

**I am sure I am wrong in some of my comments and opinions. I am sure that some of the “competing information” I present may be incorrect, or may not stand the test of time. I am also quite sure the alarmists have some very good points to make and we should continue to listen to them. However, incorrect, misleading, and incomplete information is still very prominent and could lead to incorrect decisions with potentially disastrous results. We need to be more certain – and I don’t mean to imply I want unreasonable or infinite certainty. My primary goal is to extend the debate because I believe that it certainly IS NOT AND SHOULD NOT be over!**

I want others to evaluate the very bold proclamation that **“zero” percent of scientists and scientific writing is in disagreement** with the most ominous assertions about man-made global warming. We would be absolutely foolish to venture into the expensive and pointless policies now being considered by Congress.

### **Where I Stand**

My conclusions are not very complicated:

- Cleaning and preserving the environment, including reducing CO2 emissions, is inherently good and self redeeming on its own merits – without regard to any related impact on global warming.
- Reducing our consumption of petroleum products is the right thing to do. And reducing our reliance on foreign energy sources is important for many reasons.
- Drilling in Alaska and the Gulf of Mexico is right to do in the short term.
- Developing alternative energy sources, including nuclear, is an imperative.
- **Global warming is now occurring and humans contribute to climate change.**
- The many problems identified by Mr. Gore et al, include some representations that, in my opinion, aren’t just “spin”, but appear to be exaggerations, errors, incomplete representations, or misrepresentations.
- The solutions advanced by Mr. Gore et al, most about reducing CO2 emissions, will have nowhere close to the impact that is suggested, and their successful implementation is doubtful and expensive in more ways than just economically.
- There are many forces at play other than human influence in climate change and, before making impetuous or potentially wrong and damaging policy decisions, the debate needs to be continued - and in fact it is heating up.
- There are few easy or ideal solutions to the world’s problems. Let’s pay attention as science develops and the debate continues.
- There is **CLEARLY** no consensus! The debate is **CLEARLY** not over. After reading this I hope you understand why I reached that conclusion, even if you don’t agree with all of my opinions.

The information which I gathered from both sides of the debate often can be described as “spinning” and misleading, but my research assures me that the absolute certainty displayed by Al Gore and others is incorrect, misleading, and potentially very risky. I do

not pretend to be a scientific expert, nor could I effectively debate this issue with many of those who disagree with me. I just know that informed logic doesn't compel the actions suggested by climate change zealots.

### **Some Debates (They're hard to find)**

- In March 2007, there was an Oxford-style debate in New York sponsored by Intelligence Squared, a debating society. Brenda Ekwurzel of the Union of Concerned Scientists, Gavin Schmidt of NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies and Richard Somerville of the Scripps Institution for Oceanography argued that global warming is a crisis. Michael Crichton, Dr. Richard Lindzen of MIT, and Dr. Philip Stott of the University of London argued that it was not. The audience was polled both before and after the debate with 57% believing in the crisis before the debate, with only 42% after hearing the arguments. The more facts people learn, the less they tend to agree with the alarmists.
- At a recent (2007) debate over global warming sponsored by National Public Radio, the audience was polled beforehand and was solidly on the side of the more alarmist predictions. Afterwards, they switched to a slight majority against those predictions. I don't find where Al Gore has ever debated his positions directly (with the possible exception of a debate with Rush Limbaugh about 15 years ago – that could have been like the “extreme” debating the “ridiculous”).
- NASA's top administrator Michael Griffin feels the need to debate. He recently stated that while warming is occurring, he is not yet sure - “it is fair to say that it is a problem we must wrestle with”. He is by no means a technical expert, but he is a high level official who is close to many who are, and he feels the need to be cautious in making judgments. He has received much criticism for this.

### **Some Surveys**

- In 2003, environmental scientists Dennis Bray and Hans von Storch surveyed 530 of their peers in 27 countries on topics related to global warming. One question asked, “To what extent do you agree or disagree that climate change is mostly the result of anthropogenic (human) causes?” On a scale of 1 (strongly agree) to 7 (strongly disagree), the average score was 3.62, reflecting no clear consensus.
- Referring to the same survey as in the last item, asked whether abrupt climate changes will wreak devastation in some areas of the world, the percentage of scientists strongly agreeing (9.1%) was nearly identical to the percentage strongly disagreeing (9.0%). Another question asked to what degree might global warming prove beneficial for some societies? A striking 34% of the scientists answered 1 or 2 (a great degree of benefit); just 8.3% answered 6 or 7 (very little or no benefit). Plainly, the science isn't settled. It changes all the time.
- In 2004 a panel of 8 world-renowned economists (including three Nobel laureates) met to discuss and prioritize proposals that address ten of the world's greatest challenges. This group is referred to as the “Copenhagen Consensus”. The challenges and solutions, presented as alternatives to be prioritized, were those identified by the United Nations. The climate related challenge (global warming) and the suggested solution (e.g. Kyoto) were rated at the absolute bottom of the list of priorities. Diseases and malnutrition were ranked one and

two. For comparison, a group of scientists also gathered, and the results were very similar. And here is something surprising – a sampling of U.N. ambassadors also were given this challenge and results were again similar. They all had to choose between alternatives, while being limited by resources, and having been given information on projected results of various actions or inactions. In other words, we should deal with facts, not submit to panic and emotions.

- It's interesting to note that both the Gallup and Rasmussen polls show changing public opinion. Looking specifically at the Rasmussen results, only 34% believes that global warming is caused by human activity, while 48% believes that it is caused by long-term planetary trends. That's almost exactly opposite of what was found 12 months earlier. Only what Rasmussen refers to as the "Political Class" (the elite) still have almost 50% of them believing in man-made global warming.
- A recent survey conducted by The Heartland Institute shows that while there are many scientists who believe in man-made global warming, they do not believe the debate is over. Climate scientists were asked to score this statement: "Natural scientists have established enough physical evidence to turn the issue of global climate change over to social scientists for matters of policy discussion." As expected, the scientific community split – this time down the middle. 45.8% disagreed, while 44.1% agreed. 10.2% were undecided. In summary, 56% couldn't say they agree with that statement. About a third of the climate scientists who answered this question said the uncertainty has not been reduced in the past 10 years, and an additional 10% were undecided on changes in uncertainty. Of the approximately 60% who believed uncertainty has been reduced, only 8.3% felt that it had been significantly reduced. With so few climate scientist expressing confidence that the amount of scientific uncertainty has declined during the past decade, it seems implausible that the debate is nearing an end. In fact, many involved in the global warming debate warn that the more we learn about the climate, the less confident we can be in our ability to understand or predict our climate's future. While this survey was done over a year ago, there seems to be ever more support for the conclusion that the debate must not be terminated.
- In a United States Senate Environmental and Public Works Minority Report (EPW), more than 650 international scientists are listed as official "global warming" dissenters as of December 2008. This is constantly growing and up from 400 listed in the 2007 version of the report.

### **Some Drift in Opinion**

- There seems to have been a shift in momentum in climate science. Many former believers in the catastrophic theory have recently reversed themselves and are now skeptics. Here is just a sampling of those who have recently spoken out to oppose the "consensus" theory. I understand that a soon to be released Senate report will include a much more comprehensive list (I can't find the list if it already has been released – my source for this information is a Senate related website)..... **Dr. Claude Allegre**, a top geophysicist and French Socialist – he was an early proponent of the warnings and now says the causes of global warming are "unknown" and refers to his former colleagues as "prophets of doom".....Geologist **Bruno Wiskel** of the University of Alberta recently

- reversed his view – this resulted from a closer review of the science behind the attempts being made in favor of adopting the Kyoto Protocol..... Astrophysicist **Dr. Nir Shaviv**, a young Israeli award winning scientist – his further review of the evidence behind the CO2 theory led him to state that “things are far more complicated than the story sold to us by many climate scientists” – he believes some of the causes come from solar activity..... Mathematician and engineer **Dr. David Evans**, who did carbon accounting for the Australian Government stated “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”..... Botanist **Dr. David Bellamy**, famed UK environmentalist recently converted after reviewing the science relating to natural phenomenon contributing significantly to global warming..... **Dr. Chris de Freitas** of The University of Auckland, N.Z. wrote in 2006, “with the results of research...it is unlikely that the man-made changes are drivers of significant climate variation”.....Meteorologist **Dr. Reid Bryson**, founding chairman of the Department of Meteorology at the University of Wisconsin (now The Department of Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences).....Global warming author and economist **Hans H.J. Labohm**.....Paleoclimatologist **Tim Patterson**, of Carlton University in Ottawa..... Physicist **Dr. Zbigniew Jaworowski**, chairman of the Central Laboratory for the U.N. Scientific Committee on the Effects of Radiological Protection in Warsaw.....Paleoclimatologist **Dr. Ian D. Clark**, professor of the Department of Earth Sciences at University of Ottawa.....Environmental geochemist **Dr. Jan Veizer**, professor emeritus of University of Ottawa.....This is just the tip of the iceberg – you can expect to hear of more and more defections.
- Climate researcher **Dr. Tad Murty**, former Senior Research Scientist for Fisheries and Oceans in Canada co-authored a 2006 letter to the Canadian Prime Minister which stated in part, “If, back in the mid-1990s, we knew what we know today about climate, Kyoto would almost certainly not exist.” He was one of 60 who sent the letter urging the PM to undertake “a proper assessment of recent developments in climate science”. It also disputed the contention that “a climate catastrophe is looming and humanity is the cause”. The letter cautioned that “observational evidence does not support today’s computer climate models” and warned that since the study of climate change is relatively new, “it may be many years yet before we properly understand the earth’s climate system”.
  - Referring to the letter from the prior item, also signing the letter were **Fred Singer**, former director of the U.S. Weather Satellite Service; **Ian Clark**, hydrogeology and paleoclimatology specialist at the University of Ottawa; **Hendrik Tennekes**, former director of research at the Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute; physicist **Freeman Dyson** of the Princeton Institute for Advanced Studies; the University of Alabama’s **Roy Spencer**, formerly senior scientist in climate studies at NASA’s Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville, Alabama. There were 55 more qualified individuals, but I will stop there.
  - Award winning Princeton Physicist Dr. William Happer, who was reportedly fired by Al Gore in 1993 for failing to adhere to Gore’s views, has now publicly made declarations that fears about warming are wrong. He said: “I am convinced that

the current alarm over carbon dioxide is mistaken.” He has requested to join others listed in the Senate EPW Minority Report as an official dissenter.

- Dr. Arthur Robinson of the Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine continues his petition project which has been in process for at least 2 years. As of the 2008 report, there are more than 31,000 scientists who have joined a petition rejecting claims of human-caused global warming. The purpose of this project is very simple – to dramatically demonstrate the absurdity of claims of “settled science” and “consensus”. Based on the wording of this petition, these scientists are not merely skeptics – they are committed deniers.
- There is no denying that “George W.” was no “warrior” fighting for the advancement of science. He wasn’t opposed to it, but my impression was he was distracted at best, ambivalent at worst, as regards advancing science and technology. Stem cell research as one example where he parted company with many conservative scientists and researchers. So it is no surprise that in October 2008, over 70 Nobel Science Laureates endorsed Obama for president. But that’s only part of the story. Regarding the issue of global warming the cheese gets “sliced” differently. Obama declared re: global warming, that “The science is beyond dispute...” That single statement gave rise to a group of 116 scientists signing a letter to the then president-elect. They wrote: “With all due respect Mr. President, that is not true .....” (That was followed by assertions of fact regarding global warming). Many of these scientists were involved with the IPCC report - e.g. as endorsers or reviewers. And it is interesting to note that one scientist who signed the endorsement in October ‘08 also, in November, signed this rejection of Obama’s global warming opinions and goals. That was Nobel physics laureate Dr. Ivar Giaever. I think that says a lot! The debate isn’t over!
- Regarding global sea ice, in January of 2009 there was 200,000 sq km more than in 1980. Looking at Antarctic in particular, sea ice is up by 43% compared to the same March date in 1980. Arctic sea ice is down, but less than 7% according to what I have read (I believe the square miles of coverage has gone down by more than that). Which do you hear about? You still hear about any sort of reduction of Antarctic ice – usually from the far northern peninsula. The fact remains, total Antarctic and global ice has been increasing in recent decades. Some alarmists suggest that this is due to increased snowfall from warming temperatures. But interior Antarctic temperatures are actually lower. The interior is where snowfall can increase total continental ice. What we are talking about is sea ice which is increased by lower temperatures where it forms – not from increased snowfall.
- In May 2009, Christopher Monckton, former chief scientist in Britain’s Thatcher administration, issued a report in which he felt compelled to emphasize certain points – some repeating what he has been saying for years: The IPCC process is a political process and science is not done by consensus - unlike politics; the crucial chapter of the IPCC’s 2007 report, attributing most global warming to anthropogenic influences, was written by just 53 people, not all of them climate scientists; for almost 1½ decades since 1995, there has been no statistically-significant “global warming” and since 2001 there has been measurable global cooling; it is not true that all 2500 scientists listed in the IPCC report agree with everything in the report (and many are retracting their names – see other portions

of my reports); and while there is no proof that the warming will occur, there is less indication that it will be significant enough to be dangerous.

### **Where From Here?**

One of my favorite commentator/climate experts Bjorn Lomborg reacted logically to the issue: “We need to cool our conversation, rein in the exaggerations, and start focusing where we can do the most good.” But while doing this, we need to keep studying climate change in general and let the science develop – let the debate continue. I am confident in this approach because I agree with Mr. Lomborg that the alarmists are way out of line in their predictions of the extent and impact of global warming, and the improvements available from the recommended policies. If we don’t spend money foolishly (e.g. Kyoto and Bali conference recommendations), we will have more available to spend on R&D for renewable and non-carbon energy sources, including nuclear. By the way, Mr. Lomborg believes warming is caused by humans, but is not an alarmist.

OK, that’s good advice, but time is getting very short to avoid Obama’s initiatives. Congress is now having hearings and weighing far reaching legislation. And the EPA is “puttin’ the pressure on”! The EPA recently said that rising sea levels, increased flooding and more intense heat waves and storms that come with climate change are a threat to public health and safety. The administration has signaled a willingness to use decades-old clean air laws to impose tough new regulations for motor vehicles and industrial plants to limit their release of climate-changing pollution – without new legislation! Everyone agrees that the door is open to regulate almost everything. Even cow flatulence has been proclaimed as a concern of the EPA. And the supreme court gave them the power to regulate pollution and greenhouse gases. That includes CO<sub>2</sub>. THEY DON’T EVEN NEED NEW LEGISLATION! Uff Da! Essentially the administration and the majority in Congress are telling our senators and representatives to “vote our way, or we’ll render voting meaningless” (quote from Jonah Goldberg).

### **Sources of Information**

This is not intended to be a bibliography or list of notes and references which would be necessary for publication or other wide use of this report. I don’t always give quotes and statistics specific attribution. Therefore, this report isn’t in a form which is publishable. These lists are my main sources of information on this topic. In addition, there are dozens of writers and websites (expert and otherwise) that I follow regularly to monitor this issue. This information is intended to relay the nature, extent, and seriousness of my effort to become personally more knowledgeable. I hope it lends some credibility to the project and my conclusions. The items below are listed in no particular order.

#### *Books*

An Inconvenient Truth by Al Gore (book and movie versions)

Myths, Lies, and Downright Stupidity by John Stossel

Under a Green Sky by Peter Douglas Ward (excerpts)

Taken by Storm: The Troubled Science, Policy and Politics of Global Warming  
 by Christopher Essex and Ross McKittrick (summary and review)  
 The Weather Makers: How Man Is Changing the Climate  
 and what It Means for Life on Earth by Tim Flannery (summary and review)  
 Field Notes from a Catastrophe: Man, Nature and Climate Change  
 by Elizabeth Kolbert (summary and review)  
 The No-Nonsense Guide to Climate Change by Dinyar Godrej (excerpts)  
 The Complete Idiot's Guide to Global Warming by Michael Tennesen, (excerpts)  
 Cool It by Bjorn Lomborg  
 Unstoppable Global Warming, Every 1500 Years by S. Fred Singer and Dennis T. Avery  
 Eco-Freaks by John Berlau  
 The Politically Incorrect Guide to Global Warming by Christopher C. Horner  
 Heaven and Earth by Ian Plimer (excerpts)  
 Climate Confusion by Roy Spencer, PhD – (excerpts)  
 The Really Inconvenient Truths: Seven Environmental Catastrophes Liberals Don't Want  
 You to Know About – Because They Helped Cause Them – (Excerpts)  
 The Deniers – Scientists Who Deny Global Warming: Kooks or Crooks in the Pay of Big  
 Oil, or Courageous Crusaders for the Truth by Lawrence Solomon (Excerpts)  
 Red Hot Lies: How Global Warming Alarmists Use Threats, Fraud, and Deception to  
 Keep You Misinformed by Christopher Horner

*Papers, Pamphlets, Testimony and Court Records*

A Global Warming Primer – National Center for Policy Analysis  
 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)  
 – Summaries for Policymakers – (2007)  
 IPCC Report – Summary for Policymakers – (2001)  
 The Myth of Dangerous Human-Caused Climate Change  
 by Professor R. M. Carter (Australia)  
 Climate Momentum Shifting: Prominent Scientists Reverse Belief in Man-made Global  
 Warming – Now Skeptics, by Marc Morano  
 Approved Judgment, October 2007 by Mr. Justice Burton re: British Public  
 Schools Use of “Inconvenient Truth” Without Presentation of Alternate Theory  
 Climate Change Impacts on the United States, the Potential Consequences of Climate  
 Variability and Change, by the National Assessment Synthesis Team (2000)  
 35 Inconvenient Truths – The Errors in Al Gore's Movie  
 by Christopher Monckton of Brenchley, Science & Public Policy Institute (SPPI)  
 Climate Change Science: An Analysis of Some Key Questions  
 – Executive Summary (2001), National Academy of Sciences  
 Skeptics Guide to Debunking Global Warming Alarmism  
 Global Warming: The Origin and Nature of the Alleged Scientific Consensus  
 by Professor S. Lindzen  
 Uncertainty in Climate Model Projections of Arctic Sea Ice Decline:  
 An Evaluation Relevant to Polar Bears, by Eric DeWeaver/USGS  
 Testimony of Roy W. Spencer Before the Senate Environmental and Public Works  
 Committee – (July 22, 2008)

Global Warming and Nature's Thermostat by Roy W. Spencer, PHD

Global Warming: Experts' Opinions versus Scientific Forecasts by Kesten C. Green (Monash University) and J. Scott Armstrong (The Wharton School) (February 2008)

Index of Leading Environmental Indicators by Steven F. Hayward, Pacific Research Institute and American Enterprise Institute (April 2008)

Scientific Consensus on Global Warming – Results of an International Survey of Climate Scientists by Joseph Bast and James M. Taylor, The Heartland Institute (2007)

Gore's 10 Errors Old and New – Scientific Mistakes and Exaggerations – and Interview in India Today (March 17, 2008)

Nature, Not Human Activity, Rules the Climate by S. Fred Singer, The Heartland Institute (April 2008)

Climate Skeptics Reveal 'Horror Stories' of Scientific Suppression – NYC Climate Conference Further Debunks 'Consensus' Claims – U.S. Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works (March 6, 2008)

Unequivocal Consensus on Global Warming by Christopher Monckton (May 22, 2009)

An Independent Analysis of Global Warming by Heinz Lycklama, PhD in Nuclear Physics (May 4, 2009)

The Cost of Climate Regulation for American Households by Bryan Buckley and Dr. Sergey Mithakov, The Marshall Institute (March 2, 2009)

The Incidence of a U.S. Carbon Tax: A Lifetime and Regional Analysis by Kevin A. Hassett and Aparna Mathur of American Enterprise Institute and Gilbert E. Metcalf of Tufts University (January 31, 2008)

U.S. Senate Report Debunks Polar Bear Extinction Fears – U.S. Senate Environmental and Public Works Committee (January 30 2008)

Inhofe Says Listing of Polar Bear Based on Politics, Not Science – U.S. Senate Environmental and Public Works Committee, Minority Page (May 14, 2008)

Media Hype on 'Melting' Antarctic Ignores Record Ice Growth - U.S. Senate Environmental and Public Works Committee, Minority Page (March 27, 2008)

The Wilkins Ice Shelf Con Job by John McLean (April 2, 2008)

U.S. Senate Minority Report: More than 650 International Scientists Dissent Over Man-Made Global Warming Claims – Scientists Continue to Debunk "Consensus" in 2008 (December 11, 2008)

2008 International Conference on Climate Change – Opening Remarks by Joseph Bast, President, The Heartland Institute (March 2 2008)

Reports (various) from the Global Warming Conference in New York City by Joseph L. Bast, President, The Heartland Institute (March 2008)

Nature, Not Human Activity, Rules the Climate – Summary for Policymakers of the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (Heartland Institute) by Fred Singer (March 2, 2008)

Is the Earth Getting Warmer, or Cooler? By Steven Goddard (May 2 2008)