Scientists signing the letter included: **Dr. Paul Copper**, FRSC, professor emeritus, Dept.

of Earth Sciences, Laurentian University, Sudbury, Ont.; **Dr. Andreas Prokoph**, adjunct professor of earth sciences, University of Ottawa; consultant in statistics and geology; **Mr. David Nowell**, M.Sc. (Meteorology), fellow of the Royal Meteorological Society, Canadian member and past chairman of the NATO Meteorological Group, Ottawa; **Dr. Gordon E. Swaters**, professor of applied mathematics, Dept. of Mathematical Sciences, and member, Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Research Group, University of Alberta; **Dr. L. Graham Smith**, associate professor, Dept. of Geography, University of Western Ontario, London, Ont.; **Dr. G. Cornelis van Kooten**, professor and Canada Research Chair in environmental studies and climate change, Dept. of Economics, University of Victoria; **Dr./Cdr. M. R. Morgan**, FRMS, climate consultant, former meteorology advisor to the World Meteorological Organization. Previously research scientist in climatology at University of Exeter, U.K.; **Dr. Keith D. Hage**, climate consultant and professor emeritus of Meteorology, University of Alberta; **Rob Scagel**, M.Sc., forest microclimate specialist, principal consultant, Pacific Phytometric Consultants, Surrey, B.C.; **Dr. Douglas Leahey**, meteorologist and air-quality consultant, Calgary; **Dr. Gerrit J. van der Lingen**, geologist/paleoclimatologist, Climate Change Consultant, Geoscience Research and Investigations, New Zealand; **Dr. Asmund Moene**, past head of the Forecasting Centre, Meteorological Institute, Norway; **Dr. Jack Barrett**, chemist and spectroscopist, formerly with Imperial College London, U.K.; **Dr. Harry N.A. Priem**, emeritus professor of planetary geology and isotope geophysics, Utrecht University; former director of the Netherlands Institute for Isotope Geosciences; past president of the Royal Netherlands Geological & Mining Society; Dipl.-Ing. **Peter Dietze**, independent energy advisor and scientific climate and carbon modeller, official IPCC reviewer, Bavaria, Germany; **Dr. Hugh W. Ellsaesser**, physicist/meteorologist, previously with the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Calif.; atmospheric consultant; **Dr. Arthur Rorsch**, emeritus professor of molecular genetics, Leiden University, The Netherlands; past board member, Netherlands organization for applied research (TNO) in environmental, food and public health; and **Dr. Alister McFarquhar**, Downing College, Cambridge, U.K.; international economist. ([LINK](#)) (See attachment two for full letter and complete list of signatories at end of “Consensus Busters” report)

Physicist and Mathematician Dr. Vladimir Shaidurov of the Russian Academy of Sciences, who has published more than 50 papers in peer-reviewed journals, presented his views on climate change in 2006. According to a March 13, 2006 press release from the University of Leicester in the UK, “A new theory to explain global warming was revealed at a meeting at the University of Leicester (UK) and is being considered for publication in the journal *Science First Hand*. The controversial theory has nothing to do with burning fossil fuels and atmospheric carbon dioxide levels. According to Vladimir Shaidurov of the Russian Academy of Sciences, the apparent rise in average global temperature recorded by scientists over the last hundred years or so could be due to atmospheric changes that are not connected to human emissions of carbon dioxide from the burning of natural gas and oil. Shaidurov explained how changes in the amount of ice crystals at high altitude could damage the layer of thin, high altitude clouds found in the mesosphere that reduce the amount of warming solar radiation reaching the earth’s surface.” The release continued, “The most potent greenhouse gas is water, explains Shaidurov, and it is this compound on which his study focuses. According to Shaidurov, only small changes in the atmospheric levels of water, in the form of vapour and ice crystals can contribute to significant changes to the temperature of the earth’s surface, which far outweighs the effects of carbon dioxide and other gases released by human activities. Just a rise of 1% of water vapour could raise the global average temperature of Earth’s surface more than 4 degrees Celsius.” The release concluded, “Shaidurov has

concluded that only an enormous natural phenomenon, such as an asteroid or comet impact or airburst, could seriously disturb atmospheric water levels, destroying persistent so-called 'silver', or noctilucent, clouds composed of ice crystals in the high altitude mesosphere (50 to 85km)." ([LINK](#))

Ross McKittrick, Associate Professor of Environmental Economics at the University of Guelph, is author or coauthor of dozens of peer-reviewed papers in both economics and climate science journals. McKittrick, a UN IPCC expert reviewer, and one of the de-bunkers of the IPCC 'hockey stick' graph, is coauthor of the prize-winning best-seller "Taken By Storm: The Troubled Science, Policy and Politics of Global Warming." In an essay published on December 5, 2007 in the National Post, he describes new research that shows the IPCC surface temperature record is exaggerated. "The data come from thermometers around the world, but between the thermometer readings and the final, famous, warming ramp, a lot of statistical modeling aims at removing known sources of exaggeration in the warming trend. In a new article in the December 2007 issue of the peer-reviewed Journal of Geophysical Research, Climatologist Dr. Patrick Michaels and McKittrick concluded that the temperature manipulations for the steep post-1980 period are inadequate, and the [IPCC] graph is an exaggeration. McKittrick believes that the United Nations agency promoting the global temperature graph has made "false claims about the quality of its data." McKittrick reports in this new, peer-reviewed study that data contamination problems "account for about half the surface warming measured over land since 1980." ([LINK](#)) & ([LINK](#)) & ([LINK](#))

Meteorologist Gary England, who pioneered the use of Doppler radar weather-forecasting, dismisses climate fears. "The climate has always been changing and it will most likely always continue to change. In the distant past, we have been much colder than we are now and we have been much warmer than we are now. And all of that happened many times without humans," England wrote on July 1, 2007 in an article in *Associated Content*. "Here in Oklahoma we're a little warmer than we were 30 years ago. Recently we ended a two year drought and it has been replaced with significant, long duration rains. Is all of this a result of global warming? Maybe it is and maybe it isn't. You see, no one really knows. If they say they do, I suggest that person is confused at best or has an agenda at the worst," England explained. "An examination of ice core data is frequently used as proof that CO2 heats the atmosphere. A close examination of that data shows that the air temperature went up first and then the CO2 went up. Mars is losing pole ice faster than earth is losing the same. As someone said recently, 'It's the sun stupid!' Recent research suggests that the activity of our sun combined with cosmic radiation from far outside our galaxy interact with our atmosphere to produce effects never dreamed of a few years ago. Is anything or everything in this paragraph correct? Nobody really knows," he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Chemical engineer Robert W. Hahn dismissed climate fears in an article titled "Global Warming Skepticism" on July 5, 2007. "I remain very skeptical that carbon dioxide is the primary cause and that humans either have caused it or can reverse it. According to the data, the temperature near the surface of the Earth has warmed less than one degree Celsius since 1880. That is not very much," Hahn wrote. "Carbon dioxide is not a very potent greenhouse gas. Water vapor and atmospheric methane account for most of the greenhouse effect, about 95 percent. Humans account for less than one-tenth of one percent of the greenhouse gases and about three percent of the carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. If we stopped burning all fossil fuels, including natural gas, coal, wood, gasoline, diesel, jet fuel and the like, it would have very little effect," he added. "There is a growing body of scientific evidence that the

irradiance of our sun is the primary cause of global warming. The sun is at a peak in activity, which drives off more cosmic radiation, which in turn causes less cloud cover, which then warms the surface. Studies in Copenhagen and most recently Canada have confirmed this correlation and have suggested we are heading toward a cooling, not warming, period,” he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Economist Tim Curtin, a former advisor with the EU, World bank, and an Emeritus Faculty member of Australian National University, debunked the notion that global warming would have serious economic consequences. In a June 29, 2007 paper titled “The Da Vinci Code of Climate Change Economics,” Curtin wrote, “This paper questions the claims of the IPCC and the Stern Review that the predicted warming climate over the next 100 years will have serious adverse economic consequences for the poor everywhere and above all in Africa. Finally, the paper suggests that attempts to reduce carbon emissions by systems of caps and trades are unlikely to produce any net reductions in emissions.” Curtin explained, “With a little more inaction on the part of the government, we will with any luck escape the horrors of carbon emission trading, with its associated armies of inspectors and traders all engaged in an essentially unproductive and useless exercise - useless because when permits have been issued to all current emitters at or pro rata within their current level of emissions, the subsequent trades between emission cutters and emission increasers can only produce ZERO net reduction emissions. In sum, Nicholas Stern’s quest for the da Vinci code that will save the globe may seem in retrospect as no more than another of those episodes like the persecution of the Witches of Salem that occasionally beset the most rational and well ordered societies.” ([LINK](#))

Scientist Michael Hammer who works as a research scientist/engineer for a high technology manufacturer and major worldwide exporter based in Australia wrote a June 20, 2007 paper titled “A Theoretical Analysis of the Effect of Greenhouse Gases in the Atmosphere.” The paper read, “A further hypothesis suggests that only a small portion of the temperature rise is due to the direct action of carbon dioxide with much of the remainder being due to positive feedback via water vapour. The total predicted temperature rise for an increase in CO₂ levels to 560 ppm is 2 - 4.5 degrees above current temperatures with 3 degrees most likely. This spectroscopic-based analysis suggests that sensitivity to both gases is likely to be far lower than would be required for such a scenario and does not support either hypothesis. It suggests that an increase in CO₂ concentration from the current 379 ppm to 560 ppm is likely to cause a temperature increase of about 0.12 degrees (0.22 degrees C for a change from 280 ppm to 560 ppm) and that the positive feedback effect from water vapour should be less than 15% of this direct effect. These results are about 20 times lower than the IPCC predictions.” ([LINK](#))

Hydro-climatologist Stewart Franks is an Associate Professor of Environmental Engineering at the University of Newcastle in Australia whose research has focused flood and drought risk and seasonal climate prediction. A March 17, 2007 article in *The Australian* newspaper explained Franks’ climate views. Franks “is increasingly uneasy about the dangerous path the debate is taking, where alternative views are discouraged and reputations attacked and discredited. Franks says our understanding of the physics of climate is still so limited, we cannot explain natural variability or predict when droughts will break, or the when and why clouds form, which makes him wary of mainstream claims projecting temperature changes over the next century. He argues that greenhouse gases in the atmosphere account for only about 2 per cent to 3 per cent of the overall warming effect, meaning even

major increases in gases lead to only slight shifts in temperature: between 0.5C and 1C. He is less certain than other dissenting scientists that variation in solar activity is the cause, but doubts that greenhouse gases are the main driver of temperature changes,” the article stated. “It’s clear that we don’t understand enough of the physics of climate to understand natural variability but I don’t expect climate change from CO₂ to be particularly significant at any point in the future,” Franks said. The article continued, “Franks points to new modeling which has measured changes in the Earth’s albedo, or reflectance, driven mainly by cloud formation. The paper by a team of geophysicists reported an unexplained decline in cloud cover until 1998, which caused the Earth to absorb more heat from the atmosphere. This resulted in increases in incoming solar radiation more than 10 times bigger than the same effect attributed to greenhouse gases. Franks says the current IPCC models assume albedo is constant but such research should be added to the body of knowledge, not excluded or rejected. ‘It’s reached the point that anyone who offers an open mind publicly is basically criticized and put down,’ he says.” ([LINK](#)) Franks also wrote a June 2007 paper titled “Multi-decadal Climate Variability: Flood and Drought - New South Wales” in which he concluded that “strong evidence of multi-decadal climate variability” has dominated the climate. “Climate has never been static!” Franks wrote. “Current drought cannot be directly linked to ‘climate change’” and “El Niño/ La Niña variability [is] due to natural processes,” Franks wrote. ([LINK](#))

Meteorologist Art Horn, currently operating The ‘Art’ Of the Weather business, is skeptical of man-made climate fears. “It is my belief that climate change is not a product of human activity. Many other meteorologists feel this way,” Horn wrote to EPW on May 29, 2007. “The debate on this issue is not over as many who will profit from the ‘Global Warming industry’ would like it to be. They stand to make millions if not billions of dollars by creating a climate of fear, regulation, carbon offsets and taxes. The atmosphere is regulated by changes in the solar output and it’s affects on the oceans. These factors and others impart a far greater influence on our climate than the very small amounts of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases in our atmosphere. Carbon dioxide is a natural part of the air. Humans are adding some additional amounts but it is a very small part of the total,” Horn explained. “Water vapor is by far the most significant greenhouse gas, five times more effective at retaining heat from the sun and 50 to 100 times more plentiful in our atmosphere. The news media has been using the fear of climate change due to humans as a method of generating audience. Now every news program, documentary, newspaper, magazine and Hollywood star is on the ‘bandwagon’ to make money from something they don’t understand but stand to profit from. In a free society an open debate on this important issue needs to take place, not the one sided drumbeat we get from the media,” Horn concluded.

Ivy League Organic Chemist Dr. D. Bruce Merrifield is a former Undersecretary of Commerce for Economic Affairs, Professor Emeritus of the Wharton School of Business at the University of Pennsylvania, and a member of the Visiting Committee for Physical Sciences at the University of Chicago. “The earth has been subjected to many warming and cooling periods over millions of years, none of which were of human origin,” Merrifield wrote on July 11, 2007. “Data from many independent sources have mutually corroborated these effects. They include data from coring both the Antarctic ice cap and sediments from the Sargasso Sea, from stalagmites, from tree rings, from up-wellings in the oceans, and from crustaceans trapped in pre-historic rock formations. The onset of each 100,000-year abrupt warming period has been coincident with emissions into the atmosphere of large amounts of both carbon dioxide and methane greenhouse gases, which absorb additional heat from the sun, a secondary warming effect,” he explained. “Solar radiation would appear to be the

initial forcing event in which warming oceans waters release dissolved carbon dioxide, and melt methane hydrates, both of which are present in the oceans in vast quantities. Subsequent declines in radiation are associated with long cooling periods in which the green house gases then gradually disappear (are re-absorbed) into terrestrial and ocean sinks, as reflected in the data from coring the Antarctic Ice Cap and Sargasso Sea,” he added. “The current 100 year solar radiation cycle may now have reached its peak, and irradiation intensity has been observed to be declining. This might account for the very recent net cessation of emission of green house gases into the atmosphere starting about 1988, in spite of increasing generation of anthropomorphically-sourced industrial-based green house gases. While it seems likely that solar radiation, rather than human activity, is the ‘forcing agent’ for global warming, the subject surely needs more study,” he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Oxford-educated Geochemist Dr. Cal Evans, a prominent researcher who has advised the Alberta Research Council, the Natural Sciences, and Engineering Research Council of Canada, and who is affiliated with the Calgary-based group Friends of Science, dismissed climate fears in 2007. “The primary process that governs global temperature cycles has been identified - it’s a combination of solar irradiation and high-energy cosmic rays. Carbon dioxide appears to be a very minor factor. Although the political forces that support the CO2 theory remain formidable, the science has turned decisively against them,” Evans said according to an article on July 9, 2007. “Yes, there’s been an increase [in CO2] but the quantity remains extremely small, no more than a trace element,” Evans said. “Whatever causes global warming must involve clouds and other atmospheric vapour. To date, no one has been able to identify a link between higher CO2 concentrations and greater volumes of atmospheric water vapour,” he added. “The slight increase in ground temperature has no parallel in the troposphere. If atmospheric CO2 concentration was actually a significant factor in global warming, it stands to reason that atmospheric temperatures would rise but that hasn’t happened,” he said. “It’s ironic that CO2 propaganda has achieved an unprecedented degree of political penetration in Canada and the United States precisely at the same time that the scientific case is melting away. Billions of dollars in research funding and related activity are at stake, and so are a great many professional reputations. So the truth will certainly be inconvenient for someone, and the struggle won’t end for a while yet. Eventually, however, the facts will make themselves known,” he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Dr. Peter Ridd, a Reader in Physics at James Cook University in Australia who specializes in Marine Physics and who is also a scientific adviser to the Australian Environment Foundation, dismissed the idea of a “consensus” on man-made global warming. “It should be apparent that scientists and politicians such as Al Gore, who have been telling us that the science is unquestionable on this issue, have been stretching the truth,” Ridd, who has authored over 60 publications in scientific journals, wrote on July 19, 2007. “It seems that there are some good reasons to believe that we may have been swindled,” Ridd added. Ridd also debunked fears of global warming negatively impacting coral reefs. “Just as canaries were used to detect gas in coal mines, coral reefs are the canaries of the world, and their death is a first indication of our apocalyptic greenhouse future. The bleaching events of 1998 and 2002 were our warning. Heed them now or retribution will be visited upon us. In fact a more appropriate creature with which to compare corals would be cockroaches - at least for their ability to survive. If our future brings us total self-annihilation by nuclear war, pollution or global warming, my bet is that both cockroaches and corals will survive. Their track-record is impressive,” Ridd explained. “Corals have survived 300 million years of massively varying climate both much warmer and much cooler than today, far higher CO2

levels than we see today, and enormous sea level changes. Corals saw the dinosaurs come and go, and cruised through mass extinction events that left so many other organisms as no more than a part of the fossil record. Corals are particularly well adapted to temperature changes and in general, the warmer the better. It seems odd that coral scientists are worrying about global warming because this is one group of organisms that like it hot. Corals are most abundant in the tropics and you certainly do not find fewer corals closer to the equator. Quite the opposite, the further you get away from the heat, the worse the corals. A cooling climate is a far greater threat. The scientific evidence about the effect of rising water temperatures on corals is very encouraging,” he added. “Why does a scientist and environmentalist such as myself worry about a little exaggeration about the reef? Surely it’s better to be safe than sorry. To a certain extent it is, however, the scientist in me worries about the credibility of science and scientists. We cannot afford to cry wolf too often or our credibility will fall to that of used car salesmen and estate agents - if it is not there already. The environmentalist in me worries about the misdirection of scarce resources if we concentrate on ‘saving’ a system such as the Great Barrier Reef,” he concluded.

Space physicist Dr. Eigil Friis-Christensen is the director of the Danish National Space Centre, a member of the space research advisory committee of the Swedish National Space Board, a member of a NASA working group, and a member of the European Space Agency. Friis-Christensen co-authored a paper along with physicist Henrik Svensmark on Thursday, July 19, 2007, entitled “What Do We Really Know about the Sun-Climate Connection?” The paper stated, “The sun is the source of the energy that causes the motion of the atmosphere and thereby controls weather and climate. Any change in the energy from the sun received at the Earth’s surface will therefore affect climate. During stable conditions there has to be a balance between the energy received from the sun and the energy that the Earth radiates back into Space. This energy is mainly radiated in the form of long wave radiation corresponding to the mean temperature of the Earth.” The study continued, “From historical and geological records we know that the Earth’s climate has always been changing. Sometimes such changes have been relatively abrupt and have apparently had large sociological effects.” Friis-Christensen **has authored or co-authored around 100 peer-reviewed papers and chairs the Institute of Space Physics.** ([LINK](#))

UK atmospheric scientist John Kettle, formerly of the Met Office and the Fluid Dynamics Department at the Bracknell headquarters, dismissed the linkage of wild weather in the summer of 2007 in England to global warming. “In my view, none of the severe weather we have experienced is proof of ‘climate change.’ It is just a poor summer - nothing more, nothing less - something that was the norm throughout most of the Sixties and has been repeated on several occasions more recently,” Kettle, a former meteorologist with the BBC, wrote in an op-ed on July 22, 2007 titled “Global Warming? No, Just an Old-Style British Summer.” “To many, the black skies and fierce rains must have seemed an ominous portent of things to come: symptomatic of the environmental ravages of global warming. But, however extreme the weather we have experienced over the past few days, its significance in meteorological terms is likely to be more prosaic. This year’s apparently extraordinary weather is no more sinister than a typical British summer of old and a reminder of why Mediterranean holidays first became so attractive to us more than 40 years ago,” Kettle wrote. “Going further back, history also shows that 1912 was an atrocious summer. It was so bad, in fact, that we are still some way short of the torrential downpours that happened that year. It seemed particularly bad at the time because 1911 had been such an exceptionally good summer. So, taking a long view, there is a pattern of warming and cooling. The Edwardians

were experiencing a period of significant warming (much like now) following a cold Victorian spell. There was a period of warming from the Twenties through to the end of the Fifties and, after a cooler period, there has been a further significant warming over the past 20 years,” he added. “In the final analysis, this summer may be just such a ‘blip’ in the charts,” he concluded. ([LINK](#)) & ([LINK](#))

Geologist Gabriel Salas, who leads a UN High Commission for Refugees funded team, rejected the idea that man-made global warming was causing droughts in Africa. A July 27, 2007 article in *The Christian Science Monitor* reported, “Salas, as a geologist, doesn’t see the problem of global warming as a recent phenomenon, but as something that has been going on for thousands of years. The attack of Rome by Hannibal happened 2,400 years ago, and he took elephants from Carthage and marched them toward Rome. Now, the fact that you had elephants in the North of Africa shows that there has been climate change and that desertification has been taking place for a long time.” ([LINK](#))

Former New Zealand Science Ministry analyst Don Stewart, a UK-based researcher in geological and biological history, said, “The residual ice caps and glaciers we see today have shrunk considerably since 2450 BC. Furthermore, British reports from navigators and explorers since Elizabethan times show that there has been a significant retreat since those first empirical observations available to us from their logs written up to 200 years before the Industrial Revolution that is often falsely blamed for global warming.” “Although the pollution of 200 years of carbon-based industrial activity may have contributed a miniscule factor, either reducing or increasing the already-rising atmospheric temperatures, the globe’s own natural heat from molten lava and iron at its core, in addition to the sun’s rays heating the atmosphere, means that the ice caps could not exist forever anyway and in fact now look like disappearing altogether within 4500 years (2450 BC - 2050 AD) of their formation.” Stewart dismissed claims that UK floods were evidence of man-made global warming. “At the moment, we really have insufficient empirical evidence to conclude that is true,” he added. ([LINK](#))

Chemist Frank Britton rejected man-made climate fears in 2007. “CO₂ makes a very small contribution to the Earth’s temperature. It is only 0.039 percent of the atmosphere. Nitrogen, oxygen, water vapor and argon comprise more than 99 percent of the atmosphere. Furthermore, carbon dioxide is not a particularly effective greenhouse gas. Out of the wide spectrum of radiation received from the sun, CO₂ only absorbs energy from three very narrow levels,” Britton wrote in a July 28, 2007 article in the *Pasadena Star* titled “Global Warming is Nature’s Doing.” “Many people believe there is a difference between man-made CO₂ and natural CO₂. There is no difference. Carbon dioxide is comprised of one carbon atom and two oxygen atoms. CO₂ is a natural, vital part of biological life. Ants, termites and decaying foliage account for the formation of most of the CO₂. There are more than a quadrillion ants and termites,” Britton explained. “Global-warming activists believe mankind is altering the Earth’s temperature. Although many know that man’s contribution is negligible, it is not to their political advantage to reveal this fact. Climate scientists receive funding from the government to research causes of and solutions to man-made global warming. If the current warming were demonstrated to be the natural cycle, this funding would be cut,” he added. “Carbon dioxide’s contribution to global warming is minimal; water vapor is the great buffer for the Earth’s temperature; the oceans control this process. Human beings have no measurable control over global temperatures,” he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Dr. John Brignell is a UK Emeritus Engineering Professor of Northampton Engineering College who held the Chair in Industrial Instrumentation at Southampton and was awarded the Callendar Silver Medal by InstMC. He also served on a committee of the Institute of Physics and currently publishes the website <http://www.numberwatch.co.uk/> with the mission to expose “scares, scams, junk, panics and flummery cooked up by the media, politicians, bureaucrats and so-called scientists and others that try to confuse the public with wrong numbers.” His motto is “Working to Combat Math Hysteria.” “Global warming is a new phenomenon in human affairs. Not only is it now a major religion, but it has an associated industrial complex of a wealth sufficient to give it unheard of political power throughout the world. It presides over a virtual monopoly of research funding,” Brignell wrote in July 2007. ([LINK](#)) “Clearly, global warming is anthropogenic (man-made). It exists mainly in the human mind and is manufactured from two sources - careless data acquisition and dubious data processing,” Brignell wrote. In November 2007, Brignell, who wrote a book entitled *Sorry, Wrong Number: The Abuse of Measurement*, compiled a list of over 600 things allegedly caused by global warming. To see the full list with weblinks to the source, see here: ([LINK](#))

Retired Air Force atmospheric scientist Dr. Edward F Blick, Professor of Meteorology and Engineering at University of Oklahoma, rejected man-made climate fears in 2007. “Is there any solid evidence the earth is warming due to man’s use of fossil fuels transferring excessive amounts of CO₂ in our atmosphere? The answer is NO!” Blick wrote on June 17, 2007 in an article titled “The Religions of Global Warming.” “The amount of CO₂ that man puts into the atmosphere each year is about 3 billion tons per year. But this is insignificant compared to the 39,000 billion tons in our oceans, 2,200 billion tons in our vegetation and soils, and 750 billion tons in our atmosphere. Much of the CO₂ generated by man is consumed by vegetation,” Blick explained. “Man cannot control the weather, but he can kill millions of people in his vain attempt to control it, by limiting or eliminating the fuel that we use,” Blick added. He also questioned the accuracy of temperature gathering. “At the time of the collapse of the Soviet Union (around 1990), they could not afford their weather stations in Siberia, so they were closed. Hence, with the loss of the cooler temperature data from Siberia and rural stations in other countries, coupled with the heat island effects of the large city stations, and errors in thermometers of the 1800’s, any increase in the average earth temperature in the past may be an illusion,” he wrote. “CO₂ is not poison and it is not our enemy. CO₂ and oxygen are the twin gases of life. Humans and animals breathe in oxygen and exhale CO₂. Plants breathe in CO₂, make carbohydrates, and breathe out oxygen. We feed the plants and they feed us,” Blick wrote. ([LINK](#))

Iowa State Climatologist Dr. Elwynn Taylor, Professor of Meteorology at Iowa State University and a former project scientist with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, expressed skepticism of man-made climate fears. An August 2007 article reported that “while Taylor believes entirely in global warming, he hasn’t yet jumped on the popular *Inconvenient Truth* bandwagon. ‘I don’t know how much people have caused,’ he says. ‘Nobody really knows ... but what I do know is that we had a global cooling period from around the middle 1800s to around 1900, global warming from 1900 to around 1940, global cooling again from 1940 to 1972, and global warming since 1972. Thermometers have measured this for us.’” The article continued, “Taylor accepts that global warming is occurring. But he says the extent to which man is contributing to its acceleration is debatable...he says the popular theories floated by the likes of Al Gore may be slightly overcooked. ‘I think people are exaggerating the idea that all of the temperature

change occurring on Earth is being caused by this,' he says. 'They shouldn't be saying that. Because pretty soon we could discover that these things are only partially true. And then people, feeling misled, won't do anything.'" The article added, "Taylor is reluctant to blame human activity-specifically, increased emissions of greenhouse gases like carbon dioxide-for [global warming's] apparent acceleration? Because the bigger picture tells him there are more powerful cycles at play. He justifies his pragmatic position with convincing anecdotal evidence from the story he tells about Greenland's super-thick ice cap starting to melt back and revealing that humans inhabited the place 1,400 years ago. 'You could have taken your ship across the North Pole late in the summer then, too,' he says. 'So what we've discovered is there have been occasions throughout history when sea ice in the North Pole would go away during certain times of the year and other spans of history where the ice was essentially permanent. These things go back and forth. We wonder now if there was ever a time when there was no glacier on top of Greenland at all. Geologists say yes-a short 3 million years ago we didn't have any permanent year-round ice on the planet. These things come and go in natural cycles.'" ([LINK](#)) & ([LINK](#))

Meteorologist Dr. Fred Ward, who earned his PhD in Meteorology from MIT and is a former meteorologist for Boston TV, ridiculed what he termed "global warming zealots." "Good, worldwide temperature data are available for less than a century, but that hasn't stopped the alarmists from quoting what are called 'temperature' data extending back to the Romans. Such data are not temperatures, but proxies which are claimed to measure temperature," Ward wrote in the New Hampshire *Union Leader* on July 16, 2007. "Such proxies include tree rings, ice cores and the like, but they all suffer from one serious limitation. The proxies can be calculated from the weather, but the weather cannot be calculated from the proxies. The brief reason is that many different weather elements work in complex ways to produce the proxy," he added. "Finally, for those of you old enough to read in the 1970s, there was a lot of hysteria back then about the global temperature. The same 'if we don't act promptly, in 10 years it will be too late' statements were published, on the covers of reputable papers and magazines, by many of the same 'scientists,' and for many of the same base motives. The only difference between the 1970s and now was that the disaster that was just around the corner was global cooling! How times change, while people don't," he concluded. ([LINK](#))

A 2006 study of Greenland by a team of scientists debunked fears of Greenland melting. The study led by Petr Chylek of Los Alamos National Laboratory, Space and Remote Sensing Sciences found the rate of warming in 1920-1930 was about 50% higher than that in 1995-2005, suggesting carbon dioxide 'could not be the cause' of warming. ([LINK](#))

"We find that the current Greenland warming is not unprecedented in recent Greenland history. Temperature increases in the two warming periods (1920-1930 and 1995-2005) are of similar magnitude, however the rate of warming in 1920-1930 was about 50% higher than that in 1995-2005," the abstract of the study read. The peer-reviewed study, which was published in the June 13, 2006 *Geophysical Research Letters*, found that after a warm 2003 on the southeastern coast of Greenland, "the years 2004 and 2005 were closer to normal being well below temperatures reached in the 1930s and 1940s." The study further continued, "Almost all post-1955 temperature averages at Greenland stations are lower (colder climate) than the (1881-1955) temperature average." In addition, the Chylek-led study explained, "Although there has been a considerable temperature increase during the last decade (1995 to 2005) a similar increase and at a faster rate occurred during the early part of the 20th century (1920 to 1930) when carbon dioxide or other greenhouse gases could not be a cause.

The Greenland warming of 1920-1930 demonstrates that a high concentration of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases is not a necessary condition for a period of warming to arise. The observed 1995-2005 temperature increase seems to be within natural variability of Greenland climate. A general increase in solar activity [Scafetta and West, 2006] since 1990s can be a contributing factor as well as the sea surface temperature changes of tropical ocean [Hoerling et al., 2001].” “To summarize, we find no direct evidence to support the claims that the Greenland ice sheet is melting due to increased temperature caused by increased atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide.” The co-authors of the study were M.K. Dubey of Los Alamos National Laboratory and G. Lesins, Dalhousie University in Canada. Chylek has authored over 100 studies in peer-reviewed journals. Chylek was one of the 60 scientists who wrote an April 6, 2006 letter urging withdrawal of Kyoto to Canadian prime minister Stephen Harper which stated, “If, back in the mid-1990s, we knew what we know today about climate, Kyoto would almost certainly not exist, because we would have concluded it was not necessary.” ([LINK](#))

Former California State Climatologist Jim Goodridge, a consultant for the California Department of Water Resources, authored a July 28, 2007 paper noting the impact of the sun on climate change. “Evidence for climate variation is inferred from the sunspot numbers. The ‘Solar Constant’ sunspot relationship clearly suggests a long-range historic view of solar irradiance from 1500. The solar irradiance has been clearly increasing since 1940. The Maunder Minimum of sunspot numbers from 1660 to 1710 was clearly a time of worldwide cold temperatures. The year 1816 was known as the year without a summer,” Goodridge wrote. Goodridge also blamed natural factors for the increase in temperatures in California since the 1970s. “The evidence for a major climate shift since the mid 1970s is quite real. California indices of rainfall and temperature have both shown an increasing trend since 1975. Physical changes in Earth weather systems that accompany the 1975 weather trend changes include the Pacific Decadal Oscillation (PDO) index, a 1975 change in the Atmospheric Angular Momentum (AAM) index and a 1940 increase in solar irradiance,” he explained. “A comparison of the accumulated departure from average of the California temperature and the Pacific Decadal Oscillation Index (PDO) indices indicate both peaking about 1943 and generally declining until the major climate shift of 1975. Again, this suggests a 35-year lag time in solar influence,” he added. ([LINK](#))

[Geologist Bruno Wiskel of the University of Alberta](#) recently reversed his view of man-made climate change and instead became a global warming skeptic. Wiskel was once such a big believer in man-made global warming that he set out to build a “Kyoto house” in honor of the UN sanctioned Kyoto Protocol which was signed in 1997. Wiskel wanted to prove that the Kyoto Protocol’s goals were achievable by people making small changes in their lives. But after further examining the science behind Kyoto, Wiskel reversed his scientific views completely and became such a strong skeptic that he recently wrote a book titled *The Emperor’s New Climate: Debunking the Myth of Global Warming*. A November 15, 2006 *Edmonton Sun* article explains Wiskel’s conversion while building his “Kyoto house,” saying, “Instead, he said he realized global warming theory was full of holes and ‘red flags,’ and became convinced that humans are not responsible for rising temperatures.” Wiskel now says “the truth has to start somewhere.” Noting that the Earth has been warming for 18,000 years, Wiskel told the Canadian newspaper, “If this happened once and we were the cause of it, that would be cause for concern. But glaciers have been coming and going for billions of years.” Wiskel also said that global warming has gone “from a science to a religion” and noted that research money is being funneled into promoting climate alarmism instead of funding areas

he considers more worthy. "If you funnel money into things that can't be changed, the money is not going into the places that it is needed," he said.

Dr. Denis Dutton, Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of Canterbury in New Zealand and recipient of the New Zealand Royal Society Medal for Services to Science and Technology, teaches a course on the distinction between science and pseudoscience. Dr. Dutton is skeptical about the degree to which human activity has contributed to the general warming trend that began in the 1880s. "Working at the university where Karl Popper taught in the 1940s, I am more than a little aware of the way that adequate scientific hypotheses must always be open to falsification. The best way for science and public policy to proceed is to continuously assess evidence pro and con for anthropogenic global warming," Dutton wrote to EPW on December 4, 2007. "Climate alarmists in particular are too prone to cherry-pick evidence that suits their case, ignoring factors that might disprove it," he added. Dutton recently founded the website Climate Debate Daily, which he co-edits with Douglas Campbell (<http://climatedebatedaily.com>).

Professor Emeritus Peter R Odell of International Energy Studies at the University of Rotterdam questioned why global temperatures have not increased since 1998. "The UK's Meteorological Office research centre has now had to confirm a fall in average global temperatures since 1998. This clearly opens to challenge the widely-held view that it is primarily the growth in carbon dioxide emissions, released by mankind's use of carbon fuels, that cause global warming," Odell wrote on August 13 in an unpublished letter to the UK *Guardian* newspaper. "Indeed, since 1998 there has been a record near-25% increase in the production and use of coal, oil and natural gas - totaling an additional 2000 million tons of oil equivalent over the nine year period. Two-fifths of this has been coal, the most polluting of the three carbon fuels, so generating voluminous additional carbon dioxide for the atmosphere. Yet, in spite of an all-time peak period of carbon fuels' use, it seems that no overall global warming phenomenon has been generated!" Odell wrote. "Thus, instead of the Met Office's think-tank apparent acceptance of the concept of a demonstrable relationship between global warming and carbon dioxide emissions for its future forecasts, should it not first be held responsible for an explanation as to why this has not happened over the past nine years - and why it will not happen for at least the next three years?" he asked.

UK Astronomer Dr. David Whitehouse, who authored the 2004 book *The Sun: A Biography*, detailed the sun's significant influence on the climate. "Something is happening to our sun. It has to do with sunspots, or rather the activity cycle their coming and going signifies. After a period of exceptionally high activity in the 20th century, our sun has suddenly gone exceptionally quiet. Months have passed with no spots visible on its disc. We are at the end of one cycle of activity and astronomers are waiting for the sunspots to return and mark the start of the next, the so-called cycle 24. They have been waiting for a while now with no sign it's on its way any time soon," Whitehouse wrote on December 5, 2007 in the UK *Independent*. "Throughout the 20th century, solar cycles had been increasing in strength. Almost everyone agrees that throughout most of the last century the solar influence was significant. Studies show that by the end of the 20th century the sun's activity may have been at its highest for more than 8,000 years. Other solar parameters have been changing as well, such as the magnetic field the sun sheds, which has almost doubled in the past century," Whitehouse explained. "Since [1998] average temperatures have held at a high, though steady, level. Many computer climate projections suggest that the global temperatures will start to rise again in a few years. But those projections do not take into account the change

in the sun's behaviour. The tardiness of cycle 24 indicates that we might be entering a period of low solar activity that may counteract man-made greenhouse temperature increases. Some members of the Russian Academy of Sciences say we may be at the start of a period like that seen between 1790 and 1820, a minor decline in solar activity called the Dalton Minimum. They estimate that the sun's reduced activity may cause a global temperature drop of 1.5C by 2020. This is larger than most sensible predictions of man-made global warming over this period," he added. ([LINK](#))

[MIT Climate Scientist Dr. Richard Lindzen](#), **former UN IPCC lead author and reviewer and an Alfred P. Sloan Professor of Meteorology, Dept. of Earth, Atmospheric and Planetary Sciences**, called fears of man-made global warming "silly" in January 31, 2007 CNN interview. "I think it's mainly just like little kids locking themselves in dark closets to see how much they can scare each other and themselves," Lindzen said. "Nobody's arguing that man has zero impact on the climate. But the question is can you distinguish it from all the other stuff going on? And I think the answer is still no," Lindzen told the Weather Channel on January 14, 2007. "Controlling carbon is kind of a bureaucrat's dream. If you control carbon, you control life," he also told the Weather Channel on March 31, 2007. Lindzen dismisses "solutions" to global warming like changing light bulbs to fluorescent or participating in the Kyoto Protocol. "If you had a decision to make which actually would matter, then, of course it would be a very difficult situation," Lindzen said in an April 28, 2007 CBS Chicago TV special "The Truth About Global Warming." "One of the things the scientific community is pretty agreed on is those things will have virtually no impact on climate no matter what the models say. So the question is do you spend trillions of dollars to have no impact? And that seems like a no-brainer," he said. ([LINK](#)) Lindzen also explained the UN's IPCC Summary for Policymakers involves only a dozen or so scientists. "It's not 2,500 people offering their consensus, I participated in that. Each person who is an author writes one or two pages in conjunction with someone else...but ultimately, it is written by representatives of governments, of environmental organizations like the Union of Concerned Scientists, and industrial organizations, each seeking their own benefit," Lindzen said. "At present, the greenhouse forcing is already about three-quarters of what one would get from a doubling of CO2. But average temperatures rose only about 0.6 degrees since the beginning of the industrial era, and the change hasn't been uniform-warming has largely occurred during the periods from 1919 to 1940 and from 1976 to 1998, with cooling in between. Researchers have been unable to explain this discrepancy," Lindzen wrote in the April 16, 2007 issue of Newsweek. ([LINK](#))

Astronomer Dr. Ian Wilson of the University of Southern Queensland, Australia, specializes in statistical analysis and astrophysics research, and was a former operations astronomer at the Hubble Space Telescope Institute in Baltimore, MD. Wilson declared man-made global warming fears "bit the dust" after a 2007 peer-reviewed study found that even a doubling of atmospheric carbon dioxide would not have an alarming impact on global temperatures. "Anthropogenic (man-made) global warming bites the dust," declared Wilson about the study titled "Heat Capacity, Time Constant, and Sensitivity of Earth's Climate System," authored by Brookhaven National Lab scientist Stephen Schwartz. "Effectively, this [new study] means that the global economy will spend trillions of dollars trying to avoid a warming of ~ 1.0 K by 2100 A.D.," Wilson wrote in an August 19, 2007 note to the Senate Environment & Public Works Committee. Wilson was referring to the trillions of dollars that would be spent under such international global warming treaties like the Kyoto Protocol. "Previously, I have indicated that the widely accepted values for temperature increase

associated with a doubling of CO₂ were far too high, i.e. 2 - 4.5 Kelvin. I indicated that a figure closer to 1 Kelvin (corresponding to an increase in the world mean temperature of ~ 0.1 K per decade) was more appropriate. This new peer-reviewed paper by Stephen Schwartz appearing in the *Journal of Geophysical Research* claims a value of 1.1 +/- 0.5 K increase for a doubling of CO₂,” he added. ([LINK](#))

Statistician Lenny Smith of the London School of Economics, who co-authored a study on the uncertainties of climate models for the Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research in Oxford, dubbed climate modeling “naive realism.” “Our models are being over-interpreted and misinterpreted,” Smith said, according to a *New Scientist* article from August 16, 2007. “They are getting better; I don’t want to trash them per se. But as we change our predictions, how do we maintain the credibility of the science?” Smith explained. “We need to drop the pretence that they are nearly perfect,” he added. The article noted that Smith believes that the “over-interpretation of models is already leading to poor financial decision-making.” The article continued: “[Smith] singled out for criticism the British government’s UK Climate Impacts Programme and Met Office. He accused both of making detailed climate projections for regions of the UK when global climate models disagree strongly about how climate change will affect the British Isles.” ([LINK](#))

Geologist Dr. Al Pekarek, professor of geology, earth and atmospheric sciences at St. Cloud State University, ridicules man-made global warming fears as a “media circus.” “Climate is a very complex system, and anyone who claims we know all there is to know about it, let’s say, is charitably misinformed or chooses to be,” Pekarek said according to a September 7, 2007 article. “We fool ourselves if we think we have a sufficiently well-understood model of the climate that we can really predict. We can’t,” he explained. “Geologists know that the Earth’s climate has done this all the time in its history. We also know that man has not been around very long and could not have caused that. So we know that there are many natural forces that have caused our climate to change,” he continued. “Those of us who don’t jump on the bandwagon - we’re called deniers and Hitlers and I don’t know what all else. Some of us have been threatened - I think some with their life, but more it’s trying to destroy our reputations,” Pekarek added. He also pulled no punches in criticizing former Vice President Al Gore’s documentary *An Inconvenient Truth*, calling the film “a total misrepresentation of science.” He dismissed computer model fears of a climate doomsday. “It’s an abuse of science. They are misquoting science. They are misusing science. They are making predictions of dire consequences in the name of science that will not come true, and science will lose its credibility,” he explained. “In some of our schools, we are scaring the hell out of our kids. ... They think they have no future,” he said. “In 10 years, you won’t hear anything about global warming,” he concluded. ([LINK](#))

[Botanist Dr. David Bellamy, a famed UK environmental campaigner, former lecturer at Durham University, and host of a popular UK TV series on wildlife](#), recently converted into a skeptic after reviewing the science and now calls global warming fears “poppycock.” According to a May 15, 2005 [article](#) in the UK *Sunday Times*, Bellamy said that “global warming is largely a natural phenomenon. The world is wasting stupendous amounts of money on trying to fix something that can’t be fixed.” “The climate-change people have no proof for their claims. They have computer models which do not prove anything,” Bellamy added. Bellamy’s conversion concerning global warming did not come without a sacrifice, as several environmental groups have ended their association with him because of his views on climate change. The severing of relations came despite Bellamy’s long activism for green campaigns. The UK *Times* reported Bellamy

“won respect from hard-line environmentalists with his campaigns to save Britain’s peat bogs and other endangered habitats. In Tasmania he was arrested when he tried to prevent loggers cutting down a rainforest.” On July 1, 2007, in an op-ed titled “THE GLOBAL WARMING MYTH,” Bellamy called man-made catastrophic global warming promotion “a political football that has lost its foundations in real science.” “There are no facts linking the concentration of atmospheric carbon dioxide with imminent catastrophic global warming, there are only predictions based on complex computer models,” he explained. Bellamy turned his skepticism on Gore, asking “Why scare the families of the world with tales that polar bears are heading for extinction when there is good evidence that there are now twice as many of these iconic animals, most doing well in the Arctic than there were 20 years ago? Why cry wolf on a rise in the spread of malaria thanks to rising temperatures when this mosquito borne disease was a main killer of people throughout the Little Ice Age in Britain and northern Russia?” ([LINK](#))

UK wildlife documentary maker Nigel Marven, who spent three months studying and filming polar bears in Canada’s arctic, expressed skepticism about fears that global warming would devastate polar bears. “I think climate change is happening, but as far as the polar bear disappearing is concerned, I have never been more convinced that this is just scaremongering. People are deliberately seeking out skinny bears and filming them to show they are dying out. That’s not right,” Marven said according to a December 7, 2007 article in the UK *Daily Mail*. “Of course, in 30 years, if there’s no ice over the North Pole, then the bears will be in trouble. But I’ve seen enough to know that polar bears are not yet on the brink of extinction,” Marven added. The article also noted that indigenous residents of the Arctic also reject polar bear fears. “After almost three months of working with those who know the Arctic best - among them Inuit Indians, who are appalled at the way an animal they have lived beside for centuries has become a poster species for ‘misinformed’ Greens - Nigel Marven finds himself in broad agreement,” the article reported. ([LINK](#))

Nobel Prize-winning Economist Gary S. Becker, who is a senior fellow at the Hoover Institution and University Professor of Economics and Sociology at the University of Chicago, debunked the notion that acting now to reduce greenhouse gases will save in the long run. “Future generations would be better off if the present generation, instead of investing the \$800 billion in greenhouse gas-reducing technologies, invested the same amount in capital that would be available to future generations,” Becker wrote on February 4, 2007. “One criticism of this argument is that if the resources were not invested in reducing greenhouse gases, they would not be invested in other capital that would accrue to future generations. Perhaps not. But bear in mind that during the past 150 years, more recent generations in the United States and other developed and developing nations have been much better off than earlier generations when measured by income, health, education, and virtually all other important criteria,” Becker explained. “This rising standard of living across generations has been achieved mainly through advances in technology, and generous savings and investments for children and grandchildren by parents and their elected representatives. Why should this fundamental aspect of family and public behavior change as a result of the accumulation of the harmful greenhouse gases in the atmosphere?” he wrote. “Discounting is sensible behavior. Common sense also suggests that technologies will be much improved in the future, including those that can improve health, income, and the environment. Put differently, later generations have benefited from large and continuing advances in technologies of all kinds in the past 150 years, including those related to the environment,” he added. ([LINK](#))

Lev Zeleny, director of the Institute of Space Research at the Russian Academy of Sciences and an Academy corresponding member, rejects man-made climate fears.

According to a September 28, 2007 article in the Russian publication *RIA Novosti*, Zeleny “believes that before making Kyoto Protocol-like decisions, we should thoroughly study the influence of all factors and receive more or less unequivocal results. In order to treat an illness, we must diagnose it first, he insists.” Zeleny noted, “Judging by Venus, a planet, which is similar to the Earth in all respects, we can see how far this can go. The temperature on its surface is about 500° C (mostly due to a greenhouse effect). At one time, Venus did not have a layer of clouds, and this is probably when it was warmed up by the Sun, causing a greenhouse effect. What if the Sun is responsible for the warming of our climate?” Zeleny asked. “There are two channels of energy transfer from the Sun - electromagnetic and corpuscular radiation,” he explained. “The bulk of it - about 1.37 kW per square meter of the Earth’s surface - which equals the power of an electric kettle - comes via the electromagnetic channel. This flow of energy primarily fits into the visible and infrared range of the spectrum and its amount is virtually immune to change - it alters by no more than a few fractions of a percent. It is called the ‘solar constant.’ The flow of energy reaches the Earth in eight minutes and is largely absorbed by its atmosphere and surface. It has decisive influence on the shaping of our climate,” Zeleny said. “Solar wind becomes more intense when the Sun is active. It sweeps space rays out of the solar system like a broom,” he added. “This affects cloud formation, which cools off both the atmosphere and the whole planet. We know from historic records that it was quite cold in 1350-1380. The Sun was very active during this time,” he said. “Some dangers are much less discussed today, for instance, the inversion of the Earth’s magnetic field,” Zeleny warns. “It is gradually changing its polarity; the poles are crawling to the equator at increasing speed. There were whole epochs in the Earth’s history when the magnetic field all but disappeared. Such oscillations have taken place throughout almost its entire geological history,” he concluded. ([LINK](#))

CNN Meteorologist Rob Marciano compared Gore’s film to “fiction” in an on air broadcast on October 4, 2007. When a British judge ordered schools that show Gore’s *An Inconvenient Truth* to include a disclaimer noting multiple errors in the film, Marciano applauded the judge saying, “Finally, finally.” Marciano then added, “The Oscars, they give out awards for fictional films as well.” Marciano specifically critiqued Gore for claiming hurricanes and global warming were linked. ([LINK](#))

Geologist C. Robert Shoup authored a summer 2007 scientific study for the American Association of Petroleum Geologists in which he debunked global warming fears. “The hypothesis of Anthropogenic Global Warming does not yet meet the basic scientific standards of proof needed to be accepted as a viable hypothesis, much less as accepted fact,” Shoup wrote in the study titled “Science Under Attack.” Shoup concluded, “A comprehensive review of the climate data suggests that many global warming advocates do not present data that is contradictory to their beliefs. In addition, the constant call to end debate and silence scientists who challenge the hypothesis of Anthropogenic Global Warming is a violation of scientific protocol and has the affect of suppressing healthy scientific debate.”

Horticulturalist Alan Titchmarsh, a prominent naturalist who hosts the popular “The Nature of Britain” program on the BBC, joined the climate skeptics in 2007. “Our climate has always changed,” Titchmarsh said according to an October 6, 2007 article in the UK *Telegraph*. “I wish we could grow up about it,” he explained, “I’m sure we are contributing to global warming, and we must do all we can to reduce that, but our climate has always

changed. The Romans had vineyards in Yorkshire. We're all on this bandwagon of 'Ban the 4x4 in Fulham'. Why didn't we have global warming during the Industrial Revolution? In those days you couldn't have seen across the street for all the carbon emissions and the crap coming out of the chimneys," he said. Titchmarch also rejected fears of warming induced species loss. "We'll lose some, we'll gain others. Wildlife is remarkably tenacious. Nature always copes," he said. ([LINK](#))

Meteorologist Alexandre Aguiar of Brazil's MetSul Weather Center forecaster for Ulbra TV in Porto Alegre, Brazil, debunked former Vice President Al Gore's science claims in 2007. "It was exactly 10 years ago today. October 14th 1997. The guest in the El Niño Community Preparedness Summit in Santa Monica, California, was the Vice President of the United States Al Gore. It was another opportunity to him to propagate the scary vision of a warmed globe. The main point was the super El Niño event of that year. Gore took advantage of the scene to forecast a future without (cooling) La Niña events. El Niño (warming) events, according to him and his fellow scientists, would become permanent," Aguiar wrote on October 14, 2007 on the skeptical website IceCap.US. "Gore's theory bankrupted exactly ten years after its release. The largest ocean in Earth is much colder than average and global climate starts to feel the impacts of a moderate La Niña event that may reach the strong threshold," Aguiar explained. "It will take some more years for 'Mother Nature' to dismiss some or all of Gore forecasts, but earlier predictions made by him are already proving to be an inconvenient mistake," he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Chief Meteorologist Karl Spring of Duluth, Minnesota, who is certified by both the American Meteorological Society and the National Weather Association, expressed skepticism of former Vice President Al Gore's climate views. On the day Gore's Nobel Prize was announced in October 2007, Spring declared on KUWS radio, "I wouldn't pay a dime to see [*An Inconvenient Truth*] for many reasons." Spring then ridiculed Gore. "Politically, he's a left-wing nut. And he does things for other agendas." He added that Gore "takes facts and extrapolates them to such extremes," and he projects "a doomsday scenario." **Meteorologist Kyly Underwood joined Spring in dismissing Gore's scientific opinions during on KUWS radio.** "We need to be careful about where we get our information on global warming, and this debate unfortunately is driven by politicians." ([LINK](#)) & ([LINK](#))

Gwyn Prins of the London School of Economics and Steve Rayner of Oxford authored a report prominently featured in the UK journal *Nature* in October 2007 calling on the UN to "radically rethink climate policy," and they cautioned against a "bigger" version of Kyoto with even more draconian provisions. Prins and Rayner's report in the influential journal bluntly declared "... as an instrument for achieving emissions reductions [Kyoto] has failed. It has produced no demonstrable reduction in emissions or even in anticipated emissions growth." Their report was titled "Time to Ditch Kyoto" and was highlighted in an October 24, 2007 *National Post* article. "But as an instrument for achieving emissions reductions it has failed. It has produced no demonstrable reduction in emissions or even in anticipated emissions growth. And it pays no more than token attention to the needs of societies to adapt to existing climate change." The report also noted, "Kyoto's supporters often blame non-signatory governments, especially the United States and Australia, for its woes." The report continued, "But the Kyoto Protocol was always the wrong tool for the nature of the job." Prins and Rayner instead urged investment in new technologies and adaptation as the most promising method to deal with climate change. ([LINK](#))

[Chinese Scientists Say CO2 Impact on Warming May Be 'Excessively Exaggerated'](#) - Scientists Lin Zhen-Shan's and Sun Xian's 2007 study published in the peer-reviewed journal **Meteorology and Atmospheric Physics** noted that "although the CO2 greenhouse effect on global climate change is unsuspecting, it could have been excessively exaggerated." Their study asserted that "it is high time to reconsider the trend of global climate change." The study looked at "multi-scale analysis of global temperature changes" and concluded "that 'global climate will be cooling down in the next 20 years.'" The scientists concluded that even if atmospheric CO2 were to stabilize, "the CO2 greenhouse effect will be deficient in counterchecking the natural cooling of global climate in the following 20 years." "The global climate warming is not solely affected by the CO2 greenhouse effect. The best example is temperature obviously cooling however atmospheric CO2 concentration is ascending from 1940s to 1970s. Although the CO2 greenhouse effect on global climate changes is unsuspecting, it could have been excessively exaggerated. It is high time to re-consider the global climate changes," Zhen-Shan and Xian concluded. ([LINK](#)) & ([LINK](#)) & ([LINK](#))

[Physicist Dr. Henrik Svensmark](#) released a report with his colleagues at the **Danish National Space Centre** which shows that the planet is experiencing a natural period of low cloud cover due to fewer cosmic rays entering the atmosphere. "We have the highest solar activity we have had in at least 1,000 years," Svensmark said in the February 11, 2007 article in the UK Telegraph. "Humans are having an effect on climate change, but by not including the cosmic ray effect in models it means the results are inaccurate. The size of man's impact may be much smaller and so the man-made change is happening slower than predicted," Svensmark said. Svensmark published his finding on the influence that cosmic rays have on cloud production in the Proceedings of the Royal Society Journal in late 2006 and he has a new 2007 book entitled *The Chilling Stars: A New Theory of Climate Change*. "It was long-thought that clouds were caused by climate change, but now we see that climate change is driven by clouds," Svensmark said. In October 2007, Svensmark co-authored another report from the Danish National Space Center Study concluding: "The Sun still appears to be the main forcing agent in global climate change." The report was authored with Physicist Henrik Svensmark and Eigil Friis-Christensen. ([LINK](#))

Air resources engineer Tom Scheffelin, who estimates on-road vehicle emissions for the California Air Resources Board, declared himself a climate skeptic in 2007. "Does carbon dioxide affect the climate? Carbon dioxide levels track temperature changes between 300 to 1,000 years after the temperature has changed. Carbon dioxide has no direct role in global warming; rather, it responds to biological activity, which responds to climate changes," Scheffelin wrote in a November 5, 2007 article titled "Global Warming Causes Carbon Dioxide." Scheffelin critiqued what he termed "the quasi-religious fervor surrounding global warming." He explained, "Cyclic global warming is normal and must occur no matter what anyone does or does not do. The most frequent global climate cycle is caused by the ocean's response to the orbits of the earth and moon." Scheffelin continued, "Carbon dioxide levels track temperature changes between 300 to 1,000 years after the temperature has changed. Carbon dioxide has no direct role in global warming; rather, it responds to biological activity, which responds to climate changes." He concluded by issuing a warning to the public about climate fears. "Beware future radical government mandates designed to save the planet. What can one do? Elect legislators who do not fall prey to the global warming hysteria. Walk or bicycle as often as possible; the world is a better place when experienced on foot or by bicycle. Grow two ears of corn where before only one ear grew (*Gulliver's Travels*). Stop worrying over global warming; worry causes poor health. Study geology, it's fascinating.

Enjoy life during this, the most productive, safe and healthful era in the history of mankind,” he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Atmospheric scientist Dr. Chris Walcek is a professor at the University at Albany in NY and a Senior Research Associate at the Atmospheric Sciences Research Center who studies the relationship of pollutants within the atmosphere. Walcek is also a skeptic of man-made global warming fears. “10,000 years ago we were sitting under 2,000 feet of ice right here. It looked like Antarctica right here. And then over a one to two thousand year period, we went into today’s climate and the cause of that change is not, well, nobody has a definitive theory about why that happened,” Walcek said according to a November 6, 2007 article. ([LINK](#)) In a separate May 5, 2007 interview, Walcek expanded on his climate skepticism and accused former Vice President Al Gore of having “exaggerated” part of his film. “A lot of the imagery like hurricanes and tornados. And as far as tornados go, there is no evidence at all that tornados are affected. And a recent committee of scientists concluded that there isn’t a strong correlation between climate change and hurricane intensity. A lot of people are saying we’re going to see more Katrina’s and there’s just not much evidence of that. We have had strong hurricanes throughout the last hundred years and we’re probably going to have strong hurricanes once in a while,” Walcek said. “We are over-due for an ice-age if you look at the geological records, we have had a period of not having a thousand feet of ice sitting here in Albany” New York, he added. ([LINK](#)) & ([LINK](#))

Environmental expert Sergei Golubchikov, Vice President of Russia’s National Geocryological Foundation, expressed skepticism of man-made global warming in 2007. “Humanity is focusing environmental efforts on the boogeyman of global warming,” Golubchikov wrote in a November 8, 2007 article in *RIA Novosti*. “Environmental phobias go hand in hand with technological civilization. Anxiety over climate change is carried too far, to my mind,” Golubchikov continued. “Anxiety easily turns to panic, forcing the world into hasty, and possibly wrong, steps. The Kyoto Protocol, for instance, was ratified even before the link between global warming and the concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere had been proved,” Golubchikov explained. “But is the gas [CO₂] so bad? It is no poison, and plants need it as much as we humans need our daily bread. At present it makes up a mere 0.037% of the atmosphere. Greater concentrations cause plant life to flourish-especially forests, the greatest absorbers of greenhouse gases. If the release of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere were suddenly stopped, the earth’s plant life would consume that remaining in a matter of 8-11 years. After that they would curl up and die. Every living thing on earth would be doomed with them,” he wrote. “As 95% of the world’s carbon dioxide is dissolved in saline water, global warming makes the sea the principal source of emissions, leaving industry far behind. To my mind, international agreements should instead seek to reduce emissions of sulfur dioxide, carbonic and nitric oxides, benzpyrene, soot, heavy metals and other toxic substances responsible for causing cancer and mutations. These are, in fact, the greatest environmental challenge to governments and the public,” he added. ([LINK](#))

Aeronautical engineer Bob Edleman, former Chief Engineer of Boeing’s Electronic Systems Division who also worked as a software engineer in data reduction and flight simulation, expressed skepticism about man-made climate fears promoted in former Vice President Al Gore’s film. “My conclusion is that the movie is mostly misleading and, yes, we’d better stop the ideological wrangling and consider the facts,” Edelman wrote on October 4, 2007. “There is no consensus. Even if there were it would have no value in science. Proof leads to consensus, not the other way around,” he added. ([LINK](#))

Geologists Dr. George Chilingar, and L.F. Khilyuk of the University of Southern California authored a December 2006 study in the peer-reviewed journal *Environmental Geology* which found warming temperatures were due to natural factors, not mankind. “The current global warming is most likely a combined effect of increased solar and tectonic activities and cannot be attributed to the increased anthropogenic impact on the atmosphere. Humans may be responsible for less than 0.01°C (of approximately 0.56°C (1°F) total average atmospheric heating during the last century),” the paper concluded. “Recalculating this amount into the total anthropogenic carbon dioxide emission in grams of CO₂, one obtains the estimate 1.003×10¹⁸ g, which constitutes less than 0.00022% of the total CO₂ amount naturally degassed from the mantle during geologic history. Comparing these figures, one can conclude that anthropogenic carbon dioxide emission is negligible (indistinguishable) in any energy-matter transformation processes changing the Earth’s climate,” Chilingar and Khilyuk added. Chilingar is a professor of civil and petroleum engineering at UCLA and is the former president of the U.S. chapter of the Russian Academy Sciences. ([LINK](#)) & ([LINK](#))

Chemist Dr. Daniel W. Miles, a former professor of physics who earned his PhD from the University of Utah, expressed skepticism of climate fears in 2007. “It is very apparent from a dozen or so peer-reviewed scientific articles that fluctuations in cosmic radiation have an important impact on climate change,” Miles wrote in a November 8, 2007 essay titled “Scientific Consensus on Global Warming Not Overwhelming.” “It is claimed that even if the carbon dioxide concentration in the air were doubled, its greenhouse effect would be canceled by a mere one percent rise in cloudiness. The reason is simply that greater cloudiness means a larger deflection of the solar radiation away from the surface of our planet,” he wrote. “The more intense the influx of cosmic rays, the more clouds. Cosmic rays ionize air molecules, transforming them into condensation nuclei for water vapor, where the ice crystals - from which clouds are created - are formed. The quantity of cosmic rays impacting the atmosphere is controlled by changes in the so-called solar wind - when the winds are stronger, they drive cosmic radiation away from the Earth, fewer clouds are formed and the Earth becomes warmer,” Miles explained. ([LINK](#))

Engineer David Holland authored a November 2007 study titled “Bias and Concealment in the IPCC Process: The ‘Hockey-Stick’ Affair and its Implications” which was published in the scientific journal *Energy & Environment*. Holland also wrote a 2006 critique of the Stern Review for *World Economics*. Holland, who is a member of the Institution of Engineering and Technology, critiqued modern climate science methods and the UN IPCC process. “[Climate science] is by all measures as important a field of research as medicine, and ought to operate to standards at least as high, but it does not. On the contrary, it is steeped in bias, concealment and spin,” Holland, wrote in his November paper for *Energy & Environment*. “Strong and well-founded scientific disagreement remains,” he wrote. Holland took the IPCC to task. “The IPCC’s governing principles are interpreted loosely, for example the strong scientific and statistical disagreements expressed by reviewers are not adequately, if at all, recorded in IPCC reports. Unpublished papers supporting IPCC orthodoxy are included even though their supporting data and methodology are not available. The use of non-disclosure agreements runs entirely counter to the IPCC’s role,” he wrote. ([LINK](#))

Meteorologist Morgan Palmer of Texas TV’s KLTV, who holds Seals of Approval from both the American Meteorological Society (AMS) and the National Weather Association (NWA), declared himself skeptical of man-made climate fears in 2007. “Any idea can become

mainstream if you just hear one side of the argument,” Palmer said on November 8, 2007. Palmer called man-made warming a theory and accused proponents of becoming political. “It is because of money,” Palmer explained. “Folks that are writing these papers that a lot of institutions are going after grant money, and grant money is given by folks who might have very good intentions, but unfortunately the papers that are being written are heavily weighed on man-made Global Warming,” he added. ([LINK](#)) & Click to watch video: ([LINK](#))

Berkeley University- and MIT-educated scientist Jeffrey P. Schaffer, now a professor at the Department of Science & Mathematics at Napa Valley College in California, questioned man-made climate fears in 2007. Gore’s claims of a “20-foot sea level rise due to rapid melting of the Greenland ice sheet is far from reality,” Schaffer wrote on November 14, 2007 in an article titled “A Scientist’s Take on Global Warming” in the *Napa Valley Register*. “Beginning in 1986 I became seriously interested in global warming, and learned that the sea level would rise about 20 feet very rapidly due to melting ice shelves and sea ice. However, as any science-literate elementary school kid can tell you, when floating ice melts, it contracts; there is no increase in volume, so no sea-level rise. After about 10 years with this impending doom scenario, scientists dropped it. I suppose some elementary school kid told them about the ‘floating ice cubes’ class experiment,” Schaffer explained. Schaffer also detailed why he believes climate science has become politicized and recommended the book *State of Fear* by Michael Crichton. Crichton “shows how environmental organizations such as the Sierra Club create imaginary crises. Having been on the board of one organization and observing others, I can vouch for this. A perceived crisis really boosts your membership! For example, here is a global-warming quote by Stanford University climatologist Stephen Schneider: ‘We need to get some broad-based support to capture the public’s imagination. That of course, entails getting loads of media coverage. So we have to offer up scary scenarios, make simplified, dramatic statements, and make little mention of any doubts we might have,’” Schaffer concluded. ([LINK](#))

Climate scientist Dr. David Douglass of the University of Rochester refuted the entire basis for man-made climate fears in 2007. Douglass co-authored a December 2007 peer-reviewed paper published in the *International Journal of Climatology of the Royal Meteorological Society* which found the evidence for human influence for warming temperatures lacking in the atmosphere. “The observed pattern of warming, comparing surface and atmospheric temperature trends does not show the characteristic fingerprint associated with greenhouse warming. The inescapable conclusion is that the human contribution is not significant and that observed increases in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases make only a negligible contribution to climate warming,” said Douglass, the paper’s lead author on December 10, 2007. The paper was co-authored with **Physicist Dr. S. Fred Singer, Climatologist Dr. John Christy and Benjamin D. Pearson. ([LINK](#))**

Climate scientist Dr. Dick Morgan, former director of Canada’s Met/Oceano Policy and Plans, a marine meteorologist and a climate researcher at both Exeter University and the Bedford Institute of Oceanography, rejected man-made climate fears in 2007. “I have had over 65 years of global climatic experience in every ocean of the world and am convinced that solar variability is the major component of climate change. It influences the global thermohaline circulation and the quasi-permanent pressure oscillations which export polar air towards the ITF via the Trade Winds. Hence, seasonal Monsoons, Tropical Storms and ENSO generation,” Morgan, a former associate of the British Antarctic Survey Group at Cambridge, wrote to EPW on November 18, 2007. “The Major GHGs (greenhouse gases) are

water vapour and ozone -- the latter being more important than CO₂ in fossil fuel emissions because of its effect upon aerosols which determine cloud albedo and chemistry. Having been a forecaster at an airfield in Glasgow, during the coal burning period, I can vouch for that statement empirically,” Morgan explained. “CO₂ warming is not entirely detrimental because of its feedback as a catalyst for the greening of the terrestrial surface as its own sink in forestry, food production and grazing crops for animals. Its attributes and detriments are probably near balanced,” he wrote. “As there is a perfect correlation between population growth and CO₂, the major objective of Kyoto should be population control, otherwise it is simply pissing against the wind,” he added. “As the IPCC does not have an adequate representation of oceanographers and solar scientists in its WG1 (Working Group 1) and [IPCC] Panel, it is not representative of the total scientific forum of experts in climate change integers, Centers of expertise in oceanography are almost unanimously advising that if IPCC models are right then the Gulf Stream will fail and scientists in highly reputable solar research centers are anticipating 60 years of solar quiescence are imminent. The IPCC are not advising the public of these alternative theses which advocate cooling -- countering anthropogenic warming,” he concluded.

Iowa Meteorologists George Waldenberger and Gary Shore expressed skepticism about whether mankind was driving climate change in 2007. “Well, I went to school at UCLA, a big climate school. And it isn’t really an issue as to if the global climate has been warming,” Waldenberger said on April 11, 2007. “It has over the past 40 years. The question is what type of role do we take in that warming. Is it all natural fluctuations or are the increased concentrations of carbon dioxide part of this? And that’s a subject that’s up in the air,” Waldenberger explained. **Meteorologist Gary Shore, agreed with Waldenberger.** “There’s definitely global warming,” Shore said on April 11, 2007. “No question about that. And it seems very likely that what we’re doing has some part of that, some impact; but as to exactly how much of it is us and how much of it is other things, nobody knows,” Shore explained. Waldenberger further commented, “But you know carbon dioxide is a greenhouse gas just like water vapor, which is actually the most efficient greenhouse gas. And that’s why we’re actually 60 degrees warmer than we would be without water vapor in the air. So if you’re talking about the greenhouse effect, that’s very real, and we need it to survive. But as far as carbon dioxide concentrations increasing over the last 100 years, they have about 30 percent. And temperatures have increased about a degree on average across the entire globe over the last hundred years as well. So it seems to be a reasonable argument.” “So the debate now goes into, well, what does that mean? Are things going to keep going in the direction that they’re going or does increased carbon dioxide sort of fertilize the air and does that create more plants which in turn digest more carbon dioxide and create more oxygen? You know, there’s a wide variety of ways we can go from here. So the debate then becomes: What do we need to do now?” he added. ([LINK](#))

Atmospheric scientist H. Michael Mogil, a 30-year veteran of NOAA (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration), who is certified by the American Metrological Society and currently owns the “How the Weatherworks” consulting firm, questioned man-made global warming fears in 2007. “As a certified consulting meteorologist who has written extensively about weather, I am compelled to address the spate of stories that appear almost daily promoting climate fears,” Mogil, who holds a masters degree in Meteorology, wrote in a commentary published on October 27, 2007 in the *Napa Valley Register* titled “Earth is Warming, but it’s Not Our Fault.” “Long-term climate studies show that the Earth goes through large- and small-scale weather and climate patterns. These are based on solar energy

output and solar flare activity, wobbles of the Earth's rotation, changes in land locations (plate tectonics or continental drift, depending upon your age when the subject was taught), periodic melting and reformation of glaciers and much more. Humans are clearly affecting some of these typical variations, but we are not their cause," Mogil explained. "While the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and Al Gore claim that humans are almost certainly the cause of the changes, I disagree. The warming began as the last ice age waned some 500 years ago, not as humans started to industrialize," he wrote. "I'm not sure why so many of my meteorological colleagues who have similar feelings have not spoken up. Perhaps it is because the news media is presenting mostly a one-sided approach to the topic. So, in my new book, *Extreme Weather*, coming in November [2007], and in letters like this, I'm pushing for a more scientific examination of the evidence and a more balanced perspective," he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Geologist Brian R. Pratt, a professor in the Department of Geological Sciences at the University of Saskatchewan in Canada, is an award-winning sedimentologist and paleontologist who specializes in earth's environmental history in Deep Time. Pratt is also a skeptic of climate change fears. "I have reviewed the observational evidence of climate change which leads me to interpret climate fluctuations and weather patterns as natural phenomena not caused by anthropogenic activities," Pratt told EPW on November 27, 2007. "I am very concerned that Earth's physical, chemical and biological processes are being widely misunderstood by the public, by politicians and even by many scientists. Consequently, 'stopping' global warming has been adopted as a mission by people with the power to cause severe economic harm and divert efforts away from more critical measures involving conservation, population growth, poverty and so forth," he wrote. ([LINK](#))

Climate Scientist Dr. S. Fred Singer, former director the US Weather Satellite Service, past vice chairman of the U.S. National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere and global warming co-author of the 2006 book: ([LINK](#)) Unstoppable Global Warming: Every 1500 Years details the solar-climate link using hundreds of studies from peer reviewed literature and "shows the earth's temperatures following variations in solar intensity through centuries of sunspot records, and finds cycles of sun-linked isotopes in ice and tree rings." Singer explained on February 14, 2007, "Good evidence confirms that current warming is mostly part of a natural climate cycle, most likely driven by the sun. The available data show that the human contribution from greenhouse gases is not detectable and must be insignificant. It is a non-problem. Trying to mitigate a natural warming (or cooling) is futile and a big waste of money better spent on real societal problems."

Chemist James Hammond, a councilor for the American Chemical Society's San Geronimo section, refuted man-made climate fears in 2007. "Data published during the past few years show that all other life on Earth contributes 1,000 times as much greenhouse gases as do people and all their activities," Hammond said at an American Chemical Society meeting in Redlands, California, according to a November 16, 2007 article. The article noted that Hammond explained that "all humans and human activity, from driving cars to raising cattle, produce just 14 percent of all carbon dioxide emissions." The article also explained that Hammond noted a single cow "emits about 1 1/3 tons of carbon dioxide a year, while a human on average emits 1 ton - though it depends on a person's size and diet." Hammond continued, "Reasonable sources of extra CO₂ would be all other life on Earth, including plants, animals and insects. As the Earth warmed, more food would grow, so people and animal populations could grow, thereby increasing greenhouse gas production. Dead and rotting plants, animals

and people contribute carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, ammonia, sulfurous gases and others that add to greenhouse gases.” Hammond concluded, “CO2 is only one part of the problem. We’re not looking at the whole picture.” ([LINK](#))

Aeronautical engineer Roy Clark made a presentation at an American Chemical Society meeting in Redlands, California, rejecting man-made global warming fears. “Changes since the 1950s of surface temperatures of the Earth have nothing to do with CO2,” Clark said according to a November 16, 2007 article. “It comes from ocean current circulation,” which shifts about every 10 years, Clark added. Clark attributed sun spot activity to warming and other natural factors. “Most global warming models require assumptions,” he explained. “We assume global warming is real, so we build it into our models so we can calculate CO2 concentration. It’s all a big joke.” He concluded, “Water vapor and clouds drive climate temperature.” ([LINK](#))

Dr. Richard Courtney, a UN IPCC expert reviewer and a UK-based climate and atmospheric science consultant, declared the case for man-made climate fears is weakening. “The case for anthropogenic (human-caused) global warming (AGW) is getting weaker and weaker, not ‘stronger and stronger and stronger’ as many have claimed,” Courtney wrote on November 27, 2007. “To date, no convincing evidence for AGW has been discovered. And recent global climate behavior is not consistent with AGW model predictions. Mean global temperature has not again reached the high it did in 1998 (an El Niño year) and it has been stable for the last 6 years despite an increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide concentration of by 4% since 1998,” Courtney explained. “Global temperature has not increased since 1998 because, while the northern hemisphere has warmed, the southern hemisphere has cooled. Global warming was supposed to actually be global, not hemispheric,” he added. “Scares of hypothetical ‘tipping points,’ run-away sea level rise, massively increased storms, floods, pestilence and drought are simply that, unjustified and unjustifiable scares,” he concluded. ([LINK](#))

Meteorologist Kevin Williams of the New York based WEATHER-TRACK and Chief Meteorologist at WHEC-TV in Rochester is skeptical of man-made climate fears. “It is said that the one constant in life is change. The same can be said about the Earth’s climate,” Williams, who holds the American Meteorological Society’s Seal of Approval, wrote on June 8, 2007. “For millions of years our planet has undergone colossal climatic upheavals that would make recent storms and heat waves pale in comparison. And while we know these events were not the result of humans burning fossil fuels, some claim that recent miniscule warming portends a coming, man-made catastrophe. While it is my belief that we need to be good stewards of the planet and to develop sound alternative energy sources, I also believe that the climate will continue to warm and cool naturally due to planetary and solar cycles, independent of human activities,” Williams, the author of three books about the weather, explained.

The Dean of Pittsburgh’s Graduate School of Public Health, Donald S. Burke, rejected climate fears relating to the spread of infectious diseases in 2007. “There are no apocalyptic pronouncements,” Burke said, according to a December 5, 2007 *Boston Globe* article. “There’s an awful lot we don’t know,” Burke added. The article explained that Burke “noted that the 2001 study found that weather fluctuation and seasonal variability may influence the spread of infectious disease. But he also noted that such conclusions should be interpreted with caution.” The article continued, “Burke said he is not convinced that climate change can

be proven to cause the spread of many diseases, specifically naming dengue fever, influenza, and West Nile virus.” ([LINK](#))

Harold Brown, an agricultural scientist and professor emeritus at the University of Georgia and author of “The Greening of Georgia: The Improvement of the Environment in the Twentieth Century,” mocked global warming fears in 2007. “Global warming is a wonderful environmental disease,” Brown said according to a December 7, 2007 article. “It has a thousand symptoms and a thousand cures and it has tens of thousands of practitioners with job security for decades to come unless the press and public opinion get tired of it.” Brown also noted that many were worried about “global cooling” in the 1970s. According to the article, Brown “said some of the direst effects of a warming world, such as an increase in the number of deaths because of heat-related illnesses, might not be as bad as some feared, even if climate change were to continue.” ([LINK](#))

Chief Meteorologist Mark Scirto of Texas TV’s KLTU, a degreed Meteorologist who holds the Seals of Approval from both the American Meteorological Society (AMS) and the National Weather Association (NWA), expressed climate skepticism in 2007 and predicted climate fears would eventually fade. “The late 1800s, early 1900s, we were so cold parts of Galveston Bay froze over,” Scirto said on November 8, 2007. “In parts of the 20th century it was one of the warmest ever, then we cooled off again and then it was the drought.” Scirto predicted the fears about man-made global warming will fade. “Eventually, what is going to happen 20, 30 years from now, this is all going to be gone because we will not be warming anymore,” Scirto said. ([LINK](#)) & Click to watch video: ([LINK](#))

Dr. Sonja Boehmer-Christiansen, of the faculty of science at the University of Hull in the UK who serves as a Reader at the University’s Department of Geography, is the editor of the science journal *Energy & Environment*. Boehmer-Christiansen, who has worked with emission models and published numerous peer-reviewed articles on global warming, expressed climate skepticism in 2007. “I am pretty certain that the link between fossil fuel use and climate remains speculative and hypothetical,” Boehmer-Christiansen wrote on December 10, 2007. “Neither [the] Stern [Report] nor the IPCC final summaries reflect true academic opinion; they are the products of civil servants. They have been exaggerating the climate ‘threat’ in order to serve the interests primarily of fossil fuel-poor industrialized countries,” Boehmer-Christiansen continued. “As it stands, the Climate Change convention and the supporting rhetoric about catastrophe and serious future risks to humanity, and even to ‘the creation,’ serve a number of political, ideological and now financial interests that far outweigh the influences of ‘science,’” Boehmer-Christiansen added. “The UNFCCC did not ask for a scientific examination of climate and climate variability. It did not ask for an examination of the natural influences on climatic variability. As a result the so-called science of climate change consists to a large degree of ‘cherry picking,’” Boehmer-Christiansen wrote. Finally, Boehmer-Christiansen warned, “Beware of the [UK] Stern Review. This is not an independent piece of academic research, but a UK government document closely tied to a major diplomatic effort.”

Canadian biologist Dr. Mitchell Taylor, the director of wildlife research with the Arctic government of Nunavut, dismissed these fears of global warming devastating polar bears. “Of the 13 populations of polar bears in Canada, 11 are stable or increasing in number. They are not going extinct, or even appear to be affected at present,” Taylor said in 2006, noting that Canada is home to two-thirds of the world’s polar bears. He added, “It is just silly to

predict the demise of polar bears in 25 years based on media-assisted hysteria.” In September 2007, Taylor further debunked the latest report hyping fears of future polar bear extinctions. “I think it’s naive and presumptuous,” Taylor said, referring to a recent report by the U.S. government warning that computer models predict a dire future for the bears due to projected ice loss. Taylor also debunked the notion that less sea ice means less polar bears by pointing out that southern regions of the bears’ home with low levels of ice are seeing booming bear populations. He noted that in the warmer southern Canadian region of the Davis Strait with lower levels of ice, a new survey will reveal that bear populations have grown from an estimated 850 bears to an estimated 3000 bears. And, despite the lower levels of ice, some of the bears measured in this region are among the biggest ever on record. “Davis Strait is crawling with polar bears. It’s not safe to camp there. They’re fat. The mothers have cubs. The cubs are in good shape,” he said, according to a September 14, 2007 article. He added, “That’s not theory. That’s not based on a model. That’s observation of reality.” [Note: The U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service estimates that the polar bear population is currently at 20,000 to 25,000 bears, up from as low as 5,000-10,000 bears in the 1950s and 1960s. A 2002 U.S. Geological Survey of wildlife in the Arctic Refuge Coastal Plain noted that the polar bear populations ‘may now be near historic highs.’] ([LINK](#))

Bryan Leyland, head of the International Climate Science Coalition and an engineer, disputed man-made global warming fears in 2007. “Let us start with a simple question: ‘Is the world warming?’ The surface temperature records used by the IPCC show that it has warmed by 0.7 deg C since 1900. The world has not warmed since 1998 and temperatures have been steady since 2002. So the only answer can be: ‘It warmed between 1900 and 1998. Nobody knows if the current slight cooling trend will soon end or continue,’” Leyland wrote in a November 2007 commentary. Leyland also disputed any link between man-made CO₂ and temperature. “Computer models of the climate show that if it did, the largest increase in temperature would be 10 km above the tropics. Radiosonde observations published in 2006 show NO sign of faster warming. Therefore, we can be sure that man-made carbon dioxide is not causing global warming,” Leyland wrote.

Aerospace engineer and physicist Dr. Michael Griffin, the top administrator of NASA and former head of the Space Department at Johns Hopkins University’s Applied Physics Laboratory, expressed man-made global warming skepticism in 2007. “To assume that [global warming] is a problem is to assume that the state of Earth’s climate today is the optimal climate, the best climate that we could have or ever have had and that we need to take steps to make sure that it doesn’t change,” Griffin said in a May 31, 2007 interview on National Public Radio’s (NPR) “Morning Edition.” “I guess I would ask which human beings - where and when - are to be accorded the privilege of deciding that this particular climate that we have right here today, right now is the best climate for all other human beings. I think that’s a rather arrogant position for people to take,” Griffin explained. “I have no doubt that a trend of global warming exists. I am not sure that it is fair to say that it is a problem we must wrestle with,” he added. ([LINK](#))

Research physicist Dr. Tom Quirk, a former University lecturer, fellow of three Oxford Colleges, and a board member of the Australian based Institute of Public Affairs, authored a June 7, 2007 paper questioning carbon dioxide measurements in the atmosphere titled “Everyone is Entitled to Their Own Opinion But Not Their Own Facts.” Quirk’s paper found that “it is not possible to compare peaks and valleys in CO₂ measurements from VOSTOK or EPICA with contemporary atmospheric time series. There is a mismatch in gas

age resolutions. Peaks are flattened and valleys are filled in the ice core measurements.” The paper concluded, “Thus on our contemporary timescale it is not possible to say that CO2 level has not been above 300 ppm for the last 500,000 years. The same comment applies to comparing the ‘rapid’ run up of contemporary CO2 levels with the ice core records where ‘sharp’ pulses of less than 100 years may well be smoothed away.” <http://www.lavoisier.com.au/>

Dr. Alex Robson, a lecturer in the School of Economics in the College of Business and Economics at the Australian National University and a former Economist at the Federal Treasury, ridiculed the notion of taking out an “insurance policy” against man-made global warming. “Simply put, as far as the benefits of emissions reductions are concerned, there is no ‘risk’ for Australia to ‘manage,’” Robson wrote in a paper on June 29, 2007. “As a matter of science, economics and logic this ‘insurance policy’ analogy is completely inappropriate and indeed grossly misleading. As far as Australia’s CO2 emissions reductions are concerned, the entire ‘risk management’ argument simply cannot be sustained,” Robson explained. “A policy of emission reductions is like taking out an ‘insurance policy’ in which there is never any positive payoff,” he added. <http://www.lavoisier.com.au>

[Meteorologist Chris Allen of Kentucky Fox affiliate WBKO](#) dismissed what he termed “consensus nonsense” on global warming. “But, just because major environmental groups, big media and some politicians are buying this hook, line and sinker doesn’t mean as a TV weatherperson I am supposed to act as a puppy on a leash and follow along,” Allen said in his blog titled “Still Not Convinced” on February 7, 2007. “All of this (global warming alarmism) is designed to get your money and then guilt you in to how you live your life,” Allen explained. Allen has the Seal of Approval of the National Weather Association. “As I have stated before, not only do I believe global climate change exists - it has always existed. There have been times of global warming and cooling,” Allen concluded. ([LINK](#)) “If there is a consensus among scientists about man-made global warming, then at what temperature would they all agree the earth should be before they say global warming no longer exists? The answer - there is not a scientific consensus and will never be. And if there were one, they would not agree as to what temperature the earth needs to be ‘normal’ again,” Allen wrote in another blog post on June 5, 2007. ([LINK](#))

Statistician Dr. Richard Mackey authored a 2007 peer-reviewed study which found that the solar system regulates the earth’s climate. The paper was published August 17, 2007 in the *Journal of Coastal Research* - Excerpt: “According to the findings reviewed in this paper, the variable output of the sun, the sun’s gravitational relationship between the earth (and the moon) and earth’s variable orbital relationship with the sun, regulate the earth’s climate. The processes by which the sun affects the earth show periodicities on many time scales; each process is stochastic and immensely complex.” ([LINK](#)) & ([LINK](#))

New York’s WABC-TV Senior Meteorologist Bill Evans, who has won the Outstanding Meteorologist Award from the National Weather Service and hosted the National Hurricane Conference, expressed man-made global warming skepticism in 2007. “There is climate change. The planet is warming. But we’re coming off an ice age. So you would expect naturally the planet is warming,” Evans said in an interview on Fox News Channel on August 19, 2007. “There’s really no data to just show that man is causing the warming in the atmosphere or contributing to the mass of CO2 that’s in the atmosphere. We are seeing changes in the planet, but the planet changes all the time,” Evans said. ([LINK](#))

Nuclear physicist Dr. Dennis Jensen, a PhD-trained scientist and a former researcher

for Australia's Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Organization (CSIRO) and the Defence Science and Technology Organization (DSTO), questioned man-made climate fears in 2007. "It has been found that warming is occurring on Pluto, Mars, Jupiter and Triton," Jensen said on February 27, 2007. "The last time I looked, there were no evil greenhouse gas belching industries on those planets, sub-planets and moons," he said, which clearly indicated that increased solar activity was a significant factor," Jensen explained. He also noted that studies of ice core data reveals that warming precedes rising CO2 levels in the atmosphere. "In other words, it would be more correct to say that temperature changes cause CO2 concentration changes," he said. ([LINK](#))

Environmental scientist and flood hydrologist Robert Ellison, an expert on environmental risk assessment, the movement of pollutants through soils, water, and the atmosphere, and hydrology and hydraulics, noted the impact of natural climate factors on warming temperatures. "We have moved into a cool (referring to sea surface temperatures) La Niña Phase of the Pacific Decadal Variation - this should lead to lower global surface temperatures over a couple of decades. The lack of increase in average surface temperature over a decade certainly suggests that there is some other process in play - it is fitting the pattern of ENSO variation," Ellison wrote to EPW on December 17, 2007. "Superimposed on the alternation of La Niña and El Niño are longer- term variations in the frequency and intensity of El Niño and La Niña. A period of more frequent and intense La Niña between the mid forties and 1975 was followed by more frequent and intense El Niño between 1976 and 1998. The pattern appears in centuries of proxy data - that is in tree and coral rings, sedimentation and rainfall and flood records," Ellison wrote on November 28, 2007 in a commentary titled "ENSO Variation and Global Warming." "Global surface temperatures have a similar trajectory. Falling from 1946 to 1975, rising between 1976 and 1998 and declining since," Ellison explained. "It is difficult to explain how ENSO variations have been neglected by so many for so long. ENSO involves 97% of greenhouse gases. The surface temperature impacts are significant. Note the 0.25 0C difference between 1998 and 2000. ENSO variation goes in both directions. The indications are that ENSO variation added to global surface temperatures between 1976 and 1998. It has been almost 10 years since temperatures peaked in 1998. The planet may continue to be cooler over the next few decades as a cool La Niña phase of ENSO emerges," he concluded. ([LINK](#))

###

The following scientists may not be referred to as "skeptical" but they make very important and noteworthy points: (Note: The below scientists are not included in total tally of skeptical scientists)

[Paleoclimatologist Dr. Amy Frappier labeled climate fears oversimplified.](#) **Boston College's professor of Geology and Geophysics** Frappier explained in a February 1, 2007 article in Boston College's newspaper The Heights, "The geologic record shows that many millions of years ago, CO2 levels were indeed higher - in some cases many times higher - than today." Frappier noted that greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere do not consistently continue to have a warming effect on Earth, but gases instead stabilize in the atmosphere and cease having a warming effect. "At some point the heat-trapping capacity of [the gas] and its effect get saturated," said Frappier, "and you don't have increased heating." According to the article, Frappier, who believes mankind is having an impact on the climate, criticized Gore because "his movie fails to mention any ancient incongruity between carbon dioxide and temperature."

Scientists Claim Computer Model Predictions are ‘Useless Arithmetic’ - Orrin H. Pilkey, a coastal geologist and emeritus professor at Duke and his daughter Linda Pilkey-Jarvis, a geologist in the Washington State Department of Geology, wrote a book in 2007 entitled *Useless Arithmetic: Why Environmental Scientists Can’t Predict the Future*. Thought the authors stress their book does not specifically address man-made global warming fears, it does present “an overall attack on the use of computer programs to model nature,” according to a February 20, 2007 *New York Times* book review. The *Times* book review explained how these models “may include coefficients (the authors call them ‘fudge factors’) to ensure that they come out right. And the modelers may not check to see whether projects performed as predicted.” “Nature is too complex, they (the authors) say, and depends on too many processes that are poorly understood or little monitored - whether the process is the feedback effects of cloud cover on global warming or the movement of grains of sand on a beach,” the *Times* article explained. “And instead of demanding to know exactly how high seas will rise or how many fish will be left in them or what the average global temperature will be in 20 years, they argue, we should seek to discern simply whether seas are rising, fish stocks are falling and average temperatures are increasing. And we should couple these models with observations from the field. Models should be regarded as producing ‘ballpark figures,’ they write, not accurate impact forecasts,” the *Times* article continued. The coastal models are so flawed that Pilkey recommends dredging up a lot of sand and dumping it on the beach “willy-nilly” and he predicts you would end up with the same result, minus the “false mathematical certitude.” ([LINK](#))

Climatologist/seismologist Dr. Jose Rial of the University of North Carolina is studying glacial seismic activity in Greenland and has chastised the media and criticized a proponent of man-made climate fears for presenting a “falling-sky” view of Greenland’s climate. “I also know that there is no evidence to suggest that these quakes [linked to ice melt on Greenland] ‘are happening far faster than ever anticipated’ [as Robert Corell of The Heinz Center claimed],” wrote Rial in a September 13, 2007 letter to the UK *Guardian*. Rial criticized the UK newspaper for presenting a ‘falling-sky’ alarmist perspective and added that “it will take years of continued surveying to know whether anything here [in Greenland] is ‘accelerating’ towards catastrophe, as the article [featuring Corell] claims.” Rial concluded, “I believe that to battle global climate change effectively we need the strong support of a well-informed, actively engaged public. There is great urgency indeed in all these climate matters and I understand the threat of climate change to society; but the evidence needs to be there before we needlessly alarm the public who sustain our research.” ([LINK](#))

Oceanographer and Meteorologist Bill Patzert of NASA’s Jet Propulsion Laboratory detailed how land use changes impact the climate. “Everybody’s talking about the carbon coming out of the SUV exhaust or the coal plant, but in the past 50 years in California the bigger impact has been urbanization and suburbanization,” Patzert said in a March 30, 2007 Reuters article. The article noted, “Average temperatures across California rose slightly from 1950 to 2000, with the greatest warming coming in the state’s big cities and mostly caused by urbanization -- not greenhouse gases -- authors of a study released on Wednesday said.” Patzert believes mankind’s CO₂ emissions and land use changes are key factors in climate change. “The study found that average temperatures in California rose nearly 2 degrees Fahrenheit (nearly one degree Celsius) in the second half of the 20th century, led by large urban centers such as San Francisco and Southern California,” Reuters explained. “This (warming) has already had a huge impact on the state of California. It’s changed the way we do agriculture, it’s changed the energy and water demands, it’s changed the number of days

we've had frost or extreme heat," Patzert said. ([LINK](#))

Prominent environmentalists Ted Nordhaus and Michael Shellenberger broke ranks with their counterparts on key aspects of man-made global warming fears and environmentalism in 2007. In their book *Break Through: From the Death of Environmentalism to the Politics of Possibility* they argue that any potential warming may have some beneficial impacts. "Global warming could bring drought, disease and war - and it could bring prosperity, cooperation and freedom," they wrote. Nordhaus and Shellenberger chastised the green movement for engaging in what they termed "quasi-authoritarian politics" that "aims to short-circuit democratic values" and "is hobbled by its resentment of human strength." An October 5, 2007 book review in the *San Francisco Chronicle* noted, "Environmentalists, the authors suggest darkly, are partially morally culpable for the human suffering in disasters such as Hurricane Katrina." Nordhaus and Shellenberger wrote, "Environmentalists have attacked adaptation and preparedness in the belief that taking steps to prepare for global warming - for instance, by building higher seawalls and levees or identifying new water supplies for regions likely to be affected by drought - would undermine their arguments for carbon reductions." ([LINK](#)) In an October 14, 2007 *San Francisco Chronicle* op-ed titled "Look who's in denial about global warming now," Nordhaus and Shellenberger explained how the green movement is in denial about global warming. "The problem isn't that the voters don't care about global warming. They do. It's that they don't care all that much. Consider that despite extensive publicity, Al Gore's movie, *An Inconvenient Truth*, had almost no impact on public opinion. The Pew Center for People and the Press conducted a telephone survey in June 2006, at the height of media attention for the movie, and found that 'out of a list of 19 issues, Republicans rank global warming 19th and Democrats and independents rank it 13th.' After six more months of high-profile coverage, the relative importance of global warming had declined even further," they wrote. "There are political consequences to all of this. In November 2006, months after the supposed 'tipping point' for global warming, voters in California - a relatively liberal state - rejected a ballot initiative that would have taxed the state's oil production in the name of global warming," they added. ([LINK](#))

Alex Gourevitch, a Doctoral candidate at Columbia University, compared the environmental movements' promotion of global warming and other eco-concerns to the same "politics of fear" he believes marks the war on terror. "Let's say it: Environmentalism is a politics of fear. It is not a progressive politics. When I say it is a politics of fear, I don't mean that it just deploys hysterical rhetoric or that it exaggerates threats, which I think it does. I mean it in a much deeper sense," Gourevitch stated according to an October 31, 2007 article in the *New York Times*. "What the science cannot tell you is what our political and social response should be," he explained. "Environmentalism is not just some politics. It's a political project, a full-bodied ideology, and one that presents itself in terms of progress and aspiration. But when you look at what this ideology is built on, it's built on the idea that a collective threat that makes security the basic principle of politics and makes the struggle for survival the basic and central aim of our social and political life. This, to me, is not a progressive politics at all," Gourevitch added. "What is it that moves us? It's not actually ideals. We're not stirred to action by ideals. We're compelled by the force of circumstances. It's the sheer spur of necessity that drives us forward. What's more, this ostensible politics is really anti-politics, because the idea is that we should put to one side the conflicts of interest and ideals that are the real cut and thrust of politics," he said. Yale educated Dr. Mark Greif, co-editor of journal *n+1* agreed with Gourevitch during the panel discussion at Columbia University. Greif argued

that “the politics of global warming produces the possibility of left-wing fantasies of a state of emergency in which we wouldn’t have to go through normal politics in order to get things done.” ([LINK](#))

####

Attachment Number 1: Full Text of December 13, 2007: Over 100 Prominent International Scientists Warn UN Against ‘Futile’ Climate Control Efforts in a December 13, 2007 open letter.

Complete Letter with all signatories - As published in Canada’s National Post on December 13, 2007:

The National Post

Don’t Fight, Adapt; We Should Give Up Futile Attempts to Combat Climate Change

Dec. 13, 2007

[Link to Letter:](#)

Key Quote from Scientists’ Letter to UN: “Attempts to prevent global climate change from occurring are ultimately futile, and constitute a tragic misallocation of resources that would be better spent on humanity’s real and pressing problems.”

His Excellency

Ban Ki-Moon Secretary-General,

United Nations New York, N.Y.

Dear Mr. Secretary-General,

Re: UN climate conference taking the World in entirely the wrong direction

It is not possible to stop climate change, a natural phenomenon that has affected humanity through the ages. Geological, archaeological, oral and written histories all attest to the dramatic challenges posed to past societies from unanticipated changes in temperature, precipitation, winds and other climatic variables. We therefore need to equip nations to become resilient to the full range of these natural phenomena by promoting economic growth and wealth generation.

The United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has issued increasingly alarming conclusions about the climatic influences of human-produced carbon dioxide (CO₂), a non-polluting gas that is essential to plant photosynthesis. While we understand the evidence that has led them to view CO₂ emissions as harmful, the IPCC’s conclusions are quite inadequate as justification for implementing policies that will markedly diminish future prosperity. In particular, it is not established that it is possible to significantly alter global climate through cuts in human greenhouse gas emissions. On top of which, because attempts to cut emissions will slow development, the current UN approach of CO₂ reduction is likely to increase human suffering from future climate change rather than to decrease it.

The IPCC Summaries for Policy Makers are the most widely read IPCC reports amongst politicians and non-scientists and are the basis for most climate change policy formulation. Yet these Summaries are prepared by a relatively small core writing team with the final drafts approved line-by-line by government representatives. The great majority of IPCC contributors and reviewers, and the tens of thousands of other scientists who are qualified to comment on these matters, are not involved in the preparation of these documents. The summaries therefore cannot properly be represented as a consensus view among experts.

Contrary to the impression left by the IPCC Summary reports:

*Recent observations of phenomena such as glacial retreats, sea-level rise and the migration of temperature-sensitive species are not evidence for abnormal climate change, for none of these changes has been shown to lie outside the bounds of known natural variability.

*The average rate of warming of 0.1 to 0.2 degrees Celsius per decade recorded by satellites during the late 20th century falls within known natural rates of warming and cooling over the last 10,000 years.

*Leading scientists, including some senior IPCC representatives, acknowledge that today's computer models cannot predict climate. Consistent with this, and despite computer projections of temperature rises, there has been no net global warming since 1998. That the current temperature plateau follows a late 20th-century period of warming is consistent with the continuation today of natural multi-decadal or millennial climate cycling.

In stark contrast to the often repeated assertion that the science of climate change is "settled," significant new peer-reviewed research has cast even more doubt on the hypothesis of dangerous human-caused global warming. But because IPCC working groups were generally instructed (http://ipcc-wg1.ucar.edu/wg1/docs/wg1_timetable_2006-08-14.pdf) to consider work published only through May, 2005, these important findings are not included in their reports; i.e., the IPCC assessment reports are already materially outdated.

The UN climate conference in Bali has been planned to take the world along a path of severe CO2 restrictions, ignoring the lessons apparent from the failure of the Kyoto Protocol, the chaotic nature of the European CO2 trading market, and the ineffectiveness of other costly initiatives to curb greenhouse gas emissions. Balanced cost/benefit analyses provide no support for the introduction of global measures to cap and reduce energy consumption for the purpose of restricting CO2 emissions. Furthermore, it is irrational to apply the "precautionary principle" because many scientists recognize that both climatic coolings and warmings are realistic possibilities over the medium-term future.

The current UN focus on "fighting climate change," as illustrated in the Nov. 27 UN Development Programme's Human Development Report, is distracting governments from adapting to the threat of inevitable natural climate changes, whatever forms they may take. National and international planning for such changes is needed, with a focus on helping our most vulnerable citizens adapt to conditions that lie ahead. Attempts to prevent global climate change from occurring are ultimately futile, and constitute a tragic misallocation of resources that would be better spent on humanity's real and pressing problems.

Yours faithfully,

The following are signatories to the Dec. 13th letter to the Ban Ki-moon, Secretary-General of

the United Nations on the UN Climate conference in Bali [List of signatories: [LINK](#)]:

Don Aitkin, PhD, Professor, social scientist, retired Vice-Chancellor and President, University of Canberra, Australia

[Syun-Ichi Akasofu](#), PhD, Professor of Physics, Emeritus and Founding Director, International Arctic Research Center of the University of Alaska Fairbanks, U.S.

William J.R. Alexander, PhD, Professor Emeritus, Dept. of Civil and Biosystems Engineering, University of Pretoria, South Africa; Member, UN Scientific and Technical Committee on Natural Disasters, 1994-2000

Bjarne Andresen, PhD, physicist, Professor, The Niels Bohr Institute, University of Copenhagen, Denmark

Geoff L. Austin, PhD, FNZIP, FRSNZ, Professor, Dept. of Physics, University of Auckland, New Zealand

[Timothy F. Ball](#), PhD, environmental consultant, former climatology professor, University of Winnipeg, Canada

Ernst-Georg Beck, Dipl. Biol., Biologist, Merian-Schule Freiburg, Germany

Sonja A. Boehmer-Christiansen, PhD, Reader, Dept. of Geography, Hull University, UK; Editor, Energy & Environment journal

Chris C. Borel, PhD, remote sensing scientist, U.S.

[Reid A. Bryson](#), Ph.D. D.Sc. D.Engr., UNEP Global 500 Laureate; Senior Scientist, Center for Climatic Research; Emeritus Professor of Meteorology, of Geography, and of Environmental Studies, University of Wisconsin, U.S.

Dan Carruthers, M.Sc., wildlife biology consultant specializing in animal ecology in Arctic and Subarctic regions, Alberta, Canada

[Robert M. Carter](#), PhD, Professor, Marine Geophysical Laboratory, James Cook University, Townsville, Australia

[Ian D. Clark](#), PhD, Professor, isotope hydrogeology and paleoclimatology, Dept. of Earth Sciences, University of Ottawa, Canada

Richard S. Courtney, PhD, climate and atmospheric science consultant, IPCC expert reviewer, U.K.

Willem de Lange, PhD, Dept. of Earth and Ocean Sciences, School of Science and Engineering, Waikato University, New Zealand

David Deming, PhD (Geophysics), Associate Professor, College of Arts and Sciences, University of Oklahoma, U.S.

Freeman J. Dyson, PhD, Emeritus Professor of Physics, Institute for Advanced Studies, Princeton, N.J., U.S.

[Don J. Easterbrook](#), PhD, Emeritus Professor of Geology, Western Washington University, U.S.

Lance Endersbee, Emeritus Professor, former Dean of Engineering and Pro-Vice Chancellor of Monash University, Australia

Hans Erren, Doctorandus, geophysicist and climate specialist, Sittard, The Netherlands

Robert H. Essenhigh, PhD, E.G. Bailey Professor of Energy Conversion, Dept. of Mechanical Engineering, The Ohio State University, U.S.

Christopher Essex, PhD, Professor of Applied Mathematics and Associate Director of the Program in Theoretical Physics, University of Western Ontario, Canada

David Evans, PhD, mathematician, carbon accountant, computer and electrical engineer and head of 'Science Speak', Australia

William Evans, PhD, Editor, American Midland Naturalist; Dept. of Biological Sciences, University of Notre Dame, U.S.

Stewart Franks, PhD, Associate Professor, Hydroclimatologist, University of Newcastle, Australia

R. W. Gauldie, PhD, Research Professor, Hawai'i Institute of Geophysics and Planetology, School of Ocean Earth Sciences and Technology, University of Hawaii at Manoa

Lee C. Gerhard, PhD, Senior Scientist Emeritus, University of Kansas; former director and state geologist, Kansas Geological Survey, U.S.

Gerhard Gerlich, Professor for Mathematical and Theoretical Physics, Institut für Mathematische Physik der TU Braunschweig, Germany

Albrecht Glatzle, PhD, sc.agr., Agro-Biologist and Gerente ejecutivo, INTTAS, Paraguay

Fred Goldberg, PhD, Adj Professor, Royal Institute of Technology, Mechanical Engineering, Stockholm, Sweden

[Vincent Gray](#), PhD, expert reviewer for the IPCC and author of The Greenhouse Delusion: A Critique of 'Climate Change 2001,' Wellington, New Zealand

William M. Gray, Professor Emeritus, Dept. of Atmospheric Science, Colorado State University and Head of the Tropical Meteorology Project, U.S.

Howard Hayden, PhD, Emeritus Professor of Physics, University of Connecticut, U.S.

Louis Hissink M.Sc. M.A.I.G., Editor AIG News and Consulting Geologist, Perth, Western Australia

Craig D. Idso, PhD, Chairman, Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, Arizona, U.S.

Sherwood B. Idso, PhD, President, Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, AZ, USA

Andrei Illarionov, PhD, Senior Fellow, Center for Global Liberty and Prosperity, U.S.; founder and director of the Institute of Economic Analysis, Russia

Zbigniew Jaworowski, PhD, physicist, Chairman - Scientific Council of Central Laboratory for Radiological Protection, Warsaw, Poland

Jon Jenkins, PhD, MD, computer modelling - virology, Sydney, NSW, Australia

Wibjorn Karlen, PhD, Emeritus Professor, Dept. of Physical Geography and Quaternary Geology, Stockholm University, Sweden

Olavi Kärner, Ph.D., Research Associate, Dept. of Atmospheric Physics, Institute of Astrophysics and Atmospheric Physics, Toravere, Estonia

Joel M. Kauffman, PhD, Emeritus Professor of Chemistry, University of the Sciences in Philadelphia, U.S.

David Kear, PhD, FRSNZ, CMG, geologist, former Director-General of NZ Dept. of Scientific & Industrial Research, New Zealand

Madhav Khandekar, PhD, former Research Scientist Environment Canada; Editor "Climate Research" (03-05); Editorial Board Member "Natural Hazards, IPCC Expert Reviewer 2007

William Kininmonth M.Sc., M.Admin., former head of Australia's National Climate Centre and a consultant to the World Meteorological organization's Commission for Climatology

Jan J.H. Kop, M.Sc. Ceng FICE (Civil Engineer Fellow of the Institution of Civil Engineers), Emeritus Professor of Public Health Engineering, Technical University Delft, The Netherlands

Professor R.W.J. Kouffeld, Emeritus Professor, Energy Conversion, Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands

Salomon Kroonenberg, PhD, Professor, Dept. of Geotechnology, Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands

Hans H.J. Labohm, PhD, economist, former advisor to the executive board, Clingendael Institute (The Netherlands Institute of International Relations), The Netherlands

The Rt. Hon. Lord Lawson of Blaby, economist; Chairman of the Central Europe Trust; former Chancellor of the Exchequer, U.K.

Douglas Leahey, PhD, meteorologist and air-quality consultant, Calgary, Canada

David R. Legates, PhD, Director, Center for Climatic Research, University of Delaware, U.S.

Marcel Leroux, PhD, Professor Emeritus of Climatology, University of Lyon, France; former director of Laboratory of Climatology, Risks and Environment, CNRS

Bryan Leyland, International Climate Science Coalition, consultant - power engineer, Auckland, New Zealand

William Lindqvist, PhD, consulting geologist and company director, Tiburon, California, U.S.

[Richard S. Lindzen](#), PhD, Alfred P. Sloan Professor of Meteorology, Dept. of Earth, Atmospheric and Planetary Sciences, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, U.S.

A.J. Tom van Loon, PhD, Professor of Geology (Quaternary Geology), Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznan, Poland; former President of the European Association of Science Editors

[Anthony R. Lupo](#), PhD, Associate Professor of Atmospheric Science, Dept. of Soil, Environmental, and Atmospheric Science, University of Missouri-Columbia, U.S.

Richard Mackey, PhD, Statistician, Australia

[Horst Malberg](#), PhD, Professor for Meteorology and Climatology, Institut für Meteorologie, Berlin, Germany

John Maunder, PhD, Climatologist, former President of the Commission for Climatology of the World Meteorological Organization (89-97), New Zealand

Alister McFarquhar, PhD, international economist, Downing College, Cambridge, U.K.

Ross McKittrick, PhD, Associate Professor, Dept. of Economics, University of Guelph, Canada

John McLean, Climate Data Analyst, computer scientist, Melbourne, Australia

Owen McShane, B. Arch., Master of City and Regional Planning (UC Berkeley), economist and policy analyst, joint founder of the International Climate Science Coalition, Director - Centre for Resource Management Studies, New Zealand

[Fred Michel](#), PhD, Director, Institute of Environmental Sciences and Associate Professor of Earth Sciences, Carleton University, Canada

Frank Milne, PhD, Professor, Dept. of Economics, Queen's University, Canada

Asmund Moene, PhD, former head of the Forecasting Centre, Meteorological Institute, Norway

Alan Moran, PhD, Energy Economist, Director of the IPA's Deregulation Unit, Australia

Nils-Axel Morner, PhD, Emeritus Professor of Paleogeophysics & Geodynamics, Stockholm University, Sweden

Lubos Motl, PhD, physicist, former Harvard string theorist, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

John Nicol, PhD, physicist, James Cook University, Australia

Mr. David Nowell, M.Sc., Fellow of the Royal Meteorological Society, former chairman of the NATO Meteorological Group, Ottawa, Canada

James J. O'Brien, PhD, Professor Emeritus, Meteorology and Oceanography, Florida State University, U.S.

Cliff Ollier, PhD, Professor Emeritus (Geology), Research Fellow, University of Western

Australia

Garth W. Paltridge, PhD, atmospheric physicist, Emeritus Professor and former Director of the Institute of Antarctic and Southern Ocean Studies, University of Tasmania, Australia

[R. Timothy Patterson](#), PhD, Professor, Dept. of Earth Sciences (paleoclimatology), Carleton University, Canada

Al Pekarek, PhD, Associate Professor of Geology, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences Dept., St. Cloud State University, Minnesota, U.S.

Ian Plimer, PhD, Professor of Geology, School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Adelaide and Emeritus Professor of Earth Sciences, University of Melbourne, Australia

Brian Pratt, PhD, Professor of Geology, Sedimentology, University of Saskatchewan, Canada

Harry N.A. Priem, PhD, Emeritus Professor of Planetary Geology and Isotope Geophysics, Utrecht University; former director of the Netherlands Institute for Isotope Geosciences

Alex Robson, PhD, Economics, Australian National University

Colonel F.P.M. Rombouts, Branch Chief - Safety, Quality and Environment, Royal Netherlands Air Force

R.G. Roper, PhD, Professor Emeritus of Atmospheric Sciences, School of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, Georgia Institute of Technology, U.S.

Arthur Rorsch, PhD, Emeritus Professor, Molecular Genetics, Leiden University, The Netherlands

Rob Scagel, M.Sc., forest microclimate specialist, principal consultant, Pacific Phytometric Consultants, B.C., Canada

Tom V. Segalstad, PhD, (Geology/Geochemistry), Head of the Geological Museum and Associate Professor of Resource and Environmental Geology, University of Oslo, Norway

Gary D. Sharp, PhD, Center for Climate/Ocean Resources Study, Salinas, CA, U.S.

S. Fred Singer, PhD, Professor Emeritus of Environmental Sciences, University of Virginia and former director, U.S. Weather Satellite Service

L. Graham Smith, PhD, Associate Professor, Dept. of Geography, University of Western Ontario, Canada

Roy W. Spencer, PhD, climatologist, Principal Research Scientist, Earth System Science Center, The University of Alabama, Huntsville, U.S.

[Peter Ståhl](#), PhD, Professor of Physical Chemistry, Research Leader, School of Chemical Science and Engineering, KTH (Royal Institute of Technology), Stockholm, Sweden

Hendrik Tennekes, PhD, former Director of Research, Royal Netherlands Meteorological

Institute

Dick Thoenes, PhD, Emeritus Professor of Chemical Engineering, Eindhoven University of Technology, The Netherlands

Brian G Valentine, PhD, PE (Chem.), Technology Manager - Industrial Energy Efficiency, Adjunct Associate Professor of Engineering Science, University of Maryland at College Park; Dept of Energy, Washington, DC, U.S.

Gerrit J. van der Lingen, PhD, geologist and paleoclimatologist, climate change consultant, Geoscience Research and Investigations, New Zealand

Len Walker, PhD, power engineering, Pict Energy, Melbourne, Australia

[Edward J. Wegman](#), Bernard J. Dunn Professor, Department of Statistics and Department Computational and Data Sciences, George Mason University, Virginia, U.S.

Stephan Wilksch, PhD, Professor for Innovation and Technology Management, Production Management and Logistics, University of Technology and Economics Berlin, Germany

Boris Winterhalter, PhD, senior marine researcher (retired), Geological Survey of Finland, former professor in marine geology, University of Helsinki, Finland

David E. Wojick, PhD, P.Eng., UN IPCC Expert Reviewer, energy consultant, Virginia, U.S.

Raphael Wust, PhD, Lecturer, Marine Geology/Sedimentology, James Cook University, Australia

Zichichi, PhD, President of the World Federation of Scientists, Geneva, Switzerland; Emeritus Professor of Advanced Physics, University of Bologna, Italy.

###

Attachment Number Two: [60 Prominent Scientists](#) came forward in 2006 to question the so-called “consensus” that the Earth faces a “climate emergency.”

Open Kyoto to debate, 60 Scientists call on Harper to revisit the science of global warming (The Financial Post)

April 6, 2006

Click Here for the [Link](#):

An open letter to Prime Minister Stephen Harper:

Dear Prime Minister:

As accredited experts in climate and related scientific disciplines, we are writing to propose that balanced, comprehensive public-consultation sessions be held so as to examine the scientific foundation of the federal government’s climate-change plans. This would be entirely consistent with your recent commitment to conduct a review of the Kyoto Protocol. Although many of us made the same suggestion to then-prime ministers Martin and Chretien, neither

responded, and, to date, no formal, independent climate-science review has been conducted in Canada. Much of the billions of dollars earmarked for implementation of the protocol in Canada will be squandered without a proper assessment of recent developments in climate science.

Observational evidence does not support today's computer climate models, so there is little reason to trust model predictions of the future. Yet this is precisely what the United Nations did in creating and promoting Kyoto and still does in the alarmist forecasts on which Canada's climate policies are based. Even if the climate models were realistic, the environmental impact of Canada delaying implementation of Kyoto or other greenhouse-gas reduction schemes, pending completion of consultations, would be insignificant. Directing your government to convene balanced, open hearings as soon as possible would be a most prudent and responsible course of action.

While the confident pronouncements of scientifically unqualified environmental groups may provide for sensational headlines, they are no basis for mature policy formulation. The study of global climate change is, as you have said, an "emerging science," one that is perhaps the most complex ever tackled. It may be many years yet before we properly understand the Earth's climate system. Nevertheless, significant advances have been made since the protocol was created, many of which are taking us away from a concern about increasing greenhouse gases. If, back in the mid-1990s, we knew what we know today about climate, Kyoto would almost certainly not exist, because we would have concluded it was not necessary.

We appreciate the difficulty any government has formulating sensible science-based policy when the loudest voices always seem to be pushing in the opposite direction. However, by convening open, unbiased consultations, Canadians will be permitted to hear from experts on both sides of the debate in the climate-science community. When the public comes to understand that there is no "consensus" among climate scientists about the relative importance of the various causes of global climate change, the government will be in a far better position to develop plans that reflect reality and so benefit both the environment and the economy.

"Climate change is real" is a meaningless phrase used repeatedly by activists to convince the public that a climate catastrophe is looming and humanity is the cause. Neither of these fears is justified. Global climate changes all the time due to natural causes and the human impact still remains impossible to distinguish from this natural "noise." The new Canadian government's commitment to reducing air, land and water pollution is commendable, but allocating funds to "stopping climate change" would be irrational. We need to continue intensive research into the real causes of climate change and help our most vulnerable citizens adapt to whatever nature throws at us next.

We believe the Canadian public and government decision-makers need and deserve to hear the whole story concerning this very complex issue. It was only 30 years ago that many of today's global-warming alarmists were telling us that the world was in the midst of a global-cooling catastrophe. But the science continued to evolve, and still does, even though so many choose to ignore it when it does not fit with predetermined political agendas.

We hope that you will examine our proposal carefully and we stand willing and able to furnish you with more information on this crucially important topic.

CC: The Honourable Rona Ambrose, Minister of the Environment, and the Honourable Gary

Lunn, Minister of Natural Resources

Sincerely,

Dr. Ian D. Clark, professor, isotope hydrogeology and paleoclimatology, Dept. of Earth Sciences, University of Ottawa

Dr. Tad Murty, former senior research scientist, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, former director of Australia's National Tidal Facility and professor of earth sciences, Flinders University, Adelaide; currently adjunct professor, Departments of Civil Engineering and Earth Sciences, University of Ottawa

Dr. R. Timothy Patterson, professor, Dept. of Earth Sciences (paleoclimatology), Carleton University, Ottawa

Dr. Fred Michel, director, Institute of Environmental Science and associate professor, Dept. of Earth Sciences, Carleton University, Ottawa

Dr. Madhav Khandekar, former research scientist, Environment Canada. Member of editorial board of Climate Research and Natural Hazards

Dr. Paul Copper, FRSC, professor emeritus, Dept. of Earth Sciences, Laurentian University, Sudbury, Ont.

Dr. Ross McKittrick, associate professor, Dept. of Economics, University of Guelph, Ont.

Dr. Tim Ball, former professor of climatology, University of Winnipeg; environmental consultant

Dr. Andreas Prokoph, adjunct professor of earth sciences, University of Ottawa; consultant in statistics and geology

Mr. David Nowell, M.Sc. (Meteorology), fellow of the Royal Meteorological Society, Canadian member and past chairman of the NATO Meteorological Group, Ottawa

Dr. Christopher Essex, professor of applied mathematics and associate director of the Program in Theoretical Physics, University of Western Ontario, London, Ont.

Dr. Gordon E. Swaters, professor of applied mathematics, Dept. of Mathematical Sciences, and member, Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Research Group, University of Alberta

Dr. L. Graham Smith, associate professor, Dept. of Geography, University of Western Ontario, London, Ont.

Dr. G. Cornelis van Kooten, professor and Canada Research Chair in environmental studies and climate change, Dept. of Economics, University of Victoria

Dr. Petr Chylek, adjunct professor, Dept. of Physics and Atmospheric Science, Dalhousie University, Halifax

Dr./Cdr. M. R. Morgan, FRMS, climate consultant, former meteorology advisor to the World Meteorological Organization. Previously research scientist in climatology at University of Exeter, U.K.

Dr. Keith D. Hage, climate consultant and professor emeritus of Meteorology, University of Alberta

Dr. David E. Wojick, P.Eng., energy consultant, Star Tannery, Va., and Sioux Lookout, Ont.

Rob Scagel, M.Sc., forest microclimate specialist, principal consultant, Pacific Phytometric Consultants, Surrey, B.C.

Dr. Douglas Leahey, meteorologist and air-quality consultant, Calgary

Paavo Siitam, M.Sc., agronomist, chemist, Cobourg, Ont.

Dr. Chris de Freitas, climate scientist, associate professor, The University of Auckland, N.Z.

Dr. Richard S. Lindzen, Alfred P. Sloan professor of meteorology, Dept. of Earth, Atmospheric and Planetary Sciences, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Dr. Freeman J. Dyson, emeritus professor of physics, Institute for Advanced Studies, Princeton, N.J.

Mr. George Taylor, Dept. of Meteorology, Oregon State University; Oregon State climatologist; past president, American Association of State Climatologists

Dr. Ian Plimer, professor of geology, School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Adelaide; emeritus professor of earth sciences, University of Melbourne, Australia

Dr. R.M. Carter, professor, Marine Geophysical Laboratory, James Cook University, Townsville, Australia

Mr. William Kininmonth, Australasian Climate Research, former Head National Climate Centre, Australian Bureau of Meteorology; former Australian delegate to World Meteorological Organization Commission for Climatology, Scientific and Technical Review

Dr. Hendrik Tennekes, former director of research, Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute

Dr. Gerrit J. van der Lingen, geologist/paleoclimatologist, Climate Change Consultant, Geoscience Research and Investigations, New Zealand

Dr. Patrick J. Michaels, professor of environmental sciences, University of Virginia

Dr. Nils-Axel Morner, emeritus professor of paleogeophysics & geodynamics, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden

Dr. Gary D. Sharp, Center for Climate/Ocean Resources Study, Salinas, Calif.

Dr. Roy W. Spencer, principal research scientist, Earth System Science Center, The University of Alabama, Huntsville

Dr. Al Pekarek, associate professor of geology, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences Dept., St. Cloud State University, St. Cloud, Minn.

Dr. Marcel Leroux, professor emeritus of climatology, University of Lyon, France; former director of Laboratory of Climatology, Risks and Environment, CNRS

Dr. Paul Reiter, professor, Institut Pasteur, Unit of Insects and Infectious Diseases, Paris, France. Expert reviewer, IPCC Working group II, chapter 8 (human health)

Dr. Zbigniew Jaworowski, physicist and chairman, Scientific Council of Central Laboratory for Radiological Protection, Warsaw, Poland

Dr. Sonja Boehmer-Christiansen, reader, Dept. of Geography, University of Hull, U.K.; editor, Energy & Environment

Dr. Hans H.J. Labohm, former advisor to the executive board, Clingendael Institute (The Netherlands Institute of International Relations) and an economist who has focused on climate change

Dr. Lee C. Gerhard, senior scientist emeritus, University of Kansas, past director and state geologist, Kansas Geological Survey

Dr. Asmund Moene, past head of the Forecasting Centre, Meteorological Institute, Norway

Dr. August H. Auer, past professor of atmospheric science, University of Wyoming; previously chief meteorologist, Meteorological Service (MetService) of New Zealand

Dr. Vincent Gray, expert reviewer for the IPCC and author of *The Greenhouse Delusion: A Critique of 'Climate Change 2001,'* Wellington, N.Z.

Dr. Howard Hayden, emeritus professor of physics, University of Connecticut

Dr Benny Peiser, professor of social anthropology, Faculty of Science, Liverpool John Moores University, U.K.

Dr. Jack Barrett, chemist and spectroscopist, formerly with Imperial College London, U.K.

Dr. William J.R. Alexander, professor emeritus, Dept. of Civil and Biosystems Engineering, University of Pretoria, South Africa. Member, United Nations Scientific and Technical Committee on Natural Disasters, 1994-2000

Dr. S. Fred Singer, professor emeritus of environmental sciences, University of Virginia; former director, U.S. Weather Satellite Service

Dr. Harry N.A. Priem, emeritus professor of planetary geology and isotope geophysics, Utrecht University; former director of the Netherlands Institute for Isotope Geosciences; past president of the Royal Netherlands Geological & Mining Society

Dr. Robert H. Essenhigh, E.G. Bailey professor of energy conversion, Dept. of Mechanical Engineering, The Ohio State University

Dr. Sallie Baliunas, astrophysicist and climate researcher, Boston, Mass.

Douglas Hoyt, senior scientist at Raytheon (retired) and co-author of the book *The Role of the Sun in Climate Change*; previously with NCAR, NOAA, and the World Radiation Center, Davos, Switzerland

Dipl.-Ing. Peter Dietze, independent energy advisor and scientific climate and carbon modeller, official IPCC reviewer, Bavaria, Germany

Dr. Boris Winterhalter, senior marine researcher (retired), Geological Survey of Finland, former professor in marine geology, University of Helsinki, Finland

Dr. Wibjorn Karlen, emeritus professor, Dept. of Physical Geography and Quaternary Geology, Stockholm University, Sweden

Dr. Hugh W. Ellsaesser, physicist/meteorologist, previously with the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Calif.; atmospheric consultant.

Dr. Art Robinson, founder, Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine, Cave Junction, Ore.

Dr. Arthur Rorsch, emeritus professor of molecular genetics, Leiden University, The Netherlands; past board member, Netherlands organization for applied research (TNO) in environmental, food and public health

Dr. Alister McFarquhar, Downing College, Cambridge, U.K.; international economist

Dr. Richard S. Courtney, climate and atmospheric science consultant, IPCC expert reviewer, U.K.

###

Related Links:

[Breakdown Of Key Points Debunking Climate Fears](#)

[Analysis of how Hollywood Is Promoting Climate Fears to Kids](#)

[Analysis of Costly “Solutions” to Global Warming](#)

[Over 100 Prominent Scientists Warn UN Against ‘Futile’ Climate Control Efforts](#)

[Skeptical Scientists Urge World To ‘Have the Courage to Do Nothing’ At UN Conference](#)

[NEW SENATE CAP-AND-TRADE BILL CALLED ALL ‘ECONOMIC PAIN FOR NO CLIMATE GAIN’](#)

[Debunking The So-Called ‘Consensus’ On Global Warming](#)

[Scientists Counter AP Article Promoting Computer Model Climate Fears](#)

[New Peer-Reviewed Scientific Studies Chill Global Warming Fears](#)

[Newsweek’s Climate Editorial Screech Violates Basic Standards of Journalism](#)

[Newsweek Editor Calls Mag’s Global Warming ‘Deniers’ Article ‘Highly Contrived’](#)

[Latest Scientific Studies Refute Fears of Greenland Melt](#)

[EPA to Probe E-mail Threatening to 'Destroy' Career of Climate Skeptic](#)

[Prominent Scientists Reverse Belief in Man-made Global Warming - Now Skeptics](#)

[Senator Inhofe declares climate momentum shifting away from Gore \(The Politico op ed\)](#)

[Scientific Smackdown: Skeptics Voted The Clear Winners Against Global Warming Believers in Heated NYC Debate](#)

[Global Warming on Mars & Cosmic Ray Research Are Shattering Media Driven "Consensus"](#)

[Global Warming: The Momentum has Shifted to Climate Skeptics](#)

[Prominent French Scientist Reverses Belief in Global Warming - Now a Skeptic](#)

[Top Israeli Astrophysicist Recants His Belief in Manmade Global Warming - Now Says Sun Biggest Factor in Warming](#)

[Warming On Jupiter, Mars, Pluto, Neptune's Moon & Earth Linked to Increased Solar Activity, Scientists Say](#)

[Panel of Broadcast Meteorologists Reject Man-Made Global Warming Fears- Claim 95% of Weathermen Skeptical](#)

[MIT Climate Scientist Calls Fears of Global Warming 'Silly' - Equates Concerns to 'Little Kids' Attempting to "Scare Each Other"](#)

[Weather Channel TV Host Goes 'Political'- Stars in Global Warming Film Accusing U.S. Government of 'Criminal Neglect'](#)

[Weather Channel Climate Expert Calls for Decertifying Global Warming Skeptics](#)

[ABC-TV Meteorologist: I Don't Know A Single Weatherman Who Believes 'Man-Made Global Warming Hype'](#)

[The Weather Channel Climate Expert Refuses to Retract Call for Decertification for Global Warming Skeptics](#)

[New UN Children's Book Promotes Global Warming Fears to Kids \(11-13-2006\)](#)

[Senator Inhofe Announces Public Release Of "Skeptic's Guide To Debunking Global Warming"](#)