

# REVIEWED OR NOT REVIEWED?

RESPONSES TO SOME ENQUIRIES  
ABOUT THE SCIENTIFIC PAPER  
*CLIMATE SENSITIVITY RECONSIDERED*  
(PHYSICS & SOCIETY, JULY 2008)

A personal statement  
by Christopher Monckton of Brenchley

7 February 2009



[www.scienceandpublicpolicy.org](http://www.scienceandpublicpolicy.org)  
[202] 288-5699

**SPPI Commentaries and Essays**

# REVIEWED OR NOT REVIEWED?

## Responses to some Readers' Enquiries about the Scientific Paper *Climate Sensitivity Reconsidered* (Physics & Society, July 2008)

A personal statement by Christopher Monckton of Brenchley

7 February 2009

SEVERAL readers have written to me to enquire why the July 2008 edition of *Physics and Society* carries a disclaimer saying that my scientific paper *Climate Sensitivity Reconsidered*, published in that edition, was “not peer-reviewed”. This memorandum tells the strange story of how this mendacious disclaimer came to appear above my paper some days after publication. Annex 1 reveals the reviewer's comments on the paper, in full.

*Climate Sensitivity Reconsidered* was commissioned by Dr. Jeffrey Marke, then the commissioning editor of *Physics and Society*, a journal of the 50,000-strong American Physical Society. The paper is one of the most thorough-going examinations in the scientific literature of the method by which climate sensitivity – the response of global temperatures to enrichment of the atmosphere with CO<sub>2</sub> – is officially evaluated.

In the paper, I conclude that all three of the key parameters whose product is final climate sensitivity are exaggerated in the documents of the UN's climate panel, and that in response to a doubling of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration global temperatures might be expected to rise by less than 1 degree Celsius (2 F). In short, CO<sub>2</sub> has an effect on temperature, but its effect is very small (see Annex 2).

The lengthy paper was reviewed in meticulous detail by the then Review Editor of *Physics and Society*, Professor Alvin Saperstein, an eminent Professor of Physics who is perhaps best known for maintaining a database of the current locations of all civil and military satellites.

Professor Saperstein's approach was simple but robust: since the paper was to appear not in a climate journal but in a physics journal read by general physicists who might not be familiar with climatological terms and equations, he asked me to lengthen the paper considerably so that every

term unfamiliar to him was defined, and every equation whose derivation was not clear to him was thoroughly explained.

Professor Saperstein also asked me to justify certain propositions that I had not proven: for instance, the proposition that the IPCC finds the sum of all non-CO<sub>2</sub> anthropogenic radiative forcings net-negative. I had no difficulty in justifying this and all other propositions in the paper.

The result was a paper that, in the editors' opinion, would make –

**“a very valuable contribution to the climate change debate”.**

The Professor kindly recommended the paper for publication, a recommendation that was endorsed by the commissioning editor, Jeffrey Marke, who added that he too was very pleased with the paper. His exact words were:

**“I have just talked over the phone with my co-editor, Al Saperstein, who waxed poetic about the value of your paper and is very excited (as am I) about publishing it.”**

Normally, *Physics and Society* publishes papers at a maximum length of 2500 words: however, I had obtained Jeffrey Marke's permission to write at twice that length in order to provide a comprehensive mathematical overview of the climate sensitivity question.

The clarifications for the general physicist that were rightly requested by Professor Saperstein lengthened the paper to 8000 words – more than three times the usual maximum length.

That additional length was significant, for this was the last printed edition of *Physics and Society*, and there was no small cost to the journal in printing so lengthy a paper.

I was as baffled as many of my enquirers were when, ten days after the publication of the paper that *Physics and Society* had requested me to submit, had carefully reviewed and had delightedly accepted, a disclaimer to the effect that the paper had not been scientifically reviewed appeared in red ink directly above the text of the paper in the internet edition of *Physics and Society*.

The disclaimer read as follows –

**The following article has not undergone any scientific peer review. Its conclusions are in disagreement with the overwhelming opinion of the world scientific community. The Council of the American Physical Society disagrees with this article's conclusions.**

A further disclaimer to the effect that *Physics and Society* does not publish reviewed articles was later placed above the entire publication. It read –

***“Physics and Society is the quarterly newsletter of the Forum on Physics and Society, a division of the American Physical Society. It presents letters, commentary, book reviews, and non-peer-reviewed articles on the relations of physics and the physics community to government and society.”***

The July 2008 edition of *Physics and Society*, like previous editions (see, for instance, April 2008, which the merchants of mendacity had forgotten to rewrite) had originally been prefaced on the journal’s own website with the following statement –

***“Physics and Society is the quarterly of the Forum on Physics and Society, a division of the American Physical Society. It presents letters, commentary, book reviews, and reviewed articles on the relations of physics and the physics community to government and society.”***

“Reviewed” was rewritten to read “non-peer-reviewed” because, ten days or so after publication, someone had suddenly decided to pretend that *Physics and Society* did not publish reviewed papers. Inferentially, the intention was to undermine my paper by underhand political methods rather than openly attempting to refute its scientific arguments.

It is not at all unusual for a peer-reviewed scientific journal to carry both peer-reviewed and non-peer-reviewed material such as letters. In this respect *Physics and Society* is (or was, until history was seamlessly rewritten) like many other scientific journals.

I investigated. The following, as best I can make it out, is what happened.

The commissioning editor, Jeffrey Marke, had approached me at the kind recommendation of Dr. Jerry Marsh of the Argonne National Laboratory, who had written a paper in the previous edition of *Physics and Society* questioning the mathematics underlying the official "global warming" notion.

Dr. Marke, intrigued to learn from Dr. Marsh's paper that there were serious mathematical and physical objections to the official notion that "global warming" might prove catastrophic, had asked Dr. Marsh for the contact details of people who had a track-record of studying the "global warming" question.

Dr. Marsh supplied five names, of which mine was one. Dr. Marke wrote to all five, and I was the only one who replied indicating a willingness to produce a paper questioning the new religion. I referred Dr. Marke to a guest weblog I had contributed to the scientific website of Dr. Roger Pielke, Sr., and asked him whether the level of technical detail in that weblog was what he required for *Physics and Society*. Dr. Marke read the weblog and said that indeed he did want plenty of technical detail similar to that which I had provided in the weblog. Accordingly, I researched and wrote the paper in good faith, at Dr. Marke's request, and without requiring or receiving any honorarium.

However, the publication of the paper greatly upset the well-funded, highly-organized and yet surprisingly small faction that is (with increasing desperation) promoting the false and now-discredited notion of catastrophic "global warming". This clique of lavishly-paid liars is to be distinguished from the legion of what Lenin called "useful idiots" who merely believe the new orthodoxy because it is politically convenient or expedient. They contacted two powerful allies within the American Physical Society.

First, they lobbied the Chairman of the Forum on Physics and Society, Lawrence Krauss, who has not studied climate sensitivity in any depth but is nevertheless a notorious true-believer in the new religion of catastrophic "global warming". He was furious that so long, detailed, and devastating an argument against what he regarded as orthodoxy had appeared in a publication under his control. It was he who drafted the first version of the disclaimer that appeared above my paper.

The first version of this lamentable disclaimer not only said, mendaciously, that the paper had not been scientifically reviewed, but also said,

mendaciously, that the world's scientific community disagreed with its conclusions [not a sound argument against publication, even if true], and, again mendaciously, that the Council of the American Physical Society disagreed with it [the Council had not met and had taken no such decision].

I protested. The disclaimer was amended to remove the second and third of Krauss' falsehoods, but his first falsehood remained –

**The following article has not undergone any scientific peer review, since that is not normal procedure for American Physical Society newsletters. The American Physical Society reaffirms the following position on climate change, adopted by its governing body, the APS Council, on November 18, 2007: "Emissions of greenhouse gases from human activities are changing the atmosphere in ways that affect the Earth's climate."**

Why was Krauss' falsehood about the supposed absence of scientific review retained, with the additional falsehood that scientific review was "not normal procedure", when the other two falsehoods were removed? Inferentially, because the faction that promotes the extremist version of the "global warming" notion does not want any reviewed paper published that questions the imagined magnitude of "global warming": otherwise the IPCC, which claims to review all relevant peer-reviewed papers, would then be compelled to take account of it, and the entire nonsense might unravel.

Worse, other learned papers might cite mine, whereupon other researchers might look at my equations in more detail and might discover that they represented the truth. This, of course, would have been catastrophic for the promoters of the new religion.

Next, the APS' database manager, a long-standing campaigner on "global warming" from the extreme Left, was called in to write a 3000-word rebuttal of my paper. He did so and, in accordance with the usual academic courtesies, sent me a copy for comment before publication.

I was readily able to answer the generally rather insubstantial, polemical, and often scientifically-baseless points that the "global warming" campaigner had made. Within 12 hours, I had produced a 3000-word refutation of his rebuttal. In accordance with the usual practice in academic circles, I copied the rebuttal and my refutation to the APS'

database manager, and also to the editors of *Physics and Society*, with a request that the rebuttal and my refutation should appear, as is normal, in the next following edition of *Physics and Society*.

However, Lawrence Krauss again intervened, for my refutation of the APS database manager's attempted rebuttal was, in the words of one scientific reviewer to whom I sent it, "crushing". To accord me the usual courtesy of allowing me to respond to the rebuttal would have made matters far worse for the climate extremists.

The editors did not agree to publish the "global warming" campaigner's attempted rebuttal or my refutation of it. Accordingly, I arranged for both to be published instead at [www.scienceandpublicpolicy.org](http://www.scienceandpublicpolicy.org)<sup>1</sup>.

By now, Fellows and members of the APS, in large numbers, had begun writing to its President asking him why I had been so unreasonably treated. Most of them made a simple point: my learned paper would stand or fall on its own scientific merits and, since it had been carefully reviewed and accepted for publication (see annex 1), attempts to undermine it other than by finding fault with the detailed mathematics and physics that it presented were inappropriate and contrary to the scientific method.

Krauss thereupon panicked. He decided to try to discredit me publicly in the lay news media in the UK, so that he could then circulate to his now growing band of senior critics any article that he could get published. The very fact that he was driven to go down this route demonstrated his desperation.

First, he approached *The Guardian*, which reliably supports every Leftist cause, however half-baked, and is particularly unquestioning in its lickspittle endorsement of the most extreme version of the "global warming" notion. Yet even *The Guardian* would not touch the story. The paper was not anxious to tangle with me again, for it had been compelled to publish a humiliating and very strongly-worded correction by me after one of its correspondents, a zoologist of no particular eminence, had erroneously and scathingly criticized me for misunderstanding the fundamental equation of radiative transfer (it was in fact the zoologist who had misunderstood the equation, of which he had plainly never heard before I had mentioned it in an article in the *Sunday Telegraph*. The ignorant zoologist had made a dozen serious errors of elementary physics – plainly not his subject - in a single 1800-word rant).

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/monckton/monckton\\_rebutted.html](http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/monckton/monckton_rebutted.html)

Next, Krauss tried *The Independent*, another Left-leaning true-believer in the new religion, and notorious for the series of very silly stories about the imagined future effects of “global warming” that it has been running on its front page. That paper’s “science editor” (I was surprised to find that it had one) telephoned me and asked me why I had misrepresented myself to the editors of *Physics and Society* as a doctor of science.

I explained that I had done no such thing: it was the editors who had requested the paper from me and, when they had asked me for my qualifications, I had replied in all respects accurately. Furthermore, every email to them from me was automatically stamped with my full style and title, “The Viscount Monckton of Brenchley”.

The only basis for any assumption the editors may have conceived to the effect that I held a relevant doctorate had been the detailed science I had presented in the requested paper, and in the ease, detail and completeness with which I had been able to answer all of the review editor’s numerous requests for clarification. The *Independent*, wisely, decided to drop the story, and printed nothing.

Krauss, by now frantic, was more successful with *New Scientist*, once a good journal of science for the layman, but now a mere craven, Lysenkoist-Marxist toady to whatever the current scientific party line happens to be. It ran a full-page article by Krauss saying that I had misled the editors into thinking I was a doctor of science. I had done no such thing.

Dr. Marsh, when recommending me to the editors of *Physics and Society*, had told them, correctly, that I was a “controversial” figure with “a background in science”. I had in fact advised Margaret Thatcher as UK Prime Minister on various attempted scientific frauds; on the hydrodynamics of warships; on the epidemiology and modeling of AIDS/HIV transmission; on embryology; on psephology; and on a variety of other scientific topics.

Furthermore, for 20 years I had led a successful consultancy giving technical advice on everything from tax calculations to the causes of structural defects in historic buildings. I had also made a fortune by exploiting a hitherto-unnoticed wrinkle in the laws of mathematics to sell hundreds of thousands of copies of two jigsaw puzzles each with a \$2 million prize for the first solver.



*New Scientist* kept up the attack on me in four successive weekly issues, and would not allow me any right of reply. Its editor failed to reply to any emails or telephone calls. I complained to the Press Complaints Commission, which swiftly obtained an undertaking from the editor that he would print a letter from me setting out the true position.

The editor of *New Scientist* ratted on the deal brokered at the instance of the Commission. He altered my letter without the consent of the Commission and brought forward its publication by a week so that I should have no chance to comment on his alterations, which were of course calculated to undermine the effect of my letter.

In particular, the *New Scientist* removed all mention of the scientific review of my paper by Professor Saperstein, and substituted Krauss' falsehood – a falsehood that Annex 1 will put paid to forever – to the effect that the paper had not been reviewed.

The Press Complaints Commission censured the editor of *New Scientist* for having acted behind its back, and wrote to him requiring an undertaking that his misconduct would not be repeated.

In the next quarterly edition of *Physics and Society*, Spencer Weart, a historian of science, wrote an article in which he attacked me *ad hominem* and without the usual courtesy of prior warning –

“I often get emails from scientifically trained people who are looking for a straightforward calculation of the global warming that greenhouse gas emissions will bring. What are the physics equations and data on gases that predict just how far the temperature will rise? A natural question, when public expositions of the greenhouse effect usually present it as a matter of elementary physics. These people get suspicious when experts seem to evade their question. Some try to work out the answer themselves (Lord Monckton for example) and complain that the experts dismiss their beautiful logic.”

However, Spencer Weart was not qualified to attack – and did not attempt to attack – the scientific content of my paper, which remains unchallenged in the reviewed literature to this day. My paper, far from attempting to insist upon a particular quantification of climate sensitivity, had identified precisely the difficulties mentioned by Weart, and had additionally demonstrated that the IPCC's values for the principal variables were in every case greatly exaggerated. Nor has any “expert” dismissed what Weart was kind enough to describe as my “beautiful logic”. Krauss' scrabbling

around the gutter-press had been the preferred route, for the APS' attempt at scientific refutation of my paper had fallen flat on its Left-leaning face.

The first half of *Climate Sensitivity Reconsidered* faithfully reproduces the IPCC's method of evaluating climate sensitivity, providing a clearer, more concise and yet more complete exposition than that of the IPCC itself. The second half draws attention to various exaggerations by the IPCC, and establishes those exaggerations by reference to the peer-reviewed literature. The conclusion is that climate sensitivity to atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> enrichment is likely to be a harmless and generally beneficial <1 K at CO<sub>2</sub> doubling, though I agree with Manabe and Wetherald (1975), who say that quantitative conclusions in this field should be treated with appropriate caution. If that caution is applied, there is no basis for the IPCC's 90% certainty that humankind has been responsible for more than half of the "global warming" of the past half century

The two editors of *Physics and Society* are no longer in post. Inferentially, they were pressured to stand down at Krauss' instigation, for the sin of breaking ranks and allowing publication of an effective and compelling critique of the central calculations on which the entire case for climate panic shakily rests.

The editors had compounded their mortal sin against the new religion by asserting, in the editorial that accompanied my paper, that there was "a considerable presence within the scientific community" of scientists and researchers with doubts about the science as it is officially presented –

"With this issue of *Physics & Society*, we kick off a debate concerning one of the main conclusions of the International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the UN body which, together with Al Gore, recently won the Nobel Prize for its work concerning climate change research. There is a considerable presence within the scientific community of people who do not agree with the IPCC conclusion that anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are very probably likely to be primarily responsible for the global warming that has occurred since the Industrial Revolution. Since the correctness or fallacy of that conclusion has immense implications for public policy and for the future of the biosphere, we thought it appropriate to present a debate within the pages of P&S concerning that conclusion. This editor (JJM) invited several people to contribute articles that were either *pro* or *con*. Christopher Monckton responded with this issue's article that argues against the correctness of the

IPCC conclusion, and a pair from Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, David Hafemeister and Peter Schwartz, responded with this issue's article in favor of the IPCC conclusion. We, the editors of P&S, invite reasoned rebuttals from the authors as well as further contributions from the physics community. Please contact me ([jjmarque@sbcglobal.net](mailto:jjmarque@sbcglobal.net)) if you wish to jump into this fray with comments or articles *that are scientific in nature*. However, we will not publish articles that are political or polemical in nature. Stick to the science!”

The editors’ assertion that a considerable body within the scientific community disagreed with the new orthodoxy about “global warming” was true, as anyone familiar with the peer-reviewed literature will know. However, they caved in to pressure from Krauss and, in the next quarterly issue, reversed themselves –

“Our editorial comments in the July 2008 issue include the following statement: ‘There is a considerable presence within the scientific community of people who do not agree with the IPCC conclusion that anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are very probably likely to be primarily responsible for the global warming that has occurred since the Industrial Revolution.’

“In fact, we have not polled any scientific community (e.g., the climate research community, the physics community, or the general science community) as to the extent of its consensus regarding human-activity-caused global warming, and we apologize for making such a remark for which we do not have supporting data. We now do know that, in addition to the American Physical Society, the following scientific organizations have issued statements and/or reports in support of the IPCC’s main conclusion concerning the role of anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in global warming: The National Academy of Sciences, the American Meteorological Society, the American Geophysical Union, and the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

“The July issue brought forth a storm of email responses to the Editors and to officials at APS. The emails, from members and non-members of the Forum on Physics and Society, were primarily concerned with the article by Christopher Monckton, either lauding or condemning our decision to publish it. They

ranged from polite rational discussions to very vituperative comments.”

If the two editors of *Physics and Society* had had the courage to stand their ground and assert the twin rights of free speech and of scientific integrity, and had refused either to withdraw their entirely correct editorial or to publish Krauss' mendacious disclaimers, it was he, not they who would have had to resign. For falsehoods such as the three which he had perpetrated in his first disclaimer, and his further falsehood in the *New Scientist* to the effect that I had misled the editors of *Physics and Society* about my scientific credentials, are inconsistent with the scientific method.

As a footnote to this tale, it is worth recording that Dr. Jerry Marsh, who had kindly recommended me to the editors of *Physics and Society* as a potential author, circulated both my paper and the opposing paper by Hafemeister and Schwartz to colleagues at the Argonne National Laboratory, to obtain their reactions. One, an eminent physicist, read both papers carefully and dismissed the Hafemeister and Schwartz paper in a single sentence, saying that they had perpetrated a *petitio principii* by choosing an emissivity value that was designed to support their conclusion, whereas my paper was “a non-trivial paper” and would bear further study and follow-up of the numerous references to the peer-reviewed literature.

The disgruntled APS database manager, displeased with my swift and deadly refutation of his attempted rebuttal, angrily but too hastily posted up a list of what he called 125 “errors” in my paper on his campaigning website. However, even his own supporters commented that most of the “errors” were so insubstantial that the list had the air not of a scientific rebuttal but of a mere political polemic.

A paid public official of NASA, who runs a website that engages in scientific politics on the “global warming” question contrary to NASA's obligation of neutrality as a body in receipt of taxpayers' money, published an attempted rebuttal of my paper. I was readily able to refute this attempted rebuttal also, but the NASA political website refused to publish or refer to my refutation. Weart, in his attack on me in *Physics and Society*, gleefully referred to the NASA political website's attack on me, but not to my refutation of that attack. I sent a copy of my refutation of the NASA attack to Jerry Marsh, who kindly circulated it to his colleagues at Argonne.

I have set out this history at some length because it is a not uninteresting example of the difficulties that researchers who question the current orthodoxy face when trying to get their results published.

I am by no means alone in having been treated with what many enquirers have described as unreasonable discourtesy on the part of the learned journals. Too many of the journals, and too many scientific bodies, have taken preconceived stances on the “global warming” question, and now simply refuse to countenance any paper, however scientifically solid, that casts any doubt on their publicly-declared prejudice.

The American Physical Society, for instance, has issued a pompous but scientifically-laughable “policy statement” on “global warming”. Several Fellows and members, furious at Krauss’ reliance upon this pathetic statement as the basis for his mendacious disclaimer above my paper, decided to revise it, and the new version will be found at Annex 3.

Krauss targeted me with particular savagery because my paper is a deadly threat to the prevailing orthodoxy in which he naively believes, and, above all, because it was written by a layman.

If even a non-scientist can see through the pseudo-scientific tarradiddle that is the "global warming" notion, then in due time the public are going to be asking why they have been paying so much of their taxes to so many climate scientists for so long to come up with so many absurd, inflated, and demonstrably false conclusions.

I am now working on the draft of a second paper, *Climate Trends Reconsidered*, which benchmarks the official predictions of CO<sub>2</sub> and temperature change against observed reality and demonstrates that the predictions have thus far proven wildly exaggerated. The draft has already passed informal but meticulous review by a professor of physics and a doctor of mathematics, and will be submitted shortly to a learned journal. However, for reasons my readers will surely understand if they have had the kind persistence to read this far, my new paper will not be submitted to *Physics and Society*.

The present memorandum represents my own opinions only. It does not necessarily represent the opinions of the Science and Public Policy Institute, which has kindly agreed to publish it in the interest of free speech and of correcting various otherwise-intractable falsehoods.

*Monckton of Brenchley*

*Carie, Rannoch, Scotland, PH17 2QJ  
February 2009*

## Annex 1

# Scientific review of the learned paper *Climate Sensitivity Reconsidered*

- The email dated 22 May 2008 from the commissioning editor of *Physics and Society* to me, recording the results of Professor Saperstein's scientific review of my paper *Climate Sensitivity Reconsidered*, is given here –

“I have just talked over the phone with my co-editor, Al Saperstein, who waxed poetic about the value of your paper and is very excited (as am I) about publishing it. He has made the following specific comments and suggestions, which I have put into italics and which we would like you address in a subsequent draft:

“There are no ordinate or abscissa labels on many of his figures, can't read figures on left in Fig.2, can't read Fig 4, 5 at all; no ordinate labels on Fig. 6; Fig. 7 is the only clear figure in article; Fig.8 has overprinting making it very hard for me to read or understand. Also, for all of the figures, there is no clear separation between figure captions and general text.

“In terms of raw data presentation, there seems to be a contradiction between his Figs. 1 and 2; in 1,  $T_s$  is going down, in 2 it is going up. Shouldn't he make some comments about the discrepancy (not on the projections but on the actual data of the years that have already gone by)? I suspect that different people mean different things when they talk about  $T_s$ ; perhaps he should clarify that further. He will, of course have to provide reference for the final paper.

“It would be very helpful if he defined many of the items which seem second nature to him: exactly what does he mean by radiative forcing, delta  $F$ ? Is it directly measurable; how; if so, what data do we have on it? (He criticizes IPCC for not providing such a definition!)

“Where does Eq.1 come from? What does he mean by "other anthropogenic forcings? Why are they net-negative?

“An important part of the paper is feedback: he never tells us of what to what. Feedback of Earth to space? of surface to stratosphere? etc. What is a "temperature feedback"? "Unamplified temperature feedbacks"?

“Is Eq 2 a definition or is it derived? If the latter, how? Ditto, Eq.3

“I haven't checked the algebra of Eqq. 4 or 5 but assume that they follow from 2 and 3. If so, he should say so; if not, he should give hint as to where they come from. [He needn't give full derivations, just hint of basic ideas. Perhaps all of this would be much clearer if he spent a little more time explaining, clarifying, Fig.3, e.g, what is  $\Delta G$ ?

“Next Section" Radiative forcing reconsidered". I don't understand why forcing can't be measured. That shows that I don't understand the difference between solar flux incident on top of atmosphere and "forcing", which takes us back to the initial need for clear explanatory definition. What kind of laboratory experiments is he referring to? At least a hint is required for our physicist but non-climatologist readers. Similarly, what is "greenhouse-gas forcing"? Why is it distinct from other kinds of forcing? (What are they?)

“Aside from fact that I can't read Figs 4, 5, and 6, I don't understand them nor where they come from. Some hints are needed.

“I don't know what 'aggregate forcing' means; this is related to lack of previous definitions. What does Eq 11 mean? I guess in total, I don't know difference between "forcing" and "feedback". If "forcing" is not just external energy flux, than I would assume it includes "feedback" but that does not seem to be what he means; so what does he mean?

“I think much more could be, should be, said about Figure 7, which would seem to contradict most of what the "*global warming*" people are clamoring about! Below that figure, he talks about linear and non-linear feedbacks. I always thought that the mere presence of feedback makes a system non-linear, so I don't understand this paragraph.

“Nor do I understand Table 2 or Fig 8.

“A bit lengthier and stronger conclusion may be necessary.’

“I hope that you have time to address these issues and modify your paper accordingly. Both Al and I think that your paper, after these clarifications, is a very valuable contribution to the climate change debate (which tends to be extremely one-sided, I think), and I therefore encourage you to respond immediately to Al's requests/suggestions with another draft. Please get it back to me by June 10 at the very latest, preferably before. Thank you again.”

## Annex 2

### Conclusion of the paper *Climate Sensitivity Reconsidered*

Even if temperature had risen above natural variability, the recent solar Grand Maximum may have been chiefly responsible. Even if the sun were not chiefly to blame for the past half-century's warming, the IPCC has not demonstrated that, since CO<sub>2</sub> occupies only one-ten-thousandth part more of the atmosphere than it did in 1750, it has contributed more than a small fraction of the warming. Even if carbon dioxide were chiefly responsible for the warming that ceased in 1998 and may not resume until 2015, the distinctive, projected fingerprint of anthropogenic "greenhouse-gas" warming is entirely absent from the observed record. Even if the fingerprint were present, computer models are long proven to be inherently incapable of providing projections of the future state of the climate that are sound enough for policymaking. Even if *per impossibile* the models could ever become reliable, the present paper demonstrates that it is not at all likely that the world will warm as much as the IPCC imagines. Even if the world were to warm that much, the overwhelming majority of the scientific, peer-reviewed literature does not predict that catastrophe would ensue. Even if catastrophe might ensue, even the most drastic proposals to mitigate future climate change by reducing emissions of carbon dioxide would make very little difference to the climate. Even if mitigation were likely to be effective, it would do more harm than good: already millions face starvation as the dash for biofuels takes agricultural land out of essential food production: a warning that taking precautions, "just in case", can do untold harm unless there is a sound, scientific basis for them. Finally, even if mitigation might do more good than harm, adaptation as (and if) necessary would be far more cost-effective and less likely to be harmful.

In short, we must get the science right, or we shall get the policy wrong. If the concluding equation in this analysis (Eqn. 30) is correct, the IPCC's estimates of climate sensitivity must have been very much exaggerated. There may, therefore, be a good reason why, contrary to the projections of the models on which the IPCC relies, temperatures have not risen for a decade and have been falling since the phase-transition in global temperature trends that occurred in late 2001. Perhaps real-world climate sensitivity is very much below the IPCC's estimates. Perhaps, therefore, there is no "climate crisis" at all. At present, then, in policy terms there is no case for doing anything. The correct policy approach to a non-problem is to have the courage to do nothing.



## Annex 3

### Revised APS policy statement on “global warming”

➤ As a result of my discourteous treatment at the hands of the American Physical Society, certain of its Members and Fellows decided to redraft its policy statement on “global warming”. Here is the revised (but *unofficial*) version.

**“Industries and farms emit greenhouse gases, including carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, and ozone<sup>i</sup>. While some warming may result, harm is unlikely<sup>ii</sup>, and no spending on mitigation or adaptation is required.**

**“Global temperature has been rising for 300 years<sup>iii</sup>; static for 13<sup>iv</sup>, falling for 7<sup>v</sup>. Ocean temperatures are static<sup>vi</sup> or falling<sup>vii</sup>.**

**“Recent temperatures and rates of change are unexceptional: the past four interglacials<sup>viii</sup>, most of the past 10,000 years<sup>ix</sup>, and the Bronze-Age, Medieval, and Roman warm periods<sup>x</sup> were warmer than today.**

**“Instrumental temperatures disclose no anthropogenic signal<sup>xi</sup>. Orbital, solar, and oceanic variabilities are the chief causes of decadal-to-centennial climate change<sup>xii</sup>. Land-use change biases terrestrial temperature measurements upward<sup>xiii</sup>.**

**“Computer models are instructed to be over-sensitive to greenhouse gases<sup>xiv</sup>, and anyway cannot reliably project climate<sup>xv</sup>. The anthropogenic signature they project in the tropical upper troposphere is not observed<sup>xvi</sup>.**

**“Climate sensitivity is small<sup>xvii</sup>, and its effects minimal: though Arctic sea ice extent has fractionally declined, globally there has been no trend for 30 years<sup>xviii</sup>; the Greenland ice-sheet has thickened<sup>xix</sup>; the Arctic<sup>xx</sup> and Antarctic<sup>xxi</sup> are cooler than 50 years ago; northern-hemisphere winter snow cover was at its greatest in 2007<sup>xxii</sup>; the Sahara has shrunk by 300,000 km<sup>2</sup><sup>xxiii</sup>; hurricane landfalls show no trend for 100 years<sup>xxiv</sup>; and tropical cyclone activity is at a record low<sup>xxv</sup>.**

**“Adaptation, if needed, would be orders of magnitude cheaper than mitigation<sup>xxvi</sup>.**

**“Therefore, the APS urges a balanced, objective scientific effort to understand influences on climate, and to address future warming or cooling, however caused.”**

- 
- i IPCC (2007).**
  - ii Lindzen (2008); Monckton (2008).**
  - iii Akasofu (2008).**
  - iv UAH AMSU (2008).**
  - v UAH, RSS, HadCRUt3, GISS (all 2008).**
  - vi Lyman *et al.* (2006).**
  - vii ARGO dataset (2008).**
  - viii Petit *et al.* (1999).**
  - ix e.g. Curry & Clow (1997),**
  - x e.g. Dansgaard *et al.* (1969); Schönweise (1995).**
  - xi Akasofu (2008).**
  - xii IPCC, 2001; Scafetta & West (2008).**
  - xiii McKittrick (2007).**
  - xiv Akasofu (2008).**
  - xv Lorenz (1963); IPCC (2001); Giorgi *et al.* (2005).**
  - xvi Douglass *et al.* (2008).**
  - xvii Monckton (2008); Chilingar *et al.* (2008).**
  - xviii University of Illinois (2008).**
  - xix Johannesen *et al.* (2005).**
  - xx Soon (2004).**
  - xxi Doran *et al.* (2002).**
  - xxii Rutgers University Snow Lab (2008).**
  - xxiii Nicholson, 1998 (2001).**
  - xxiv Robinson, Robinson & Soon (2007).**
  - xxv Accumulated Cyclone Energy index (2008 October).**
  - xxvi e.g. Henderson (2007).**



Robert Ferguson  
*SPPI President*

bferguson@sppinstitute.org  
Washington, D.C.  
202-288-5699

5501 Merchant View Square  
Box 209  
Haymarket, VA 20169-5699

[www.scienceandpublicpolicy.org](http://www.scienceandpublicpolicy.org)