

## Of Course Our Climate Is Changing

Yes, the earth's climate is changing. It has changed throughout Earth's geological history and continues to change as a result of a number of variables. Galileo, Kepler, Newton and Milankovic, inter alia, have shown how such variables such as the Earth's wandering axial tilt, variable eccentricity of orbit and precession, the sun's varying output, solar wind, planetary pulls and the solar system's galactic traverse have constantly changed Earth's climates. Successive ice ages, warming periods, glaciation and deglaciation have been the geological history of this Earth for the last 4.6 billion years in what are now known as Milankovic cycles. The climate has constantly changed, is changing now and, presumably, will be continue to change in the future

Within just the last 2000 years grapes were harvested in Britain as far north as Newcastle, crops and cattle were raised in Greenland. On the other hand, on occasions, the Thames has frozen over and the sea between Iceland and Greenland has been iced up and impassable. Regular glaciations of cold periods during the Pleistocene era lasted for approximately 90,000 years, with a low temperature of approximately 5°C below that of the present, alternated by warm interglacial periods (for 4,000-6,000 years) with temperatures of 1-3°C higher than at present. Over the past 11,000 years there were at least five distinct warm periods, the so-called "climatic optima" when the temperature of the planet was at 1-3°C higher than at present. Approximately 11,000 years ago the last significant increase in temperature began (of approximately 5°C), during which time a huge glacier which covered a considerable part of Eurasia and America, completely melted.

Moreover, local climates change as a result of altering oceanic current such as the North Atlantic Deep Water Formation, multi-decadal oscillation of the oceans, varying weather patterns and Albedo, volcanic activity together with deglaciation since the preceding ice age.

The Earth was and is in the process of recovering from the Little Ice Age (including the Dalton and Maunder Minima). Two natural components of the presently progressing global warming can be identified. The first one is an almost linear global temperature increase of about 0.5°C/100 years, which seems to have started in 1800 - one hundred years before 1946 when man made CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere began to increase rapidly. This 200-year-long linear warming trend is a purely natural change. The second a multi-decadal oceanic oscillation of amplitude 0.2°C and period of 50~60 years superposed on the linear change.

But where was mankind's hand this constantly changing scenario?

In the past 100 years or so the "scientific consensus" has twice held that the earth was definitely cooling (1895-1930 and then 1968-75) and consequently forecasted that a catastrophic ice age was approaching. Scientific consensus has also held on two occasions the contrary view that, instead of cooling, the Earth was dangerously warming up (1930-60 and 1981-now) to the imminent destruction of coral reefs and polar bears. Mankind has blamed itself in each of these four separate alarms and thus mankind must do something about it. What cavalcades of rewarding bandwagons each of these dire warnings have engendered.

Yes, you may carefully select particular trends over very small periods of history to justify particular points of view and the alarmists, both warming and cooling, are very skilful at doing this. However, you just cannot buck the facts of geological history. The alarmists, those who actually believe, and the bandwagon opportunists as well, have been ruthless in the pursuit of their religion. They have played on every fear and every emotion to great effect. Sadly, science, fact and common sense have been trampled in the rush. For the Met Office to forecast global warming and announce that this is based on trends since their records began (whilst conveniently forgetting to mention climatic optima and the natural recovery from the Little Ice Age) has a smack of obeisance to current political requirements.

There has been an undeniable increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide over the last century. This increase can be made to look huge or minuscule according to your espoused point of view - depending on whether you calculate the rise as a percentage increase or expressed as a fraction of the Earth's atmosphere. However, in spite of this atmospheric carbon dioxide increase, coupled with the direst warnings complete with complex computer based predictions, the Earth's temperature has obdurately refused to comply with these predictions.

Over geological time, the carbon dioxide content of the atmosphere has been for long periods far higher than at present. The only proven correlation in geological history between the amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere and the Earth's surface temperature is that the periodic rises in atmospheric carbon dioxide content have followed rises in global temperature and not the other way round.

The IPCC Reports have stated (1) that the global average temperature increased about 0.6°C during the last 100 years and that (2) “most” of the increase after the middle of the last century is caused by the greenhouse effect of man made CO<sub>2</sub>. The former is a statement of fact - the latter is simply unverified conjecture - now preached as gospel. The complete statement blithely ignores the linearity of the graph since 1800 until 2000 and that mankind's CO<sub>2</sub> contribution really only started mid-century.

However, on the basis of this survey, it is shown that the Earth has been warming from about 1800–1850 to 2000 with approximately the same rate (0.5 C/100) years, so that there is no definitive proof that “most” of the warming after 1975 is due to a man made greenhouse effect. This is simply their *hypothesis*. It is well known that CO<sub>2</sub> is part of the greenhouse effect and atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> is increasing, so it is natural to *hypothesize* that CO<sub>2</sub> is one of the causes of the warming trend.

However, it is not appropriate to conclude *a priori* that the 0.5°C/100years rise is mostly due to human causes without carefully subtracting the contributions of natural changes. Natural causes are almost ignored in the IPCC study. Natural changes are substantial and, further, there is nothing unusual about the present temperature rise.

Yes, the Arctic ice is thinning in places but do we hear at the same time about the contemporaneous extension and thickening of other parts of the polar ice caps? Why are some populations of polar bears actually increasing? The thinning of the polar ice caps has not just started to happen - it has been going on constantly but irregularly since the last ice age. The Earth's polar regions have had ice caps for only about 20% of the Earth's geological history. To parade precariously poised and puzzled polar bears as being the consequence of man's burning of fossil fuels is political gimmickry of a low order -- yet it sells, and how!

Records show that glaciers in Alaska, New Zealand, the European Alps, and the Himalayas have been receding from the time of the earliest records, about 1800. It is clear that the retreat is not a phenomenon that began only in recent years, or after CO<sub>2</sub> emission increase in 1945. Therefore, the retreat of glaciers cannot be used as supporting evidence of the greenhouse effect of CO<sub>2</sub>.

The very same scientists who were forecasting in the 1970s the imminent disaster of the approaching new ice age are now forecasting doom by global warming. What a myriad of businesses this new religion of climate change has spawned and what a bandwagon on which to advance both careers and profit. En passant, an entirely new concept has been created - that of policy based evidence making.

If it were not so serious it would be profoundly funny to witness the very building block of life, carbon dioxide, vilified as a pollutant. Nitrous oxide, nitric oxide, sulphur dioxide, the fluorocarbons and the particulates of combustion are all pollutants and do damage. Carbon dioxide is not a pollutant; it is an essential part of all life on Earth. Furthermore, atmospheric carbon dioxide is but 0.0001% of the carbon dioxide held in the Earth's oceans, rock, terrestrial structure, soil and life itself.

Carbon dioxide has no colour, nor a taste, nor a smell. Therefore, popularly used photos and videos showing factory chimney stacks belching smoke and cars emitting clouds of exhaust to illustrate the evils of carbon dioxide are just as misleading as pictures of puzzled polar bears – CO<sub>2</sub> is invisible; that which is visible in those images are pollutants and nothing else. For the present Government to issue a film on climate change showing a father reading to his daughter and telling her that “*carbon dioxide is a pollutant*” is a such a dishonest piece of advertising that it is difficult to believe that the proponents can lay claim to any science beyond sound bites or political subservience.

As for the “greenhouse” surrounding us. The Sun's variable radiation heats the Earth and the Earth in turn re-radiates some of this heat. The Earth has an atmosphere composed of a number of gases, some of which absorb and impede the heat re-radiated from the Earth but others do not. Without these heat-retaining gases Earth's surface temperature would be some minus 18°C and life, as we know it, could not exist. It is more meaningful and less emotive to describe the atmosphere as a sweater round the earth, protecting us from the cold, rather than a greenhouse intent on boiling us and doing us harm.

The atmosphere contains two main absorbers and retainers of Earth's re-radiated heat - water vapour and carbon dioxide. Water vapour accounts for some 95% of this heat retention whilst carbon dioxide accounts for only 3.502% with methane and ozone accounting for nearly all the rest. I.e. by far the largest culprit in so-called "greenhouse effect" is water vapour but do we hear anything about that or any proposals to reduce water vapour? The table below shows the "greenhouse effect" of the various constituents of the atmosphere and which demonstrates the overwhelming importance of water vapour as being by far the greatest agent in heat retention, whilst carbon dioxide in total contributes a mere 3.618%. Moreover the proportion of mankind's generated carbon dioxide to natural atmospheric carbon dioxide is a minuscule 0.117% .

**Contribution to the "Greenhouse Effect," expressed as % of Total**

Based on concentrations (ppb) adjusted for heat retention characteristics	% of Greenhouse Effect	% Natural	% Man-made
Water vapour	95.000%	94.999%	<b>0.001%</b>
Carbon Dioxide (CO2)	3.618%	3.502%	<b>0.117%</b>
Methane (CH4)	0.360%	0.294%	<b>0.066%</b>
Nitrous Oxide (N2O)	0.950%	0.903%	<b>0.047%</b>
Misc. gases ( CFCs, etc.)	0.072%	0.025%	<b>0.047%</b>
Total	100.00%	<b>99.72</b>	<b>0.28%</b>

From this table it can be seen that **ninety five percent, yes, 95%** of the Earth's greenhouse gas effect of heat retention is produced by **water vapour** and **only 3.6% by carbon dioxide**. The remaining 1.4% is provided by methane etc. The methane of cattle kept by mankind has more greenhouse effect than the whole of the world's current transport system.

**Yes, 95% of the greenhouse effect comes from water vapour and what on earth are we doing worrying about carbon dioxide?**

**Not only is Earth's atmospheric carbon dioxide's total greenhouse effect puny compared to that of water vapour, mankind's contribution to the greenhouse (0.117%) is, in itself, minuscule.**

Even worse, we are spending a prodigious amount of money on trying to act like King Canute with the changing climate. To ascribe modern climate change to one single variable (carbon dioxide) or, more specifically, to a very small proportion of one variable (i.e. human produced carbon dioxide – 0.117%) is not science, for it requires abandoning all we know about planet Earth, the sun, our galaxy and the cosmos.

Volcanoes, swamps, rice paddies, fallen leaves, and even insects and bacteria produce carbon dioxide, as well as methane. According to the journal Science (Nov. 5, 1982), termites alone emit twice as much carbon dioxide as all the factories and automobiles in the world. There have been times when volcanic activity was ten times greater than in modern times. But by far the largest source of carbon dioxide emissions is the equatorial Pacific Ocean. It produces 72% of the earth's emissions of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere, the rest of the Pacific, the Atlantic, the Indian Ocean, and the other oceans also contribute. The human generation of carbon dioxide is vastly overshadowed by these far larger sources. The overwhelming majority (98%) of carbon dioxide in the earth's atmosphere comes from nature, not from man.

Natural wetlands emit more greenhouse gases than all human activities combined. If greenhouse warming is such a problem, why are we trying to save all the wetlands? Geothermal activity in Yellowstone National Park emits ten times the carbon dioxide of a mid size coal-burning power plant, and volcanoes emit hundreds of times more. In fact, our atmosphere's composition is primarily the

result of volcanic activity. There are about 100 active volcanoes today, mostly in remote locations, and we're living in a period of relatively low volcanic activity.

There have been times when volcanic activity was ten times greater than in modern times. Combining the factors of water vapour and nature's production of carbon dioxide, we see that 99.8% of any greenhouse effect has nothing to do with carbon dioxide emissions from human activity. So how much effect could regulating the tiny remainder have upon world climate, even if carbon dioxide determined climate?

Every single hour the earth receives more energy from the sun than the entire human population uses in one whole year. The amount of solar energy reaching the surface of the planet annually is twice as much as will ever be obtained from all of the Earth's non-renewable resources of coal, oil, natural gas, and mined uranium combined.

Carbon dioxide is, by itself, a weak greenhouse gas, so present day computer models predicting environmental catastrophe depend for their predictions on the small amount of warming from carbon dioxide being amplified by increased evaporation of water. However, in the many documented periods of higher carbon dioxide, even during much warmer climate periods, that never happened. During the time of the dinosaurs, the carbon dioxide levels were 3–5 greater than today. Five hundred million years ago, the level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere was 15–20 times what it is today. Yet the catastrophic water-vapour amplification of carbon dioxide warming never occurred.

That's exactly opposite to the "runaway" warming that present computer models predict should occur. Clearly the models are wrong; they depend upon an assumption of amplification that is contrary to the climate record of millions of years. Today we're told catastrophic warming will result if carbon dioxide doubles. But during the Ordovician Period, the carbon dioxide level was 12 times what it is today, and the earth was in an Ice Age.

The disaster of chopping down and burning of carbon-absorbing rainforests in order to grow biofuels has added measurable amounts of carbon dioxide to the atmosphere - never mind the immorality of diverting agricultural output for us to drive our cars whilst many in the world are starving. This gives an inkling of the degree of human idiocy involved in trying to interfere with the natural change of Earth's climate.

Biofuels from soy beans can create up to four times more so-called greenhouse gas emissions than standard diesel or petrol, according to an EU document released under freedom of information laws.

In spite of this the European Union has set itself a goal of obtaining 10 percent of its road fuels from renewable sources, mostly biofuels, by the end of this decade, but it is now worrying about the unintended environmental impacts. Four major studies are under way [ID:nLDE62O1UK]. Chief among those concerns is that biofuel production soaks up grain from global commodity markets, forcing up food prices and encouraging farmers to clear tropical forests in the quest for new land .

Bio diesel from North American soybeans has an indirect carbon footprint of 339.9 kilograms of CO<sub>2</sub> per gigajoule -- **four times higher than standard diesel** -- Bio diesel from European rapeseed has an indirect carbon footprint of 150.3 kg of CO<sub>2</sub> per gigajoule, while bioethanol from European sugar beet is calculated at 100.3 kg -- both much higher than conventional diesel or gasoline at around 85 kg. This was admitted in an annex that was controversially stripped from a EU report published in December 2009.

**This tampering with the Report caused one of the consultancies, Fraunhofer of Germany, to disown it partly in a disclaimer. However, the stripped out part has now been made public after Reuters used freedom of information laws to gain a copy.**

The European Commission claimed *"it had not doctored the report to hide the evidence, but only to allow deeper analysis before publishing"*. (Reporting by Pete Harrison)

Then, in a bid to outdo the EU in idiocy, Britain has exceeded the bounds of sanity by passing the Climate Change Act including the mandatory use of biofuels. Britain stands alone in the world in legislating such folly into law. No other country in the world has embodied into its statute book such a specific and powerful legal prescription for the destruction of its own industrial base.

In a wave of self-righteous euphoria, which Peter Lilley warned us about at the time, Parliament enacted the Climate Change Act in 2008 with only five members dissenting. As Peter Lilley said, only those who clearly didn't understand the complexity of the science involved could have done this. It was not until after the enactment that was this legislation costed and the Brown Government's estimate of the cost over the next 20 years of the Climate Change Act is £404 billion making this the most expensive piece of legislation ever passed by Parliament.

What a reduction in our standard of living this will cause in order to apply supposedly remedial actions which sane inspection tells us are quite unjustifiable, hopelessly expensive and some plainly quite unachievable. Gordon Brown's policies, now continued virtually unchanged by the Coalition, are largely based on the several reports of the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) ( From which so many world class scientists have resigned over subterfuge) and on the former views of the Royal Society.

The IPCC is not, as many people seem to think, a large organization. In fact, it has only 10 full-time staff in its secretariat at the World Meteorological Organization in Geneva, plus a few staff in four technical support units that help the chairmen of the three IPCC working groups and the national greenhouse gas inventories group. The actual work of the IPCC is done by unpaid volunteers. Assessment reports are published every six or seven years and writing them takes about three years. Each working group publishes one of the three volumes of each assessment. The focus of the recent allegations is the Fourth Assessment Report (AR4), which was published in 2007.

A number of leading climate scientists have found that their opinions were incompatible with the conclusions of the IPCC. They have found it impossible to reconcile their scientific work with the IPCC, and so have resigned from the IPCC. Other IPCC authors find that when they express any criticism of the IPCC, they are not selected to write for the next report.

For example, the alarming and unsubstantiated IPCC forecasts on the future incidence and ferocity of hurricanes compelled the resignation from the IPCC of Dr. Christopher Landsea (Chief scientist at the National Hurricane Center) who wrote :

*"After some prolonged deliberation, I have decided to withdraw from participating in the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). 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."*

As a result Prof Frederick Seitz, past president of the American Academy of Sciences and also of the American Physical Society, wrote in a letter to the Wall Street Journal:

**" This report is not the version that was approved by the contributing scientists on the title page. 15 key sections of the science chapter had been deleted. I have never witnessed a more disturbing corruption of the peer-review process than the events which led to this IPCC report. No study to date has positively attributed all or part of the climate change observed to man-made causes."**

But worst of all was the removal by IPCC staff from the IPCC First Report of the following paragraph:

**"None of the studies cited above has shown clear evidence that we can attribute to the observed climate changes to the specific cause of the increase in greenhouse gases "**

Other scientists who resigned from IPCC are:

**Paul Reiter** is an expert in tropical diseases such as malaria. He was a contributing author to the WGII report of the TAR (2001) (chapter 9, dealing with impacts on human health). He found it impossible to work with lead authors who were not experts in the field, who were insisting on a link between climate change and diseases such as malaria, so he resigned from the IPCC process. He was interviewed for the Channel 4 programme, [The Great Global Warming Swindle](#). He gave evidence to a [US Senate Committee](#), launching a scathing attack on the IPCC: *A galling aspect of the debate is that this spurious 'science' is endorsed in the public forum by influential panels of "experts." I refer particularly to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Every five years, this UN-based organization publishes a 'consensus of the world's top scientists' on all aspects of climate change. Quite apart from the dubious process by which these scientists are selected, such consensus is the stuff of politics, not of science.* In a report to the [House of Lords](#) he wrote: *"In my opinion, the IPCC has done a disservice to society by relying on "experts" who have little or no knowledge of the subject, and allowing them to make authoritative pronouncements that are not based on sound science. In truth, the principal determinants of transmission of malaria and many other mosquito-borne diseases are politics, economics and human activities."*

**Richard Lindzen**, Professor of Meteorology at MIT, has over 200 publications in meteorology and climate. He was a lead author on Chapter 7 of the IPCC TAR, published in 2001. Subsequently, in May 2001, [he was critical](#) of the Summary for Policymakers, which he said "*misrepresents what scientists say*" and "*Exaggerates scientific accuracy and certainty*". He also said that the IPCC encourages misuse of the Summary, and that the Summary does not reflect the full document, and that the final version was modified from the draft in a way to exaggerate man-made warming (all of these comments refer to the 2001 TAR, but as we have seen on these pages, are equally applicable to the 2007 AR4). Lindzen played no part in the writing of AR4.

One salient characteristic of the IPCC is its political motivation to exaggerate the dangers of global warming and the level of human influence on climate change. When IPCC predictions are compared to observed data, the opposite is shown to be the case. Moreover the lead scientists who resigned from the IPCC over the many misrepresentations of their work had to resort to legal action to get their names removed from the published list of contributors to the Report.

Among the many alarming forecasts made by the IPCC which it had subsequently to retract are those concerning the Amazon rainforests, the Himalayan glacier melt, land levels in the Netherlands and African crop yields.

According to the *London Times* of 18 January 2010, the IPCC will now be forced to withdraw its 2007 report because it turns out that it was not based on any scientific research at all. Instead, the authors could only cite the speculation of a scientist in India who had been interviewed by a magazine some years before 2007. He did no research to back up his speculation.

If these are examples of how careless IPCC climate scientists are in writing their official reports, it is a wonder that any reasonable scientist or politician could trust their conclusions. Yet our Gordon did and that is going to cost us dear. The climate change industry is very big business and there is a huge vested interest in maintaining the idea that human generated carbon dioxide emissions are dangerous.

The Kyoto agreement has largely fallen apart and the Russians for a long time resolutely refused to join it. That is until they belatedly realised just how much money they could make out of the EU with carbon trades. They have made billions out of these trades, to which you and I have contributed involuntarily, without needing to modify their emissions by one puff.

Moreover the USSR has accused the UK Met office of employing Russian meteorological data **selectively** to support its theory of global warming. This has surely recycled one old cynicism -- that "scientific consensus" varies in direct proportion to government funding and patronage.

The Meanwhile, the City of London is enjoying the joke tremendously whilst trading Carbon Credits enthusiastically and profitably. This form of trading is an unedifying up-to-the-minute, revival of the mediaeval practice of selling indulgences. If you made this up who would believe you?

What a wonderful self-sustaining activity this climate change movement has generated. We now have a whole new and expensive Government Department, that of Energy and Climate Change, which has brought new lustre and dimension to the term "tilting at windmills"

To summarise: scares may come and scares may go but, whilst there is no dispute about the fact that the climate is changing as it always has done, there is no universally accepted evidence that mankind's production of carbon dioxide has anything whatsoever to do with climate change or even temporary global warming. Of the total "greenhouse effect" the constituent having by far the greatest proportion of this "effect" is water vapour at 95% whilst atmospheric carbon dioxide in total contributes a mere 3.5% with man-made carbon dioxide at 0.117% - but what discussion do we hear about tackling water vapour?

Whilst the contemplated emission reductions (CRC) would exact a high human price, in terms of sacrifices to our standard of living, they would yield statistically negligible results in terms of measurable impacts to climate change. There is no expectation that any statistically significant global warming reductions would come from any international emissions agreement -- should one ever be reached.

If mankind doubled its carbon dioxide emissions, bearing in mind that the increased "greenhouse effect" is logarithmic and not linear, the increment in heat retention would be less than a further 0.117%, whilst a halving of mankind's carbon dioxide emissions would reduce the total greenhouse effect by 0.0585%. However, the cost of achieving this utterly minuscule reduction can only be measured in trillions of pounds, which would impact on the whole world's standard of living.

Professor Reid Bryson, founding chairman of the Department of Meteorology at the University of Wisconsin, has stated, **"You can go outside and spit and have the same effect as doubling carbon dioxide."**

If you wish to see the errors Al Gore made in ascribing global warming to anthropogenic carbon dioxide just visit [increased levels of greenhouse gases](#)

It thus appears unlikely, given the altogether unsatisfactory performance of the IPCC coupled with the mathematics of the minuscule contribution to global warming by anthropogenic carbon dioxide, that climate change is primarily driven solely by mankind burning fossil fuels. Moreover, conclusive evidence of a mechanism linking cause and effect is entirely missing.

A group at CALTEC has monitored [The Earth's Albedo](#) (The Earth's sunlight reflectivity), by monitoring the light intensity from the dark side of the Moon. By doing this they can measure the light variations that the Earth is emitting out into space, and thus calculate variations of the amount of light energy the Earth is absorbing from the Sun.

They have come up with some rather surprising results. First, the variation in the Albedo which changes as a function of variation of the cloud cover on the Earth seems to be much greater than expected. Secondly, this variation is much greater than can be expected from the calculated impact that only greenhouse gases would bring. Thirdly, The variations of the Albedo follow variations of the Earth temperature that have been registered by satellites. This strongly indicated that it is variations in the Earth's cloud cover which is the main cause for global warming and not variation in levels of greenhouse gases.

This study supports the hypothesis that variation in solar activity is the main cause for climate changes and weakens the hypothesis that anthropogenic greenhouse gases play a major part in present climate change. Spectral analysis has revealed a number of solar periodicities including a 2,400 year cycle, a 200 year cycle, a 80 to 90 year cycle and the shorter 11 and 22 year cycles. These records have also been correlated with a number a climate change indicators (Eddy, 1977), including glacial advance-retreat fluctuations and annual temperatures for England. It is certainly feasible that the climatic variations of the Holocene (last 10,000 years since the end of the last ice age), and the

shorter fluctuations associated with the Little Ice Age have been forced by the interacting millennia and century scale cycles of solar activity. However, conclusive evidence of a mechanism linking cause and effect is again missing.

A pertinent and useful scientific paper can be found at:

<http://www.webcommentary.com/docs/2natural.pdf> by Syun-Ichi Akasofu who concludes:

*Climate change during the last few hundred years may be interpreted mainly in terms of a combination of the recovery from the Little Ice Age (LIA) and the multi-decadal oscillations, both of which are natural changes.*

The theory that the combination of normal recovery from the Little Ice Age, solar variation, the Albedo effect, multi-decadal oceanic oscillations are the main and natural drivers of Climate Change is considerably more plausible than the conjecture, and it is only a conjecture, that mankind is causing Climate Change by burning fossil fuels.

I suggest that many of the remedies and restrictions being currently touted by both the EU and the British Government are not only pointless but also utterly impractical. Man against the tide is one thing but to take on the power of the sun does seem to be taking vainglory to the extreme.

We have a large Department of Climate Change and Energy numbering 1180 civil servants all happily promoting their wares and careers, plus various ministers. Not one nuclear power station has been built in the Department's entire existence. We have a hopelessly muddled energy policy with a Department that apparently cannot make up its mind, in which direction to go, apart from initiating a huge expenditure on wind turbines that actually require a wind to work at all. There is considerable controversy over the payback time for these devices.

What an opportunity to reduce the Deficit by scrapping the entire edifice and cost of this Department, together with the Climate Change Act - the latter alone costing £404 billion, for which there is no sensible justification unless, as a taxpayer, you enjoy playing King Canute with the sun.

In short, natural and cyclical global warming is occurring and the production of greenhouse gases manifestly is increasing but where is the irrefutable evidence that mankind has any significant effect on the way in which our climate changes or that mankind has actually caused any significant deviation from the natural? It seems it is a matter of conjecture and guilt amalgamating to form a religion for which there is no logical or evidential basis. It is becoming a credo akin to the mediaeval European practice of blaming elderly women for crop failure and burning them at the stake for witchcraft.

One is constantly told of a consensus of scientists believing that mankind can alter the climate by burning fossil fuels. This is the simple error in logic of argumentum ad populum. For example, a very great number of people believe in deities but this does not make them a scientific fact nor prove their existence. Moreover, the recent upheaval at the Royal Society has largely destroyed the myth of consensus.

Until Gordon Brown the climate changed merrily away all by itself without any Ministry for Climate Change. Why do we need one now? The very title of that Ministry is a prime example of petitio principii.

Yet the present Coalition government is still intent on continuing to spend £400 billion over the next 20 years trying to combat climate change whilst basing its astonishingly expensive emission policies on the now discredited IPCC reports. This procedure, whilst apparently ignoring many potent factors changing our climate, seems highly questionable. The DECC Minister has recently written to me confirming his contentment with the IPCC reports.

**TATA, the Indian steel conglomerate, is currently closing the Redcar steelworks with the loss of 1700 British jobs. The current reports are that TATA thus stands to benefit by some £600 million in EU Carbon Credits for stopping Redcar's "Carbon Emissions". TATA is currently expanding its steel production elsewhere in the world. Thanks to Chris Huhne the British taxpayer is now paying Europe to throw British workers out of work and, in the end, achieving nothing**

I pity the party in power when the public arrives at the full realisation of how completely misled it has been by its own Government and how many trillions of their money had been wasted (accompanied by falling standards of living) in vainly trying to pursue the deluded folly of stemming naturally occurring climate change. The attempt of King Canute springs to mind. I can just imagine the wrath that will be visited on the party in power when the full realisation sets in.

In short, the Government is spending a prodigious amount of money trying to act like King Canute in attempting to stem the vast primordial external forces that drive the constant and cyclical changes to our climate. Thus, whilst the Government is asking us to tighten our belts, are you really content for it to wager £20 billion a year on a theory, now formally deemed as uncertain by the Royal Society, that mankind is causing or even capable of causing alteration to the climate?

I recently asked my MP to obtain from the Climate Change Ministry a detailed and logical analysis of, and for correction of any errors of fact in an earlier edition of this paper. The Minister of State for Climate Change, in replying, did not deny that **95%** of the greenhouse effect was caused by water vapour, only **4%** by natural carbon dioxide and **only a minuscule 0.117% by man-made carbon dioxide**.

However, instead of a detailed analysis or repudiation of the paper, the Minister responded in general terms, expressing his admiration for the IPCC and relying on for his clinching argument on the phrase:

*"The **overwhelming majority** of climate scientists agree that climate change is a grave environmental threat".*

Apart from his unimpressive resort to argumentum ad populum to make his point, the Minister's claimed "overwhelming majority" seems to have evaporated markedly in late 2010 when a number of irate climate scientists forced the Royal Society into an almost unprecedented and humiliating climb down by having to withdraw its own formal publication "*Climate Change - a Summary of the Science*".

The Society's Chairman, Lord Rees, then issued a statement "*There is little confidence in specific projections of future regional climate change*". This is a telling swipe at the IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change), which has had to withdraw its dramatic forecasts on the melting of Himalayan glaciers, rising sea levels, flooding of the Netherlands and African crop failures.

The Royal Society's new guide now admits, "*The size of future temperature changes and other aspects of climate change are still subject to uncertainty and some uncertainties are unlikely ever to be significantly reduced.*" What an astonishing and complete reversal of The Society's earlier stance. This sober statement of uncertainty over mankind's involvement in climate change now differs markedly from the present British Government's melodramatic posture.

Undeterred by this fundamental alteration to the Royal Society's view of climate science, Britain's Energy Secretary, Chris Huhne, subsequently made his pitch that the UK Government wanted to foster : **"a third industrial revolution" in low-carbon technology with policies based on cutting emissions of carbon dioxide and other 'greenhouse gases.'**

So the Royal Society now openly admits it that got it wrong but why does the Energy Secretary have such difficulty in doing the same? His conviction is patent - but where are the facts?

Let me repeat the conclusion reached by the scientists responsible from the draft of the IPCC's first report and who resigned when it was omitted by the IPCC staff from the published edition of the report.

***"None of the studies cited has shown clear evidence that we can attribute the observed climate changes to the specific cause of the increase in greenhouse gases "***

## **Conclusion**

The Government is spending a prodigious amount of money trying to act like King Canute in attempting to stem the vast primordial external forces that drive the unending cyclical changes to our climate. Thus, whilst the Government is asking us to tighten our belts, are you really content for it to wager £20 billion a year on a theory, now formally deemed as uncertain by the Royal Society and strongly contended by other scientists, that mankind is causing or even capable of causing alteration to the climate?

How sad to find two international bodies – the IPCC and the European Commission showing such questionable probity by attempting to suppress the publication of findings by their own staff when these findings severely compromised the political doctrines of those two bodies on Climate Change. When you couple this with Climate Gate you have to ask - just whom can you trust? Patronage and political ambition appear to have gravely distorted the whole subject.

The whole rickety edifice of "Climate Change" based as it is on foundations of anecdotal and inferential evidence without any universally accepted scientific data to support it, with its mantra of political correctness, political patronage and preferment, suppression of inconvenient facts and findings, policy initiatives involving massive and lucrative contracts, is not only starting to crumble but also starting to smell of corruption.

The cavalier use of taxpayers money by various agencies on a raft of gimmickry schemes is tantamount to the abandonment of good housekeeping and good government. For the Minister of State For Climate Change to write to me recently:

*"It is recently emerged that the IPCC may have deviated slightly from its rigorous review procedures in one part of the Fourth assessment, with the result that it overestimated possible climate change projection impacts in certain restricted geographical regions. Because of this a full review of IPCC processes and management is kindly underway and the government fully supports this review however, none of the alleged errors has been found to undermine the underlying scientific evidence of human induced climate change."* makes me wonder just what his civil servants allow him to see. For he is certainly not seeing what I am seeing.

For the Minister to ignore not only the resignations of eminent scientists from the IPCC but also the reasons for their resignations too seems to suggest that the Minister finds these subjects inconvenient too.

In ending may I commend and acknowledge valuable help from Nigel Lawson's book "An Appeal to Reason - A Cool Look at Global Warming": Professor Ian Plimer's book "Heaven and Earth - Global Warming: the Missing Science": Christopher Booker's "The Real Global Warming Disaster": "The End of the IPCC " By S Fred Singer and "An Inconvenient Truth" by Al Gore. "Two Natural Components of the Recent Climate Change" by Syun-Ichi Akasofu.

-----  
**Professor Richard Lindzen of MIT:**

***Future generations will wonder in bemused amazement that the early 21st century's developed world went into hysterical panic over a globally average temperature increase of a few tenths of a degree and on the basis of gross exaggerations of highly***

*uncertain computer projections combined into implausible chains of inference, proceeded to contemplate a roll back of the industrial age"*

-----

**Clive Francis**

**1st January 2011**