

2007 - GLOBAL WARMING ALARMISM
REACHES A 'TIPPING POINT'

by

SENATOR JAMES INHOFE (R)

OF OKLAHOMA

FLOOR OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE

OCTOBER 26, 2007

SPPI REPRINT SERIES



www.scienceandpublicpolicy.org

CONTENTS

SELECTED HIGHLIGHTS OF SPEECH 3

FULL TEXT OF SPEECH 12

Robert Ferguson, President
bferguson@sppinstitute.org

209 Pennsylvania Ave., SE
Suite 299
Washington, D.C 20003
www.scienceandpublicpolicy.org (202) 288-5699

2007 - GLOBAL WARMING ALARMISM REACHES A 'TIPPING POINT'

http://epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Minority.PressReleases&ContentRecord_id=dc7c65f-802a-23ad-4668-0aec926c60c8

Selected Highlights

WASHINGTON, DC - Sen. James Inhofe (R-Okla.), Ranking Member of the Environment and Public Works Committee, delivered a speech more than two hours long on the Senate floor Friday revealing the very latest in peer-reviewed studies, analyses, and data error discoveries in global warming science. The new developments have prompted many scientists to declare that the scientific basis for fears of catastrophic man-made global warming are collapsing. Senator Inhofe also detailed how children have been impacted by climate propaganda from their schools, Hollywood and our pop culture. Further, Senator Inhofe exposed the painful economic realities of global warming cap-and-trade legislation.

"I agree with [former Vice President Al] Gore. Global warming may have reached a 'tipping point,'" Senator Inhofe said in his speech today. "The man-made global warming fear machine crossed the 'tipping point' in 2007. I am convinced that future climate historians will look back at 2007 as the year the global warming

fears began crumbling. The situation we are in now is very similar to where we were in the late 1970's when coming ice age fears began to dismantle. We are currently witnessing an international awakening of scientists who are speaking out in opposition to former Vice President Al Gore, the United Nations, the Hollywood elitists and the media-driven "consensus" on man-made global warming."

Senator Inhofe on Climate propaganda to Kids:

Hollywood activist Leonardo DiCaprio decided to toss objective scientific truth out the window in his new scarefest "The 11th Hour." DiCaprio refused to interview any scientists who disagreed with his dire vision of the future of the Earth. In fact, his film reportedly features physicist Stephen Hawking making the unchallenged assertion that "the worst-case scenario is that Earth would become like its sister planet, Venus, with a temperature of 250 [degrees]

centigrade." I guess these "worst-case scenario's" pass for science in Hollywood these days. It also fits perfectly with DiCaprio's stated purpose of the film. DiCaprio said on May 20th of this year: "I want the public to be very scared by what they see. I want them to see a very bleak future." Children are now the number one target of the global warming fear campaign. DiCaprio announced his goal was to recruit young eco-activists to the cause. "We need to get kids young," DiCaprio said in a September 20 interview with USA Weekend. Hollywood activist Laurie David, Gore's co-producer of "An Inconvenient Truth" recently co-authored a children's global warming book with Cambria Gordon for Scholastic Books titled, The Down-To-Earth Guide to Global Warming. David has made it clear that her goal is to influence young minds with her new book when she recently wrote an open letter to her children stating: "We want you to grow up to be activists." Apparently, David and other activists are getting frustrated by the widespread skepticism on climate as reflected in both the U.S. and the UK according to the latest polls. It appears the alarmists are failing to convince adults to believe their increasingly shrill and scientifically unfounded rhetoric, so they have decided kids are an easier sell. < > And this agenda of indoctrination and fear aimed at children is having an impact. Nine year old Alyssa Luz-Ricca was quoted in the Washington Post on April 16, 2007 as saying: "I worry about [global warming] because I don't want to die." Unfortunately, children are hearing the scientifically unfounded doomsday message loud and clear. But the message kids are receiving is not a scientific one, it is a political message designed to

create fear, nervousness and ultimately recruit them to liberal activism.

Senator Inhofe on how many on the Left have become disenchanted with global warming activism:

The global warming scare machine is now so tenuous, that other liberal environmental scientists and activists are now joining [Geologist Dr. Robert] Giegengack and refuting the entire basis for man-made global warming concerns. Denis G. Rancourt Professor of Physics and an environmental science researcher at the University of Ottawa, believes the global warming campaign does a disservice to the environmental movement. Rancourt wrote on February 27, 2007: "Promoting the global warming myth trains people to accept unverified, remote, and abstract dangers in the place of true problems that they can discover for themselves by becoming directly engaged in their workplace and by doing their own research and observations. It trains people to think lifestyle choices (in relation to CO2 emission) rather than to think activism in the sense of exerting an influence to change societal structures." Rancourt believes that global warming "will not become humankind's greatest threat until the sun has its next hiccup in a billion years or more in the very unlikely scenario that we are still around." He also noted that even if CO2 emissions were a grave threat, "government action and political will cannot measurably or significantly ameliorate global climate in the present world." Most significantly, however, Rancourt -- a committed left-wing activist and scientist -- believes environmentalists have been duped into promoting global warming as a crisis.

Rancourt wrote: "I argue that by far the most destructive force on the planet is power-driven financiers and profit-driven corporations and their cartels backed by military might; and that the global warming myth is a red herring that contributes to hiding this truth. In my opinion, activists who, using any justification, feed the global warming myth have effectively been co-opted, or at best neutralized." "Global warming is strictly an imaginary problem of the First World middleclass," Rancourt added. < > Left-wing Professor David Noble of Canada's York University has joined the growing chorus of disenchanted liberal activists. Noble now believes that the movement has "hyped the global climate issue into an obsession." Noble wrote a May 8 essay entitled "The Corporate Climate Coup" which details how global warming has "hijacked" the environmental left and created a "corporate climate campaign" which has "diverted attention from the radical challenges of the global justice movement."

Senator Inhofe on how the poor will pay for symbolic climate measures:

What few Americans realize is that the impact of these policies would not be evenly distributed. The Congressional Budget Office recently looked at the approach taken by most global warming proposals in Congress - known as cap and trade - that would place a cap on carbon emissions, allocate how much everyone could emit, and then let them trade those emissions. Let me quote from the CBO report: "Regardless of how the allowances were distributed, most of the cost of meeting a cap on CO2 emissions would be borne by consumers, who would face

persistently higher prices for products such as electricity and gasoline. Those price increases would be regressive in that poorer households would bear a larger burden relative to their income than wealthier households would." Think about that. Even relatively modest bills would put enormous burdens on the poor. The poor already face energy costs much higher as a percentage of their income than wealthier Americans. While most Americans spend about 4 percent of their monthly budget on heating their homes or other energy needs, the poorest fifth of Americans spend 19 percent of their budget on energy. Why would we adopt policies which disproportionately force the poor and working class to shoulder the heaviest burdens through even higher energy costs?

Senator Inhofe on Kyoto style attempts to control global temperatures:

First, going on a carbon diet would do nothing to avert climate change. After the U.S. signed the Kyoto Protocol in 1997, Al Gore's own scientist, Tom Wigley of the National Center for Atmospheric Research, calculated that Kyoto would reduce emissions by only 0.07 degrees Celsius by the year 2050. That's all. 0.07 degrees. And that's if the United States had ratified Kyoto and the other signatories met their targets. But we didn't and they won't. Of the 15 original EU countries, only two are on track to meet their targets. And even one of those, Britain, has started increasing its emissions again, not decreasing. Similar calculations have been done to estimate other climate bills. The Climate Change Stewardship Act that was defeated 38-60 last year would have only reduced temperatures by 0.029 degrees

Celsius, and another bill modeled on the National Commission on Energy Policy (NCEP) report would have only reduced temperatures by 0.008 degrees Celsius. That's right - 0.008 degrees Celsius, or less than one percent of one degree.

Senator Inhofe on new scientific developments:

W We have witnessed Antarctic ice **GROW** to record levels since satellite monitoring began in the 1970's. We have witnessed NASA temperature data errors that have made 1934 -- not 1998 -- the hottest year on record in the U.S. We have seen global averages temperatures flat line since 1998 and the Southern Hemisphere cool in recent years." (...) Current temperatures in Greenland -- a poster boy for climate alarmists - are **COOLER** than the temperatures there in the 1930's and 1940's, according to multiple peer-reviewed studies. Yes, you heard me correctly. Greenland has **COOLED** since the 1940's! A fact the media and global warming activists conceal. Greenland reached its highest temperatures in 1941, according to a peer-reviewed study published in the June 2006 issue of the *Journal of Geophysical Research*. And, keep in mind that 80% of man-made CO2 came **AFTER** these high temperatures. How inconvenient that the two poster children of alarmism - Greenland and Antarctica -- trumpeted by Al Gore and the climate fear mongers, have decided not to cooperate with computer model driven fears.

Senator Inhofe on the challenges of controlling emissions:

Many times I have heard that America is the biggest emitter of

carbon dioxide and thus is the problem. But that is no longer true. Earlier this year, China surpassed the United States as the world's largest emitter of carbon. Only 6 years ago, it was estimated that China's emissions would still lag those of the United States in 2040. China's emissions growth is explosive and climbing upward. Just to put things in perspective, the United States did not build a single new coal-fired power plant in the last 15 years up to 2006, although there are now some efforts underway to change that. In comparison, according to the *New York Times*, "China last year built 117 government-approved coal-fired power plants - a rate of roughly one every three days, according to official figures." We won't complete that many in the next decade. India's emission increases are not far behind China, and Brazil is not far behind them. The fact is that if these countries do not curb their rapidly accelerating emissions growth, then embracing a carbon diet and sluggish economic growth by developed countries will accomplish nothing. Moreover, many of the carbon reductions achieved through lost manufacturing jobs in developed countries are simply emitted elsewhere as jobs are created to make the same product in countries that do not ration energy. The U.S. emissions as a measure of productivity are far lower than China's. Cement manufacturing is a perfect example. Every job sent there will increase emissions, not lower them.

Senator Inhofe on the path forward:

So what's the path forward? I categorically will oppose legislation or initiatives that will devastate our economy as well as those that will cost jobs simply to make symbolic gestures

purely to start us down the ruinous economic path of energy rationing. I believe such measures will be defeated because the approach is politically unsustainable. We are seeing the first signs of that in Europe right now. Even if the alarmists were right on the science - which they are not - their command-and-control approaches sow the seeds of their own failure. As long as their policies put national economies in the cross-hairs, they will stoke the fires of opposition and eventually collapse of their own weight. Stabilizing emissions can not happen in 20, 40, or even 60 years because our world's infrastructure is built on fossil fuels and it will continue to be so for a long time to come - the power plants and other facilities being built now and in the future will emit carbon for a half century after they're completed. Quite simply, the technology does not exist to cost-effectively power the world without emitting carbon dioxide. And I and many others who reject climate alarmism or ineffective yet expensive solutions will block efforts to implement mandatory carbon restrictions. I find it unfortunate that so many politicians and climate advocates focus on trying to resurrect a mandatory carbon cap policy in the face of its demonstrated failure in practice in the countries that have adopted it. In the process, they are ignoring the best path forward. There is only one approach so far that I know of that will work - it is the Asia-Pacific Partnership on Clean Development and Climate. Why? Because this approach serves multiple purposes - it will reduce air pollution, expand our energy supply, increase trade, and along with these other goals, reduce greenhouse gases as a byproduct. Others might put this list together differently in terms of priority,

but my point is that the Asia-Pacific Partnership meets the criteria for success - it is a politically and economically sustainable path forward that addresses multiple issues in the context of their relation to other issues. Perhaps other approaches in the future will meet these criteria as well, but the APP is currently the only one that does.

Senator Inhofe on how scientific studies reveal climate changes on Earth lie well within the bounds of natural climate variability:

A June 29, 2007 paper by Gerd Burger of Berlin's Institute of Meteorology in the peer-reviewed Science Magazine challenged a 2006 study that claimed the 20th century had been unusually warm. Ivy League geologist Dr. Robert Giegengack, the chair of Department of Earth and Environmental Science at the University of Pennsylvania, noted in May 2007 that extremely long geologic timescales reveal that "only about 5% of that time has been characterized by conditions on Earth that were so cold that the poles could support masses of permanent ice." Giegengack added: "For most of Earth's history, the globe has been warmer than it has been for the last 200 years. It has rarely been cooler."

Inhofe on how fear is being driven by unproven and un-testable computer model fears of the future:

Even the New York Times has been forced to acknowledge the overwhelming evidence that the Earth is currently well within natural climate variation. This inconvenient reality means that all the warming doomsayers have to back up their climate fears are

unproven computer models predicting future doom. Of course, you can't prove a prediction of the climate in 2100 wrong today, which reduces the models to speculating on what 'could' 'might' 'may' happen 50 or 100 years from now. But prominent UN scientists have publicly questioned the reliability of climate models. In a candid statement, IPCC scientist Dr. Jim Renwick—a lead author of the IPCC 4th Assessment Report—publicly admitted that climate models may not be so reliable after all. Renwick stated in June: "Half of the variability in the climate system is not predictable, so we don't expect to do terrifically well." Let me repeat: a UN scientist admitted, "Half of the variability in the climate system is not predictable." Also in June, another high-profile UN IPCC lead author, Dr. Kevin Trenberth, echoed Renwick's sentiments about climate models by referring to them as nothing more than "story lines." A leading scientific skeptic, Meteorologist Dr. Hendrik Tennekes, a scientific pioneer in the development of numerical weather prediction and former director of research at The Netherlands' Royal National Meteorological Institute, recently took the critique of climate computer models one step further. Tennekes said in February 2007, "I am of the opinion that most scientists engaged in the design, development, and tuning of climate models are in fact software engineers. They are unlicensed, hence unqualified to sell their products to society."

Senator Inhofe debunks "More CO2 = A Warmer World" simplicity:

Scientists and peer-reviewed studies are increasingly revealing that catastrophic climate fears of rising CO2

are simply unsustainable. In May 2007, the "father of meteorology" Dr. Reid Bryson, the founding chairman of the Department of Meteorology at University of Wisconsin, dismissed fears of rising CO2 bluntly saying: "You can go outside and spit and have the same effect as doubling carbon dioxide." Bryson has been identified by the British Institute of Geographers as the most frequently cited climatologist in the world. Climatologist Dr. Ball recently explained that one of the reasons climate models are failing is because they overestimate the warming effect of CO2 in the atmosphere. Ball described how CO2's warming impact diminishes. "Even if CO2 concentration doubles or triples, the effect on temperature would be minimal. The relationship between temperature and CO2 is like painting a window black to block sunlight. The first coat blocks most of the light. Second and third coats reduce very little more. Current CO2 levels are like the first coat of black paint," Ball explained in June 2007. Environmental economist Dennis Avery, co-author with climate scientist Dr. Fred Singer of the new book "Unstoppable Global Warming Every 1500 Years," explained how much impact CO2 has had on temperatures. "The earth has warmed only a net 0.2 degrees C of net warming since 1940. Human-emitted CO2 gets the blame for only half of that—or 0.1 degree C of warming over 65 years! We've had no warming at all since 1998. Remember, too, that each added unit of CO2 has less impact on the climate. The first 40 parts per million (ppm) of human-emitted CO2 added to the atmosphere in the 1940s had as much climate impact as the next 360 ppm," Avery wrote in August. Avery and Singer's book details how solar activity is linked to Earth's natural

temperature cycles. < > [Dr. Robert] Giegengack said: "[Gore] claims that temperature increases solely because more CO2 in the atmosphere traps the sun's heat. That's just wrong ... It's a natural interplay." He continued, "It's hard for us to say that CO2 drives temperature. It's easier to say temperature drives CO2." "The driving mechanism is exactly the opposite of what Al Gore claims, both in his film and in that book. It's the temperature that, through those 650,000 years, controlled the CO2; not the CO2 that controlled the temperature," he added.

Senator Inhofe debunks the so-called "consensus":

The notion of a "consensus" is carefully manufactured for political, financial and ideological purposes. < > Key components of the manufactured "consensus" fade under scrutiny. We often hear how the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) and the American Meteorological Society (AMS) issued statements endorsing the so-called "consensus" view that man is driving global warming. But what you don't hear is that both the NAS and AMS never allowed member scientists to directly vote on these climate statements. Essentially, only two dozen or so members on the governing boards of these institutions produced the "consensus" statements. It appears that the governing boards of these organizations caved in to pressure from those promoting the politically correct view of UN and Gore-inspired science. The Canadian Academy of Sciences reportedly endorsed a "consensus" global warming statement that was never even approved by its governing board. Rank-and-file scientists are now openly

rebelling. James Spann, a certified meteorologist with the AMS, openly defied the organization when he said in January that he does "not know of a single TV meteorologist who buys into the man-made global warming hype." < > There are frequently claims that the UN IPCC Summary for Policymakers is the voice of hundreds or even thousands of the world's top scientists. But such claims do not hold up to even the lightest scrutiny. According to the Associated Press, during the IPCC Summary for Policymakers meeting in April 2007, only 52 scientists participated. The April 9, 2007 AP article by Seth Borenstein reported: "Diplomats from 115 countries and 52 scientists hashed out the most comprehensive and gloomiest warning yet about the possible effects of global warming, from increased flooding, hunger, drought and diseases to the extinction of species." Many of the so-called "hundreds" of scientists who have been affiliated with the UN as "expert reviewers" are in fact climate skeptics. Skeptics like Virginia State Climatologist Dr. Patrick Michaels, Alabama State Climatologist Dr. John Christy, New Zealand climate researcher Dr. Vincent Gray, former head of the Geological Museum at the University of Oslo, Tom V. Segalstad, and MIT's Dr. Richard Lindzen have served as IPCC "expert reviewers" but were not involved in writing the alarmist Summary for Policymakers.

Senator Inhofe on the UN IPCC process:

The UN allowed a Greenpeace activist to co-author a key economic report in 2007. Left unreported by most of the media was the fact that Bill Hare, an advisor to Greenpeace, was a lead co-

author of a key economic report in the IPCC's 4th Assessment. Not surprisingly, the Greenpeace co-authored report predicted a gloomy future for our planet unless we follow the UN's policy prescriptions. The UN IPCC's own guidelines explicitly state that the scientific reports have to be "change[d]" to "ensure consistency with" the politically motivated Summary for Policymakers. In addition, the IPCC more closely resembles a political party's convention platform battle - not a scientific process. During an IPCC Summary for Policymakers process, political delegates and international bureaucrats squabble over the specific wording of a phrase or assertion. Alabama State Climatologist Dr. John Christy of the University of Alabama in Huntsville, served as a UN IPCC lead author in 2001 for the 3rd assessment report and detailed how he personally witnessed UN scientists attempting to distort the science for political purposes. "I was at the table with three Europeans, and we were having lunch. And they were talking about their role as lead authors. And they were talking about how they were trying to make the report so dramatic that the United States would just have to sign that Kyoto Protocol," Christy told CNN on May 2, 2007. Former Colorado State Climatologist Roger Pielke Sr. also detailed the corruption of the UN IPCC process on September 1, 2007: "The same individuals who are doing primary research in the role of humans on the climate system are then permitted to lead the [IPCC] assessment! There should be an outcry on this obvious conflict of interest, but to date either few recognize this conflict, or see that since the recommendations of the IPCC fit their policy and political agenda, they chose

to ignore this conflict. In either case, scientific rigor has been sacrificed and poor policy and political decisions will inevitably follow," Pielke explained. He added: "We need recognition among the scientific community, the media, and policymakers that the IPCC process is obviously a real conflict of interest, and this has resulted in a significantly flawed report." Politics appears to be the fuel that runs the UN IPCC process from the scientists to the bureaucrats to the delegates and all the way to many of the world leaders involved in it. And another key to the motivation of the UN was explained by former French President Jacques Chirac in 2000: Chirac said Kyoto represents "the first component of an authentic global governance."

Senator Inhofe on Polar Bears:

The Fish and Wildlife Service estimates that the polar bear population is currently at 20,000 to 25,000 bears, whereas in the 1950s and 1960s, estimates were as low as 5,000-10,000 bears. We currently have an estimated four or five times more polar bears than 50 years ago. A 2002 U.S. Geological Survey of wildlife in the Arctic Refuge Coastal Plain noted that the polar bear populations 'may now be near historic highs.' Top biologists and wildlife experts are dismissing unproven computer model concerns for polar bears. In 2006, Canadian biologist Dr. Mitchell Taylor, the director of wildlife research with the Arctic government of Nunavut, dismissed these fears with evidence based data on Canada's polar bear populations. "Of the 13 populations of polar bears in Canada, 11 are stable or increasing in number. They are not going extinct, or even appear to be affected at present," Taylor said, noting

that Canada is home to two-thirds of the world's polar bears. He added: "It is just silly to predict the demise of polar bears in 25 years based on media-assisted hysteria." In September, Taylor further debunked the latest report hyping fears of future polar bear extinctions. "I think it's naive and presumptuous," Taylor said, referring to a recent report by the U.S. government warning that computer models predict a dire future for the bears due to projected ice loss. Taylor also debunked the notion that less sea ice means less polar bears by pointing out that southern regions of the bears' home with low levels of ice are seeing booming bear populations. He noted that in the warmer southern Canadian region of the Davis Strait with lower levels of ice, a new survey will reveal that bear populations have grown from an estimated 850 bears to an estimated 3000 bears. And, despite the lower levels of ice, some of the bears measured in this region are among the biggest ever on record. "Davis Strait is crawling with polar bears. It's not safe to camp there. They're fat. The mothers have cubs. The

cubs are in good shape," he said, according to a September 14, 2007 article. He added: "That's not theory. That's not based on a model. That's observation of reality." Other biologists are equally dismissive of these computer model based fears. Biologist Josef Reichholf, who heads the Vertebrates Department at the National Zoological Collection in Munich, rejected climate fears and asserted any potential global warming may be beneficial to both humans and animals. In a May 8, 2007 interview, Reichholf asked: "How did the polar bear survive the last warm period?"

Reichholf also debunked the entire notion that a warmer world will lead to mass species extinctions. "Warming temperatures promote biodiversity," Reichholf explained. "The number of species increases exponentially from the regions near the poles across the moderate latitudes and to the equator. To put it succinctly, the warmer a region is, the more diverse are its species," he added.

FULL TEXT

2007: GLOBAL WARMING ALARMISM REACHES A "TIPPING POINT"

http://epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Minority.Speeches&ContentRecord_id=dceb518c-802a-23ad-45bf-894a13435a08&Region_id=&Issue_id=

The American people will soon be asked to support global warming cap-and-trade legislation that will be billed as a "solution" to global warming. These bills come at a time when the science is overwhelmingly taking away the basis for alarm.

An abundance of new peer-reviewed studies, analyses, and data error discoveries in the last several months has prompted scientists to declare that fear of catastrophic man-made global warming "bites the dust" and the scientific underpinnings for alarm are "falling apart."

I have addressed global warming on the Senate floor more than a dozen times since 2003, and today's speech will reveal that peer-reviewed studies and scientists are coming over to many of the concerns I raised years ago.

I want to talk to you today for what may be a personally unprecedented two hours or more of time to report on the recent developments which are turning 2007 into a "tipping point" for climate alarmism. I will detail how even committed left-wing scientists now

believe the environmental movement has been "co-opted" into promoting global warming as a "crisis" and I will expose the manufactured façade of "consensus."

I will also address the economic factors of so-called "solutions" to global warming and how they will have no measurable impact on the climate. But these so called "solutions" will create huge economic harm for American families and the poor residents of the developing world who may see development hindered by unfounded climate fears.

We are currently witnessing an international awakening of scientists who are speaking out in opposition to former Vice President Al Gore, the United Nations, the Hollywood elitists and the media-driven "consensus" on man-made global warming.

We have witnessed Antarctic ice GROW to record levels since satellite monitoring began in the 1970's. We have witnessed NASA temperature data errors that have made 1934 -- not 1998 -- the hottest year on record in the U.S. We have seen global averages temperatures

flat line since 1998 and the Southern Hemisphere cool in recent years.

These new developments in just the last six months are but a sample of the new information coming out that continues to debunk climate alarm.

But before we delve into these dramatic new scientific developments, it is important to take note of our pop culture propaganda campaign aimed at children.

HOLLYWOOD TARGETS CHILDREN WITH CLIMATE FEARS

In addition to Gore's entry last year into Hollywood fictional disaster films, other celebrity figures have attempted to jump into the game.

Hollywood activist Leonardo DiCaprio decided to toss objective scientific truth out the window in his new scarefest "The 11th Hour." DiCaprio refused to interview any scientists who disagreed with his dire vision of the future of the Earth.

In fact, his film [reportedly](#) features physicist Stephen Hawking making the unchallenged assertion that "the worst-case scenario is that Earth would become like its sister planet, Venus, with a temperature of 250 [degrees] centigrade."

I guess these "worst-case scenario's" pass for science in Hollywood these days. It also fits perfectly with DiCaprio's stated purpose of the film.

DiCaprio said on May 20th of this year: "I want the public to be very scared by what they see. I want them to see a very bleak future." ([LINK](#))

While those who went to watch DiCaprio's science fiction film may see his intended "bleak future," it is DiCaprio who has been scared by the bleak box office numbers, as his film has failed to generate any significant audience interest.

Gore's producer to kids: 'Be activists'

Children are now the number one target of the global warming fear campaign. DiCaprio announced his goal was to recruit young eco-activists to the cause.

"We need to get kids young," DiCaprio said in a September 20 [interview](#) with USA Weekend.

Hollywood activist Laurie David, Gore's co-producer of "An Inconvenient Truth" recently co-authored a children's global warming book with Cambria Gordon for Scholastic Books titled, *The Down-To-Earth Guide to Global Warming*.

David has made it clear that her goal is to influence young minds with her new book when she recently wrote an open letter to her children stating: "We want you to grow up to be activists."

Apparently, David and other activists are getting frustrated by the widespread skepticism on climate as reflected in both the U.S. and the UK according to the latest polls.

It appears the alarmists are failing to convince adults to believe their increasingly shrill and scientifically unfounded rhetoric, so they have decided kids are an easier sell.

But David should worry less about recruiting young activists and more about scientific accuracy. A science group found what it called a major "scientific error" in David's new kid's book on page 18.

According to a Science and Public Policy Institute [release](#) on September 13:

"The authors [David and Gordon] present unsuspecting children with an altered temperature and CO2 graph that reverses the relationship found in the scientific literature. The manipulation is critical because David's central premise posits that CO2 drives temperature, yet the peer-reviewed literature is unanimous that CO2 changes have historically followed temperature changes."

David has now been forced to publicly admit this significant scientific error in her book.

Nine year old: 'I don't want to die' from global warming

A Canadian high school student named McKenzie was shown Gore's climate horror film in four different classes.

"I really don't understand why they keep showing it," McKenzie said on May 19, 2007. ([LINK](#))

In June, a fourth grade class from Portland Maine's East End Community School issued a dire climate report: "Global warming is a huge pending global disaster" read the elementary school kids' report according to an article in the Portland Press Herald on June 14, 2007. Remember, these are

fourth graders issuing a dire global warming report. ([LINK](#))

And this agenda of indoctrination and fear aimed at children is having an impact.

Nine year old Alyssa Luz-Ricca was quoted in the Washington Post on April 16, 2007 as saying:

"I worry about [global warming] because I don't want to die." ([LINK](#))

The same article explained: "Psychologists say they're seeing an increasing number of young patients preoccupied by a climactic Armageddon."

I was told by the parent of an elementary school kid last spring who said her daughter was forced to watch "An Inconvenient Truth" once a month at school and had nightmares about drowning in the film's predicted scary sea level rise.

The Hollywood global-warming documentary "Arctic Tale" ends with a child actor telling kids: "If your mom and dad buy a hybrid car, you'll make it easier for polar bears to get around." ([LINK](#))

Unfortunately, children are hearing the scientifically unfounded doomsday message loud and clear. But the message kids are receiving is not a scientific one, it is a political message designed to create fear, nervousness and ultimately recruit them to liberal activism.

There are a few hopeful signs. A judge in England has ruled that schools must issue a warning before they show Gore's

film to children because of scientific inaccuracies and "sentimental mush." ([LINK](#))

In addition, there is a new kids book called "The Sky's Not Falling! Why It's OK to Chill About Global Warming." The book counters the propaganda from the pop culture. ([LINK](#))

Objective, Evidence based Science is Beginning to Crush Hysteria

My speech today and these reports reveal that recent peer-reviewed scientific studies are totally refuting the Church of Man-made Global Warming.

Global warming movement 'falling apart'

Meteorologist Joseph Conklin who launched the skeptical website www.climatepolice.com in 2007, recently declared the "global warming movement [is] falling apart."

All the while, activists like former Vice President Al Gore repeatedly continue to warn of a fast approaching climate "tipping point."

I agree with Gore. Global warming may have reached a "tipping point."

The man-made global warming fear machine crossed the "tipping point" in 2007.

I am convinced that future climate historians will look back at 2007 as the year the global warming fears began crumbling. The situation we are in now is very similar to where we were in the late 1970's when coming ice age fears began to dismantle.

Remember, it was *Newsweek Magazine* which in the 1970's proclaimed meteorologists were "almost unanimous" in their view that a coming Ice Age would have negative impacts. It was also *Newsweek* in 1975 which originated the eerily similar "tipping point" rhetoric of today:

Newsweek wrote on April 28, 1975 about coming ice age fears: "The longer the planners delay, the more difficult will they find it to cope with climatic change once the results become grim reality."

Of course *Newsweek* essentially retracted their coming ice age article 29 years later in October 2006. In addition, a 1975 National Academy of Sciences report addressed coming ice age fears and in 1971, NASA predicted the world "could be as little as 50 or 60 years away from a disastrous new ice age."

Today, the greatest irony is that the UN and the media's climate hysteria grows louder as the case for alarmism fades away. While the scientific case grows weaker, the political and rhetorical proponents of climate fear are ramping up to offer hefty tax and regulatory "solutions" both internationally and domestically to "solve" the so-called "crisis."

Skeptical Climatologist Dr. Timothy Ball formerly of the University of Winnipeg in Canada wrote about the current state of the climate change debate earlier this month:

"Imagine basing a country's energy and economic policy on an incomplete, unproven theory - a theory based entirely on computer models in which one minor

variable (CO₂) is considered the sole driver for the entire global climate system."

And just how minor is that man-made CO₂ variable in the atmosphere?

Meteorologist Joseph D'Aleo, the first Director of Meteorology at The Weather Channel and former chairman of the American Meteorological Society's (AMS) Committee on Weather Analysis and Forecasting, explained in August how miniscule mankind's CO₂ emissions are in relation to the Earth's atmosphere.

"If the atmosphere was a 100 story building, our annual anthropogenic CO₂ contribution today would be equivalent to the linoleum on the first floor," D'Aleo wrote.

Four Essential Points Debunking Climate Fears

Debunking catastrophic man-made global warming fears can be reduced to four essential points:

1) Recent climate changes on Earth lie well within the bounds of natural climate variability - even the *New York Times* concedes this. UN temperature data show that the late 20th century phase of global warming ended in 1998; new data for the Southern Hemisphere show that a slight cooling is underway there.

2) Almost all the current public fear of global warming is being driven by unproven and un-testable computer model fears of the future, which now even the UN concedes that the models do not account for half the variability in

nature, and thus that their predictions are not reliable.

3) Debunking the "More CO₂ = A Warmer World" simplicity. Scientists are reporting in the peer-reviewed literature that increasing CO₂ in the atmosphere will not have the catastrophic impact doomsters have been predicting. In fact, climate experts are discovering that you cannot distinguish the impact of human-produced greenhouse gasses from natural climate variability.

4) A climate change "consensus" does not exist. Instead, the illusion that it does has been carefully manufactured for political, financial and ideological purposes.

These four basic points form the foundation of the rational, evidence-based approach to climate science that has come to be called global warming skepticism.

Essential Point #1: Earth's Climate Within Natural Climate Variability

Let us examine the first essential point:

The current climate of the Earth is well within natural variability.

An April 23, 2006, article in the *New York Times* by Andrew Revkin stated:

"Few scientists agree with the idea that the recent spate of potent hurricanes, European heat waves, African drought and other weather extremes are, in essence, our fault [a result of manmade emissions]. There is more than enough

natural variability in nature to mask a direct connection, [scientists] say."

The Times is essentially conceding that no recent weather events fall outside the range of natural climate variability. And on a slightly longer time scale, many scientific studies have shown the Medieval and earlier Warm Periods were as warm as or warmer than Earth's current temperature -- when there were no influence from MAN or SUVs.

A 2006, National Academy of Sciences (NAS) report discredited the now infamous "Hockey Stick" temperature graph. The study, created by UN IPCC lead author Michael Mann, purported to show Northern Hemisphere temperatures flat for 1,000 years and then spiked upwards in the 20th century -- allegedly due to mankind's emissions.

But the NAS found evidence of both a Medieval Warm Period and the Little Ice Age. It also expressed little confidence in Mann's conclusion that the 1990s were the hottest decade of the last millennium and even less confidence that 1998 was the hottest year. In fact, as I will detail in a moment, in August NASA declared 1934 as the hottest year in the U.S.

There have been other recent studies refuting claims that the 20th century has seen unprecedented warmth. A June 29, 2007 paper by Gerd Burger of Berlin's Institute of Meteorology in the peer-reviewed Science Magazine challenged a 2006 study that claimed the 20th century had been unusually warm.

Ivy League geologist Dr. Robert Giegengack, the chair of Department of Earth and Environmental Science at the

University of Pennsylvania, noted in May 2007 that extremely long geologic timescales reveal that "only about 5% of that time has been characterized by conditions on Earth that were so cold that the poles could support masses of permanent ice."

Giegengack added: "For most of Earth's history, the globe has been warmer than it has been for the last 200 years. It has rarely been cooler."

Greenland has COOLED since the 1940's!

In fact, current temperatures in Greenland -- a poster boy for climate alarmists - are COOLER than the temperatures there in the 1930s and 1940s, according to multiple peer-reviewed studies.

Yes, you heard me correctly. Greenland has COOLED since the 1940s! A fact the media and global warming activists conceal.

Greenland reached its highest temperatures in 1941, according to a peer-reviewed study published in the June 2006 issue of the *Journal of Geophysical Research*. And, keep in mind that 80% of man-made CO2 came AFTER these high temperatures.

According to a July 2007 survey of peer-reviewed literature:

"Research in 2006 found that Greenland has been warming since the 1880's, but since 1955, temperature averages at Greenland stations have been colder than the period between 1881-1955. Another 2006 peer-reviewed study concluded the rate of warming in Greenland from

1920-1930 was about 50% higher than the warming from 1995-2005. One 2005 study found Greenland gaining ice in the interior higher elevations and thinning ice at the lower elevations. In addition, the often media promoted fears of Greenland's ice completely melting and a subsequent catastrophic sea level rise are directly at odds with the latest scientific studies."

These are scientific facts you will not hear from the UN scientists, Gore or the hysteria promoting media.

HEINZ CENTER ACTIVIST TWISTS THE FACTS

Yet despite all of this evidence, the media and many others still attempt to distort the science in order to create hysterical fears about Greenland.

Environmental activist Robert Corell, who works for Teresa Heinz Kerry's The Heinz Center, recently tried to stir alarm by [stating](#): "I spent four months on the [Greenland] ice cap in 1968 and there was no melting at all."

If Corell, a former fellow with the American Meteorological Society, had desired to give a balanced historical view, he would have noted that Greenland in the 1930's or 1940's was much warmer. This is typical of the how many activists mislead the public by presenting utterly meaningless bits of information and avoiding inconvenient facts. Corell is also on record for giving former Vice President Gore's 2006 science fiction film two thumbs up for accuracy.

Corell's assertion in a September 8, UK Guardian article that earthquakes

triggered by melting ice are increasing in Greenland was rebuffed by University of North Carolina's Jose Rial. Rial is a prominent climatologist/seismologist working on glacial seismic activity in Greenland.

Corell's erroneous claim prompted Rial to take the unusual step of writing a letter to the UK Guardian.

"I also know that there is no evidence to suggest that these quakes 'are happening far faster than ever anticipated' [as Corell claimed,]" wrote Rial in a September 13 letter.

Rial criticized the newspaper for presenting a 'falling-sky' alarmist perspective and added that "it will take years of continued surveying to know whether anything here [in Greenland] is 'accelerating' towards catastrophe, as the article [featuring Corell] claims."

Antarctica Ice GROWS to Record Levels

For more evidence that the Earth's current climate is not changing in an alarming manner, you need to look no further than the South Pole.

Scientists monitoring ice in Antarctica reported on October 1 that the ice has GROWN to record levels since 1979 satellite monitoring began. The ice record was announced on the University of Illinois Polar Research Group website.

"The Southern Hemisphere sea ice area has broken the previous maximum of 16.03 million square kilometers and is currently at 16.26 million square kilometers."

And there's more: A February 2007 study reveals Antarctica is not following predicted global warming temperature or precipitation models. Here is an excerpt: "A new report on climate over the world's southernmost continent shows that temperatures during the late 20th century did not climb as had been predicted by many global climate models." The study was conducted by David Bromwich, professor of atmospheric sciences in the Department of Geography, and researcher with the Byrd Polar Research Center at Ohio State University.

How inconvenient that the two poster children of alarmism - Greenland and Antarctica -- trumpeted by Al Gore and the climate fear mongers, have decided not to cooperate with computer model driven fears.

And, there is much more evidence the Earth is currently well within natural climate variability.

Southern Hemisphere COOLING

The Southern Hemisphere is COOLING, according to UN scientist Dr. Madhav L. Khandekar, a retired Environment Canada scientist and an expert IPCC reviewer in 2007.

Dr. Khandekar explained on August 6, 2007:

"In the Southern Hemisphere, the land-area mean temperature has slowly but surely declined in the last few years. The city of Buenos Aires in Argentina received several centimeters of snowfall in early July, and the last time it snowed in Buenos Aires was in 1918! Most of Australia experienced one of its coldest

months of June this year. Several other locations in the Southern Hemisphere have experienced lower temperatures in the last few years. Further, the sea surface temperatures over world oceans are slowly declining since mid-1998, according to a recent world-wide analysis of ocean surface temperatures."

Studies find Arctic, Alaska climate due to natural factors

The media will not report on the historical perspective of Greenland, the ice growing in Antarctica or the Southern Hemisphere cooling. Instead the media's current fixation is on hyping Arctic sea ice shifts.

What the media is refusing to report about the North Pole is that according to a 2003 study by Arctic scientist Igor Polyakov, the warmest period in the Arctic during the 20th Century was the late 1930s through early 1940s. Many scientists believe that if we had satellite monitoring of the Arctic back then, it may have shown less ice than today.

According to a 2005 peer-reviewed study in Geophysical Research Letters by astrophysicist Dr. Willie Soon, solar irradiance appears to be the key to Arctic temperatures. The study found Arctic temperatures follow the pattern of increasing or decreasing energy received from the sun.

In another 2005 study published in the Journal of Climate, Brian Hartmann and Gerd Wendler linked the 1976 Pacific climate shift to a very significant one-time shift upward in Alaskan temperatures. These evidence based scientific studies debunk fears of man-

made warming in the Arctic and in Alaska.

A NASA study published in the peer-reviewed journal *Geophysical Research Letters* on October 4, 2007, found Arctic winds blew "older thicker" ice to warmer southern waters.

Despite the media's hyping of global warming, Ignatius Rigor a co-author of the NASA study explained: "While the total [Arctic] area of ice cover in recent winters has remained about the same, during the past two years an increased amount of older, thicker perennial sea ice was swept by winds out of the Arctic Ocean into the Greenland Sea. What grew in its place in the winters between 2005 and 2007 was a thin veneer of first-year sea ice, which simply has less mass to survive the summer melt."

Do not expect the media to report about this new NASA study blaming the "unusual winds" for moving ice out of the Arctic.

Global warming has stopped

It is important to point out that the phase of global warming that started in 1979 has itself been halted since 1998.

You can almost hear my critics skeptical of that assertion. Well, it turns out not to be an assertion, but an irrefutable fact, according to the temperature data the UN relies on.

Paleoclimate scientist Dr. Bob Carter, who has testified before the U.S. Senate Committee on Environment & Public Works, noted on June 18 of this year:

"The accepted global average temperature statistics used by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) show that no ground-based warming has occurred since 1998. Oddly, this eight-year-long temperature stability has occurred despite an increase over the same period of 15 parts per million (or 4 per cent) in atmospheric CO₂. Second, lower atmosphere satellite-based temperature measurements, if corrected for non-greenhouse influences such as El Nino events and large volcanic eruptions, show little if any global warming since 1979, a period over which atmospheric CO₂ has increased by 55 parts per million (17 %)."

Yes, it is true that 1998 was influenced by the warming effect of a particularly strong El Nino. But, lest you think Dr. Carter somehow misinterpreted the data, I have more evidence to bury any 'skepticism.'

UK Officially Concedes Global Warming Has Stopped

The UK Met Office, Britain's version of our National Weather Service, was finally forced to concede the obvious in August of this year -- global warming has stopped.

After the UK Met Office --a group fully entrenched in the global warming fear movement-- was forced to acknowledge this inconvenient truth in August, they continued stoking man-made climate alarm.

Their response was to promote yet more unproven dire computer model projections of the future. They now claim climate computer models

predict "global warming will begin in earnest in 2009" because greenhouse emissions will then overtake natural climate variability.

Hyping yet more unproven computer models of the future in response to inconvenient real world evidence based data is the ONLY bag of tricks left for the promoters of man-made climate doom. But it is a bit refreshing to hear climate doomsters be forced to utter the phrases like natural climate variability.

Meteorologist Joseph Conklin recently weighed in on these new developments.

Conklin wrote in August: "A few months ago, a study came out that demonstrated global temperatures have leveled off. But instead of possibly admitting that this whole global warming thing is a farce, a group of British scientists concluded that the real global warming won't start until 2009."

This new claim that "global warming will begin in earnest in 2009" sounds like the reverse of the 1930's Great Depression slogan of: 'Prosperity is just around the corner.' Only in this instance the wording has been changed to "A climate catastrophe is just around the corner."

This is not to say that global average temperatures may not rise again - change is what the Earth naturally and continually does, and part of this is temperatures fluctuating both up and down. However, the awkward halting of global warming since 1998 despite rising emissions is yet another indication that CO2 levels and temperature are not the simple relationship many would have us believe.

U.S. surface weather measurement 'scandal'

Another key development in 2007 is the research led by Meteorologist Anthony Watts of SurfaceStations.org which has revealed massive U.S. temperature collection data errors biasing thermometers to have warmer readings.

Meteorologist Conklin explained on August 10, 2007:

"The (U.S.) National Climate Data Center (NCDC) is in the middle of a scandal. Their global observing network, the heart and soul of surface weather measurement, is a disaster. Urbanization has placed many sites in unsuitable locations - on hot black asphalt, next to trash burn barrels, beside heat exhaust vents, even attached to hot chimneys and above outdoor grills! The data and approach taken by many global warming alarmists is seriously flawed. If the global data were properly adjusted for urbanization and station siting, and land use change issues were addressed, what would emerge is a cyclical pattern of rises and falls with much less of any background trend."

Adding to the further chilling of warming fears is a NASA data error correction that made 1934 the warmest year on record in the U.S., not the previously hyped 1998. Revised data now reveals four of the top ten hottest years in the U.S. were in the 1930's while only three of the hottest years occurred in the last decade.

Perhaps the most humorous reaction to this inconvenient correction came from NASA's James Hansen who tried to

minimize the data error in August when he wrote: "No need to read further unless you are interested in temperature changes to a tenth of a degree over the U.S."

This comment was particularly outlandish, given that Hansen has become a media darling in recent years by hyping temperature differences of "tenth of a degree" to any reporter he could get within ear shot.

Essential Point #2: Unproven Computer Models Drive Climate Fears

Even the New York Times has been forced to acknowledge the overwhelming evidence that the Earth is currently well within natural climate variation. This inconvenient reality means that all the warming doomsayers have to back up their climate fears are unproven computer models predicting future doom. Of course, you can't prove a prediction of the climate in 2100 wrong today, which reduces the models to speculating on what 'could' 'might' 'may' happen 50 or 100 years from now.

But prominent UN scientists have publicly questioned the reliability of climate models.

In a candid statement, IPCC scientist Dr. Jim Renwick-a lead author of the IPCC 4th Assessment Report-publicly admitted that climate models may not be so reliable after all.

Renwick stated in June: "Half of the variability in the climate system is not predictable, so we don't expect to do terrifically well."

Let me repeat: a UN scientist admitted, "Half of the variability in the climate system is not predictable."

Also in June, another high-profile UN IPCC lead author, Dr. Kevin Trenberth, echoed Renwick's sentiments about climate models by referring to them as nothing more than "story lines."

"In fact there are no predictions by IPCC at all. And there never have been. The IPCC instead proffers 'what if projections of future climate that correspond to certain emissions scenarios,'" Trenberth wrote in journal Nature's blog on June 4, 2007. He also admitted that the climate models have major shortcomings because "they do not consider many things like the recovery of the ozone layer, for instance, or observed trends in forcing agents. There is no estimate, even probabilistically, as to the likelihood of any emissions scenario and no best guess."

Climate models made by unlicensed 'software engineers'

A leading scientific skeptic, meteorologist Dr. Hendrik Tennekes, a scientific pioneer in the development of numerical weather prediction and former director of research at The Netherlands' Royal National Meteorological Institute, recently took the critique of climate computer models one step further.

Tennekes said in February 2007, "I am of the opinion that most scientists engaged in the design, development, and tuning of climate models are in fact software engineers. They are unlicensed,

hence unqualified to sell their products to society."

Meteorologist Augie Auer of the New Zealand Climate Science Coalition, former professor of atmospheric sciences at the University of Wyoming, agreed, describing climate models this way: "It's virtual science, it's virtual reality."

On a New Zealand radio interview in May, Auer joked about climate models: "Most of these climate predictions or models, they are about a half a step ahead of PlayStation 3 [video games]. They're really not justified in what they are saying. Many of the assumptions going into [the models] are simply not right."

Predictions 'simply cannot happen'

Prominent scientist Professor Nils-Axel Morner, also denounced computer models in August 2007 saying: "The rapid rise in sea levels predicted by computer models simply cannot happen."

Morner is a leading world authority on sea levels and coastal erosion who headed the Department of Paleogeophysics & Geodynamics at Stockholm University. Morner, who was president of the Commission on Sea Level Changes and Coastal Evolution from 1999 to 2003, has published a new booklet refuting climate model predictions of catastrophic sea level rise.

Physicist Dr. Syun-Ichi Akasofu, the former director of both University of Alaska Fairbanks' Geophysical Institute and International Arctic Research Center, told a Congressional hearing in

2006 that highly publicized climate models showing a disappearing Arctic were nothing more than "science fiction." Akasofu has twice been named one of the "1000 Most Cited Scientists."

Geologist Morten Hald, an Arctic expert at of the University of Tromso in Norway has also questioned the reliability of computer models that predict a future melting of the Arctic.

"The main problem is that these models are often based on relatively new climate data. The thermometer has only been in existence for 150 years and information on temperature which is 150 years old does not capture the large natural changes," Hald, who is participating with a Norwegian national team in Arctic climate research, said in May 2007.

Physicist Freeman Dyson, professor emeritus of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, called himself a "heretic" on global warming.

"The fuss about global warming is grossly exaggerated," writes Dyson in his 2007 book "Many Colored Glass: Reflections on the Place of Life in the Universe." Dyson is a fellow of the American Physical Society, a member of the US National Academy of Sciences, and a fellow of the Royal Society of London.

Dyson focuses on debunking climate models predictions of climate doom: "They do not begin to describe the real world that we live in. The real world is muddy and messy and full of things that we do not yet understand. It is much easier for a scientist to sit in an air-conditioned building and run computer

models, than to put on winter clothes and measure what is really happening outside in the swamps and the clouds. That is why the climate model experts end up believing their own models."

Gore Challenged to Bet on Climate Model Accuracy

Internationally known forecasting pioneer Dr. Scott Armstrong of the Ivy League University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School, challenged Gore to a \$10,000 bet in June over the accuracy of climate computer models predictions. Armstrong and his colleague Professor Kesten Green of Monash University's in Australia, found: "Claims that the Earth will get warmer have no more credence than saying that it will get colder." According to Armstrong, the author of "Long-Range Forecasting," the most frequently cited book on forecasting methods.: "Of 89 principles [of forecasting], the [UN] IPCC violated 72."

Internationally renowned scientist Dr. Antonino Zichichi, president of the World Federation of Scientists and a retired professor of advanced physics at the University of Bologna, has also taken climate models to task.

According to an April 27, 2007 article at Zenit.org, Zichichi, who has published over 800 scientific papers, said "the mathematical models used by the [UN's] IPCC do not correspond to the criteria of the scientific method."

UN Scientist Claims no climate model has ever been 'validated'

IPCC reviewer and climate researcher Dr Vincent

Gray, of New Zealand, an expert reviewer on every single draft of the IPCC reports going back to 1990, ridiculed the IPCC process as "dangerous scientific nonsense." Gray, the author of "Greenhouse Delusion: A Critique of "Climate Change 2001," explained on April 10, 2007:

"My greatest achievement was the second [IPCC] report where the draft had a chapter 'Validation of Climate Models'. I commented that since no climate model has ever been 'validated' that the word was inappropriate. They changed the word to 'evaluate' 50 times, and since then they have never 'predicted' anything. All they do is make 'projections' and 'estimates.'"

In fact, so much of climate computer modeling is based on taking temperature data from a very short time frame and extrapolating it out over 50 or 100 or more years and coming up with terrifying scare scenarios. There is often no attempt to look at the longer geologic record.

But much of this type of modeling has about as much validity as me taking my five year old granddaughter's growth rate from the last two years and using that to project her height when she is 25. My projections may show her to be 12 feet tall based on such short time frames. Yet that is exactly how many of the computer model fears of the future are generated for sea level rise estimates and ice melt projections in places like Greenland and the Arctic.

Once again, computer model predictions are not evidence.

Computer models drive polar bear extinction fears

In September, yet another report was issued based on computer models predictions. This report found that polar bear populations are allegedly going to be devastated by 2050 due to global warming. The report was issued as part of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's consideration of listing the polar bear under the Endangered Species Act.

This is a classic case of reality versus unproven computer model predictions. The Fish and Wildlife Service estimates that the polar bear population is currently at 20,000 to 25,000 bears, whereas in the 1950s and 1960s, estimates were as low as 5,000-10,000 bears. We currently have an estimated four or five times more polar bears than 50 years ago. A 2002 U.S. Geological Survey of wildlife in the Arctic Refuge Coastal Plain noted that the polar bear populations 'may now be near historic highs.'

Top biologists and wildlife experts are dismissing unproven computer model concerns for polar bears.

In 2006, Canadian biologist Dr. Mitchell Taylor, the director of wildlife research with the Arctic government of Nunavut, dismissed these fears with evidence based data on Canada's polar bear populations.

"Of the 13 populations of polar bears in Canada, 11 are stable or increasing in number. They are not going extinct, or even appear to be affected at present," Taylor said, noting that Canada is home to two-thirds of the world's polar bears.

He added: "It is just silly to predict the demise of polar bears in 25 years based on media-assisted hysteria."

In September, Taylor further debunked the latest report hyping fears of future polar bear extinctions.

"I think it's naive and presumptuous," Taylor said, referring to a recent report by the U.S. government warning that computer models predict a dire future for the bears due to projected ice loss.

Less Ice = More Polar Bears?

Taylor also debunked the notion that less sea ice means less polar bears by pointing out that southern regions of the bears' home with low levels of ice are seeing booming bear populations. He noted that in the warmer southern Canadian region of the Davis Strait with lower levels of ice, a new survey will reveal that bear populations have grown from an estimated 850 bears to an estimated 3000 bears. And, despite the lower levels of ice, some of the bears measured in this region are among the biggest ever on record.

"Davis Strait is crawling with polar bears. It's not safe to camp there. They're fat. The mothers have cubs. The cubs are in good shape," he said, according to a September 14, 2007 article.

He added: "That's not theory. That's not based on a model. That's observation of reality."

Computer models predictions 'do not prove anything'

Other Biologists are equally dismissive of these computer model

based fears.

Biologist Josef Reichholf, who heads the Vertebrates Department at the National Zoological Collection in Munich, rejected climate fears and asserted any potential global warming may be beneficial to both humans and animals.

In a May 8, 2007 interview, Reichholf asked: "How did the polar bear survive the last warm period?"

Reichholf also debunked the entire notion that a warmer world will lead to mass species extinctions.

"Warming temperatures promote biodiversity," Reichholf explained. "The number of species increases exponentially from the regions near the poles across the moderate latitudes and to the equator. To put it succinctly, the warmer a region is, the more diverse are its species," he added.

Botanist Dr. David Bellamy, a famed UK environmental campaigner and former lecturer at Durham University, also dismissed fears of a global warming driven polar bear demise.

"Why scare the families of the world with tales that polar bears are heading for extinction when there is good evidence that there are now twice as many of these iconic animals" than there were 20 years ago? Bellamy, the host of a popular UK TV series on wildlife, asked on May 15, 2007.

Bellamy concluded: "The climate-change people have no proof for their claims. They have computer models which do not prove anything."

The bottom line is that the attempt to list the polar bear under the Endangered Species Act is not based on any evidence that the polar bear populations are declining or in trouble. It is based on computer climate models fraught with uncertainties. The truth is that we clearly do not know enough about most of the polar bear populations to make the argument for listing.

And frankly, listing the polar bear isn't about the bear either. It is about trying to bring about climate change regulations using the most powerful development-stopping law in the land, the Endangered Species Act. Polar bears are being used to achieve long sought left-wing environmental regulatory policies.

Essential Point #3: Debunking "More CO2 = A Warmer World" Simplicity

The third critical point on global warming is to debunk the "more CO2 = a warmer world" simplicity. Scientists and peer-reviewed studies are increasingly revealing that catastrophic climate fears of rising CO2 are simply unsustainable.

In May 2007, the "father of meteorology" Dr. Reid Bryson, the founding chairman of the Department of Meteorology at University of Wisconsin, dismissed fears of rising CO2 bluntly saying: "You can go outside and spit and have the same effect as doubling carbon dioxide."

Bryson has been identified by the British Institute of Geographers as the most frequently cited climatologist in the world.

Climatologist Dr. Ball recently explained that one of the reasons climate models are failing is because they overestimate the warming effect of CO2 in the atmosphere. Ball described how CO2's warming impact diminishes.

"Even if CO2 concentration doubles or triples, the effect on temperature would be minimal. The relationship between temperature and CO2 is like painting a window black to block sunlight. The first coat blocks most of the light. Second and third coats reduce very little more. Current CO2 levels are like the first coat of black paint," Ball explained in June 2007.

Environmental economist Dennis Avery, co-author with climate scientist Dr. Fred Singer of the new book "Unstoppable Global Warming Every 1500 Years," explained how much impact CO2 has had on temperatures.

"The earth has warmed only a net 0.2 degrees C of net warming since 1940. Human-emitted CO2 gets the blame for only half of that-or 0.1 degree C of warming over 65 years! We've had no warming at all since 1998. Remember, too, that each added unit of CO2 has less impact on the climate. The first 40 parts per million (ppm) of human-emitted CO2 added to the atmosphere in the 1940s had as much climate impact as the next 360 ppm," Avery wrote in August. Avery and Singer's book details how solar activity is linked to Earth's natural temperature cycles.

Global warming fears "bite the dust"

Perhaps the most inconvenient fact for the promoters of climate doom is the abundance of new peer-reviewed papers

echoing these and many more scientists' skeptical views.

A new peer-reviewed study by Brookhaven National Lab scientist Stephen Schwartz accepted for publication in the Journal of Geophysical Research, finds that even a doubling of atmospheric carbon dioxide would not have the previously predicted dire impacts on global temperatures.

This study is in agreement with the views of the 60 prominent scientists who advised the Canadian Prime Minister to withdraw from Kyoto in 2006.

The 60 scientists noted: "Global climate changes all the time due to natural causes and the human impact still remains impossible to distinguish from this natural 'noise.'"

Astronomer Dr. Ian Wilson proclaimed in August 2007 that the new Schwartz study means: "Anthropogenic (man-made) global warming bites the dust."

Overturing Warming Fears in 'One Fell Swoop'

American Enterprise Institute scientist Joel Schwartz also agreed:

"Along with dozens of other studies in the scientific literature, [this] new study belies Al Gore's claim that there is no legitimate scholarly alternative to climate catastrophism. Indeed, if [this study's] results are correct, that alone would be enough to overturn in one fell swoop the IPCC's scientific 'consensus', the environmentalists' climate hysteria, and the political pretext for the energy-restriction policies that have become so popular with the world's environmental

regulators, elected officials, and corporations. The question is, will anyone in the mainstream media notice?"

Former Harvard physicist Dr. Lubos Motl said the new study has reduced proponents of man-made climate fears to "playing the children's game to scare each other."

Sampling of recent peer-reviewed studies debunking rising CO2 fears

There are many other brand new peer-reviewed studies that show that fear of rising CO2 is misplaced. Here is a sampling of even more recent papers that I have not already cited:

1) An August 2007 peer-reviewed study published in Geophysical Research Letters finds global warming over last century linked to natural causes. Excerpt: The study, by scientists at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, was entitled "Synchronized Chaos: Mechanisms For Major Climate Shifts." The author's found that "By studying the last 100 years of these [natural] cycles' patterns, they find that the systems synchronized several times." The authors show that this mechanism explains all global temperature tendency changes and El Nino variability in the 20th century." ([LINK](#))

2) A September peer-reviewed study counters global warming theory, by finding carbon dioxide did not end the last Ice Age. The study found: "Deep-sea temperatures rose 1,300 years before atmospheric CO2, ruling out the greenhouse gas as driver of meltdown. The lead author geologist Lowell Stott, explained: "The climate dynamic is

much more complex than simply saying that CO2 rises and the temperature warms." ([LINK](#))

3) An October 2007 study by the Danish National Space Center Study concluded: "The Sun still appears to be the main forcing agent in global climate change." This study was authored by Physicist Henrik Svensmark and Eigil Friis-Christensen. ([LINK](#))

4) A Belgian weather institute's August 2007 study dismissed the decisive role of CO2 in warming. Here is an excerpt about the study: "CO2 is not the big bogeyman of climate change and global warming. This is the conclusion of a comprehensive scientific study done by the Royal Meteorological Institute, which was published this past summer. Climate scientist Luc Debontridder explained: "Not CO2, but water vapor is the most important greenhouse gas. It is responsible for at least 75 % of the greenhouse effect. This is a simple scientific fact, but Al Gore's movie has hyped CO2 so much that nobody seems to take note of it." (

5) An August peer-reviewed study finds clouds may greatly reduce global warming: Here is an excerpt about the study: "This study published on August 9, 2007 in the Geophysical Research Letters finds that climate models fail to adequately take into account the effects of clouds. The study shows that tropical rainfall events are accompanied by a decrease in high ice clouds, thus allowing more infrared heat radiation to escape to space. Author Dr. Roy Spencer of the University of Alabama Huntsville said: "At least 80 percent of the Earth's natural greenhouse effect is due to water vapor and clouds, and those are largely

under the control of precipitation systems. Until we understand how precipitation systems change with warming, I don't believe we can know how much of our current warming is manmade. Without that knowledge, we can't predict future climate change with any degree of certainty." Spencer, formerly a senior scientist for climate studies at NASA's Marshall Space Flight Center where he received NASA's Exceptional Scientific Achievement Medal, believes that the Earth self-regulates its own temperature. "In fact, for the amount of solar energy available to it, our climate seems to have a 'preferred' average temperature, damping out swings beyond one degree or so. I believe that, through various negative feedback mechanisms, the atmosphere 'decides' how much of the available sunlight will be allowed in, how much greenhouse effect it will generate in response, and what the average temperature will be." ([LINK](#))

6) A new peer-reviewed study finds that the solar system regulates the earth's climate – The paper, authored by Richard Mackey, is published August 17, 2007 in the Journal of Coastal Research. Here is an excerpt about the paper: "According to the findings reviewed in this paper, the variable output of the sun, the sun's gravitational relationship between the earth (and the moon) and earth's variable orbital relationship with the sun, regulate the earth's climate." ([LINK](#)) & ([LINK](#))

7) Chinese scientists Lin Zhen-Shan, and Sun Xian's 2007 study, published in the peer-reviewed Meteorology and Atmospheric Physics, noted that CO2's impact on warming may be "excessively exaggerated." Here is an

excerpt: "The global climate warming is not solely affected by the CO2 greenhouse effect. The best example is temperature obviously cooling however atmospheric CO2 concentration is ascending from 1940s to 1970s. Although the CO2 greenhouse effect on global climate change is unsuspected, it could have been excessively exaggerated. It is high time to reconsider the trend of global climate change," the two scientists concluded. ([LINK](#)) & ([LINK](#))

8) A Team of Scientists Question The Validity Of A 'Global Temperature' - The study was published in Journal of Non-Equilibrium Thermodynamics. A March 18, 2007 article in Science Daily explained: "Discussions on global warming often refer to 'global temperature.' Yet the concept is thermodynamically as well as mathematically an impossibility, says Bjarne Andresen, a professor at The Niels Bohr Institute, University of Copenhagen. ([LINK](#))

"It is impossible to talk about a single temperature for something as complicated as the climate of Earth", Bjarne Andresen says, an expert of thermodynamics. According to Andresen: "The Globe consists of a huge number of components which one cannot just add up and average. That would correspond to calculating the average phone number in the phone book. That is meaningless."

9) An April 2007 study revealed the Earth's climate "seesawing" during the last 10,000 years, according to Swedish researchers at Lund University. An excerpt of the study states: "During the last 10,000 years

climate has been seesawing between the North and South Atlantic Oceans. As revealed by findings presented by scientists at Lund University in Sweden, cold periods in the north have corresponded to warmth in the south and vice versa. These results imply that Europe may face a slightly cooler future than predicted by IPCC, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. ([LINK](#))

10) A new peer-reviewed study on Surface Warming and the Solar Cycle published in Geophysical Research Letters by scientists from the University of Washington claims to be "the first to document a statistically significant globally coherent temperature response to the solar cycle," according to an August 2, 2007 Science Daily article. The paper found "that times of high solar activity are on average 0.2 degrees C warmer than times of low solar activity." Despite the fact that one of the co-author's protests this study being used to chill climate fears, this paper is an important contribution to establishing the solar climate link. ([LINK](#))

11) In 2007, even the alarmist UN IPCC reduced its sea level rise estimates significantly, thus reducing man's estimated impact on the climate by 25%. Meanwhile, a separate UN report in late 2006 found that cow emissions are more damaging to the planet than all of the CO2 emissions from cars and trucks. ([LINK](#))

12) The UN Climate Panel has been accused of possible research fraud. Here is an excerpt: Douglas J. Keenan, a former Morgan Stanley employee and current

independent mathematical researcher, accused the UN of "fabrications" and "discovered that the sources used by the Intergovernmental Panel for Climate Change (IPCC) have disregarded the positions of weather stations." Keenan has accused the UN of "intentionally using outdated data on China from 1991 and ignoring revised data on the country from 1997."

13) A study in the summer 2007 American Association of Petroleum Geologists publication debunked global warming fears. The study by Geologist C. Robert Shoup, was entitled "Science Under Attack." It concluded: "The hypothesis of Anthropogenic Global Warming does not yet meet the basic scientific standards of proof needed to be accepted as a viable hypothesis, much less as accepted fact."

Again, I stress that these research studies are but a sampling of the new science flowing in that is starting to overwhelm the fear campaigns of the global warming alarmists.

I frequently get asked by warming activists whether I can name a single peer-reviewed study disagreeing with Gore or the UN Summary for Policymakers.

As you can see, the skeptic's cup overflows with recent scientific studies.

In addition to the above recent sampling of new studies, I also refer to the more than 100 scientific studies by more than 300 coauthors that are cited in their new book "Unstoppable Global Warming Every 1500 Years" by climate scientist Dr. Fred Singer and Dennis Avery. The

book details extensive research going back decades to reveal how solar activity is linked to Earth's natural temperature cycles.

Interestingly enough, what the warming doomsayers like to avoid discussing is that a colder world causes more deaths than a warmer world.

Geophysicist Dr. David Deming, associate professor of arts and sciences at the University of Oklahoma, explained in January of this year:

"No one has ever died from global warming. What kills people is cold, not heat. For more than 150 years, it has been documented in the medical literature that human mortality rates are highest in the winter when temperatures are the coldest."

Undergraduates know more about climate than Gore?

Perhaps the most scathing indictment of the "more CO2 equals a warmer world" simplicity comes from Ivy League geologist Dr. Robert Giegengack, the chair of Department of Earth and Environmental Science at the University of Pennsylvania. Giegengack voted for Gore in 2000 and says he would do so again, but he is appalled by Gore's ignorance of climate science.

He tells his undergraduates: "Every single one of you knows more about [global warming] than Al Gore."

Giegengack said: "[Gore] claims that temperature increases solely because more CO2 in the atmosphere traps the sun's heat. That's just wrong ... It's a natural interplay." He continued, "It's

hard for us to say that CO2 drives temperature. It's easier to say temperature drives CO2."

"The driving mechanism is exactly the opposite of what Al Gore claims, both in his film and in that book. It's the temperature that, through those 650,000 years, controlled the CO2; not the CO2 that controlled the temperature," he added.

Now this might be a bit technical, but what Giegengack is saying here is that it is temperatures that control CO2. This is crucial to understanding the reason why the scientific underpinnings of man-made global warming fears are utterly collapsing and the climate models are continuing to fail.

Giegengack continued: "Certain 'feedback loops' naturally control the levels of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. A warmer temperature drives gases out of solution in the ocean and releases them." "[Today, humans] are putting 6.5 billion tons of fossil-fuel carbon into the atmosphere, and only 3.5 billion is staying there, so 3 billion tons is going somewhere else. In the past, when the Earth's climate rose, CO2 came out of the ocean, the soils, and the permafrost. Today as temperatures rise, excess CO2 is instead going into those and other reservoirs. This reversed flux is very important. Because of this, if we reduced the rate at which we put carbon into the atmosphere, it won't reduce the concentration in the atmosphere; CO2 is just going to come back out of these reservoirs ... If we were to stop manufacturing CO2 tomorrow, we wouldn't see the effects of that for generations."

Let me repeat a key point Dr. Giegengack makes: "If we reduced the rate at which we put carbon into the atmosphere, it won't reduce the concentration in the atmosphere; CO2 is just going to come back out of these reservoirs." (reservoirs such as the oceans, soil and permafrost)

Giegengack is explaining the heart of the scientific skepticism about CO2's role in the Earth's climate system.

But Giegengack is not finished. "In terms of [global warming's] capacity to cause the human species harm, I don't think it makes it into the top 10," Giegengack said in an interview in the May/June 2007 issue of the Pennsylvania Gazette. ([LINK](#))

It is entirely appropriate that a man who supports Gore politically may be putting the final nail in the coffin of the man-made global warming fears.

'Unverified, remote, and abstract dangers'

The global warming scare machine is now so tenuous, that other liberal environmental scientists and activists are now joining Giegengack and refuting the entire basis for man-made global warming concerns.

Denis G. Rancourt professor of physics and an environmental science researcher at the University of Ottawa, believes the global warming campaign does a disservice to the environmental movement.

Rancourt wrote on February 27, 2007: "Promoting the global warming myth trains people to accept unverified,

remote, and abstract dangers in the place of true problems that they can discover for themselves by becoming directly engaged in their workplace and by doing their own research and observations. It trains people to think lifestyle choices (in relation to CO2 emission) rather than to think activism in the sense of exerting an influence to change societal structures." ([LINK](#))

Rancourt believes that global warming "will not become humankind's greatest threat until the sun has its next hiccup in a billion years or more in the very unlikely scenario that we are still around." He also noted that even if CO2 emissions were a grave threat "government action and political will cannot measurably or significantly ameliorate global climate in the present world."

Most significantly, however, Rancourt -- a committed left-wing activist and scientist -- believes environmentalists have been duped into promoting global warming as a crisis.

Rancourt wrote: "I argue that by far the most destructive force on the planet is power-driven financiers and profit-driven corporations and their cartels backed by military might; and that the global warming myth is a red herring that contributes to hiding this truth. In my opinion, activists who, using any justification, feed the global warming myth have effectively been co-opted, or at best neutralized."

"Global warming is strictly an imaginary problem of the First World middleclass," Rancourt added.

Finally, Rancourt asserted that in a warm world, life prospers. "There is no known case of a sustained warming alone having negatively impacted an entire population," he said, "As a general rule, all life on Earth does better when it's hotter: Compare ecological diversity and biotic density (or biomass) at the poles and at the equator," he added.

Indeed, 2007 has turned into the "tipping point" for the unsubstantiated fears and gross distortion of science by activists who have committed decades trying to convince the world it faced a man-made climate crisis. Rancourt so eloquently summed up the movement as one featuring "Unverified, remote, and abstract dangers."

Renowned Scientists Convert to Skeptics

Perhaps the biggest shock to the global warming debate was the recent conversion of renowned French geophysicist Dr. Claude Allegre from a believer in dangerous man-made warming fears to a skeptic.

Allegre, a former French Socialist Party leader and a member of both the French and U.S. Academies of Science, was one of the first scientists to sound global warming fears 20 years ago, but he now says the cause of climate change is "unknown." He ridiculed what he termed the "prophets of doom of global warming" in a September 2006 article. ([LINK](#))

Allegre has authored more than 100 scientific articles and written 11 books and received numerous scientific awards including the Goldschmidt Medal from the Geochemical Society of the United

States. He now believes the global warming hysteria is motivated by money. "The ecology of helpless protesting has become a very lucrative business for some people!" he explained.

I find it ironic that a free market conservative capitalist in the U.S. Senate and a French Socialist scientist both apparently agree that sound science is not what is driving this debate, but greed by those who would use this issue to line their own pockets.

Bravo for the growing scientific dissent. You don't have to believe me. In October, Washington Post Staff Writer Juliet Eilperin conceded the obvious, writing that climate skeptics "appear to be expanding rather than shrinking."

The Washington Post's Eilperin wrote: "In late May, Michael Griffin, administrator of NASA, which conducts considerable amounts of climate research, told National Public Radio that he was not sure climate change was 'a problem we must wrestle with' and that it was 'rather arrogant' to suggest that the climate we have now represents the best possible set of conditions. Alexander Cockburn, a maverick journalist who leans left on most topics, lambasted the global-warming consensus last spring on the political Web site CounterPunch.org, arguing that there's no evidence yet that humans are causing the rise in global temperature."

Left-wing Professor David Noble of Canada's York University has joined the growing chorus of disenchanted liberal activists. Noble now believes that the movement has "hyped the global climate issue into an obsession." Noble wrote a May 8 essay entitled "The Corporate

Climate Coup" which details how global warming has "hijacked" the environmental left and created a "corporate climate campaign" which has "diverted attention from the radical challenges of the global justice movement." ([LINK](#))

Geologist Peter Sciaky echoes this growing backlash of left-wing activists about global warming.

Sciaky, who describes himself as a "liberal and a leftist" wrote on June 9: "I do not know a single geologist who believes that [global warming] is a man-made phenomenon."

And finally, world leaders like Czech President Vaclav Klaus and former German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt have been outspoken in their climate skepticism.

Schmidt said on June 4 that fears of global warming were "hysterical" and "overheated" and called efforts to control the Earth's temperature "idiotic." ([LINK](#)) Another EU leader -- Spanish opposition leader Mariano Rajoy - spoke out against climate orthodoxy on October 23. Rajoy said, "No scientist has guaranteed to me what the weather will be like tomorrow" and he then asked "How can anyone know what will happen in the world within 300 years?" ([LINK](#))

Former Vice President Gore's biggest worry is now coming true; previously committed believers in man-made global warming are now converting to skeptics after reviewing the new science.

New scientific findings changing minds

The 60 prominent scientists, many of whom advised the Canadian Prime Minister in the 1990's to ratify Kyoto, became the first to foresee 2007 as the "tipping point" for climate alarm.

"Significant [scientific] advances have been made since the [Kyoto] protocol was created, many of which are taking us away from a concern about increasing greenhouse gases. If, back in the mid-1990s, we knew what we know today about climate, Kyoto would almost certainly not exist, because we would have concluded it was not necessary," the 60 scientists wrote in an open letter to Prime Minister Stephen Harper on April 6, 2006. ([LINK](#))

The climate skeptics have welcomed many scientists from around the world into the fold recently. They include the previously noted Claude Allegre, top Israeli astrophysicist Nir Shaviv, Australian mathematician David Evans, Canadian climate expert Tad Murty, Paleoclimatologist Tim Patterson, Geologist Bruno Wiskel, Paleoclimatologist Ian D. Clark, Environmental geochemist Jan Veizer, and Climate scientist Chris de Freitas of New Zealand. ([LINK](#))

And that is just to name a few. Again, please go to [EPW.Senate.Gov](#) for the full report and stay tuned for the upcoming blockbuster report detailing the hundreds of scientists who have spoken out recently to denounce man-made global warming fears.

Essential Point #4: Debunking "consensus"

The fourth and final essential point deals with how the media and

climate doomsters insist that there is an overwhelming scientific "consensus" of man-made global warming. The notion of a "consensus" is carefully manufactured for political, financial and ideological purposes. Its proponents never explain fully what "consensus" they are referring to. Is it a "consensus" that future computer models will turn out correct? Is it a "consensus" that the Earth has warmed? Proving that parts of the Earth have warmed does not prove that humans are responsible.

While it may appear to the casual observer that scientists promoting climate fears are in the majority, the evidence continues to reveal this is an illusion. Climate skeptics -- the emerging silent majority of scientists -- receive much smaller shares of university research funds, foundation funds and government grants and they are not plugged into the well-heeled environmental special interest lobby.

On the other side of the climate debate, you have an comparatively well funded group of scientists and activists who participate in UN conferences, receiving foundation monies and international government support and also receive fawning media treatment.

The number of skeptics at first glance may appear smaller, but the skeptics are increasingly becoming vocal and turning the tables on the Goliath that has become the global warming fear industry.

Key components of the manufactured "consensus" fade under scrutiny. We often hear how the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) and the American Meteorological Society (AMS) issued statements endorsing the so-called

"consensus" view that man is driving global warming. But what you don't hear is that both the NAS and AMS never allowed member scientists to directly vote on these climate statements.

Essentially, only two dozen or so members on the governing boards of these institutions produced the "consensus" statements. It appears that the governing boards of these organizations caved in to pressure from those promoting the politically correct view of UN and Gore-inspired science. The Canadian Academy of Sciences reportedly endorsed a "consensus" global warming statement that was never even approved by its governing board.

Rank-and-file scientists are now openly rebelling. James Spann, a certified meteorologist with the AMS, openly defied the organization when he said in January that he does "not know of a single TV meteorologist who buys into the man-made global warming hype." In February a panel of meteorologists expressed unanimous climate skepticism, and one panelist estimated that 95% of his profession rejects global warming fears.

In August 2007, a comprehensive survey of peer-reviewed scientific literature from 2004-2007 revealed "Less Than Half of all Published Scientists Endorse Global Warming Theory."

"Of 539 total papers on climate change, only 38 (7%) gave an explicit endorsement of the consensus. If one considers 'implicit' endorsement (accepting the consensus without explicit statement), the figure rises to 45%. However, while only 32 papers (6%) reject the consensus outright, the largest

category (48%) are neutral papers, refusing to either accept or reject the hypothesis. This is no 'consensus,' according to an August 29, 2007 article in Daily Tech.

In addition, a September 26, 2007 report from the international group Institute of Physics' finds no "consensus" on global warming. Here is an excerpt: "As world leaders gathered in New York for a high-level UN meeting on climate change, a new report by some of the world's most renowned scientists urges policymakers to keep their eyes on the "science grapevine", arguing that their understanding of global warming is still far from complete." The Institute of Physics is also urging world leaders "to remain alert to the latest scientific thought on climate change."

Debunking UN mirage of "consensus"

In May, UN special climate envoy Dr. Gro Harlem Brundtland declared "it's completely immoral, even, to question" the UN's alleged global warming "consensus," according to a May 10, 2007 article.

There are frequently claims that the UN IPCC Summary for Policymakers is the voice of hundreds or even thousands of the world's top scientists. But such claims do not hold up to even the lightest scrutiny.

According to the Associated Press, during the IPCC Summary for Policymakers meeting in April 2007, only 52 scientists participated. The April 9, 2007 AP article by Seth Borenstein reported:

"Diplomats from 115 countries and 52 scientists hashed out the most comprehensive and gloomiest warning yet about the possible effects of global warming, from increased flooding, hunger, drought and diseases to the extinction of species."

Many of the so-called "hundreds" of scientists who have been affiliated with the UN as "expert reviewers" are in fact climate skeptics. Skeptics like Virginia State Climatologist Dr. Patrick Michaels, Alabama State Climatologist Dr. John Christy, New Zealand climate researcher Dr. Vincent Gray, former head of the Geological Museum at the University of Oslo, Tom V. Segalstad, and MIT's Dr. Richard Lindzen have served as IPCC "expert reviewers" but were not involved in writing the alarmist Summary for Policymakers.

New study finds IPCC "consensus" an "illusion"

An analysis released in September 2007 on the IPCC scientific review process by climate data analyst John McLean, revealed that the UN IPCC peer-review process is "an illusion."

The new study found that very few scientists are actively involved in the UN's peer-review process. The report contained devastating revelations to the central IPCC assertion that 'it is very highly likely that greenhouse gas forcing has been the dominant cause of the observed global warming over the last 50 years."

The analysis by McLean states: "The IPCC leads us to believe that this statement is very much supported by the

majority of reviewers. The reality is that there is surprisingly little explicit support for this key notion. Among the 23 independent reviewers just 4 explicitly endorsed the chapter with its hypothesis, and one other endorsed only a specific section. Moreover, only 62 of the IPCC's 308 reviewers commented on this chapter at all."

Let me repeat the key point here: Only four UN scientists in the IPCC peer-review process explicitly endorsed the key chapter blaming mankind for warming the past 50 years, according to this recent analysis.

UN scientist says IPCC has 'flawed review process'

This analysis was echoed by UN scientist Dr. Madhav L. Khandekar, a retired Environment Canada scientist.

In an August 13, 2007 letter, Khandekar lashed out at those who "seem to naively believe that the climate change science espoused in the [UN's] Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) documents represents 'scientific consensus.'"

Khandekar continued: "Nothing could be further than the truth! As one of the invited expert reviewers for the 2007 IPCC documents, I have pointed out the flawed review process used by the IPCC scientists in one of my letters. I have also pointed out in my letter that an increasing number of scientists are now questioning the hypothesis of Greenhouse gas induced warming of the earth's surface and suggesting a stronger impact of solar variability and large-scale atmospheric circulation patterns on

the observed temperature increase than previously believed."

"Unfortunately, the IPCC climate change documents do not provide an objective assessment of the earth's temperature trends and associated climate change," Khandekar concluded.

Paul Reiter, a malaria expert formerly of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, participated in a past UN IPCC process and now calls the concept of consensus on global warming a "sham." Reiter, a professor of entomology and tropical disease with the Pasteur Institute in Paris, had to threaten legal action to have his name removed from the IPCC. "That is how they make it seem that all the top scientists are agreed," he said on March 5, 2007. "It's not true," he added.

Hurricane expert Christopher W. Landsea of NOAA's National Hurricane Center, was both an author and a reviewer for the IPCC's 2nd Assessment Report in 1995 and the 3rd Assessment Report in 2001, but resigned from the 4th Assessment Report after charging the UN with playing politics with Hurricane science.

Landsea wrote a January 17, 2005 public letter detailing his experience with the UN:

"I am withdrawing [from the UN] 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."

"I personally cannot in good faith continue to contribute to a process that I view as both being motivated by pre-conceived agendas and being scientifically unsound," Landsea added.

As if to further cement these allegations, the UN allowed a Greenpeace activist to co-author a key economic report in 2007. Left unreported by most of the media was the fact that Bill Hare, an advisor to Greenpeace, was a lead co-author of a key economic report in the IPCC's 4th Assessment. Not surprisingly, the Greenpeace co-authored report predicted a gloomy future for our planet unless we follow the UN's policy prescriptions.

The UN IPCC's own guidelines explicitly state that the scientific reports have to be "change[d]" to "ensure consistency with" the politically motivated Summary for Policymakers.

In addition, the IPCC more closely resembles a political party's convention platform battle - not a scientific process. During an IPCC Summary for Policymakers process, political delegates and international bureaucrats squabble over the specific wording of a phrase or assertion.

Steve McIntyre, one of the individuals responsible for debunking the infamous "Hockey Stick" temperature graph, slammed the IPCC Summary for Policymaker's process on January 24, 2007.

McIntyre wrote: "So the purpose of the three-month delay between the publication of the (IPCC) Summary for Policy-Makers and the release of the actual WG1 (Working Group 1) is to

enable them to make any 'necessary' adjustments to the technical report to match the policy summary. Unbelievable. Can you imagine what securities commissions would say if business promoters issued a big promotion and then the promoters made the 'necessary' adjustments to the qualifying reports and financial statements so that they matched the promotion. Words fail me."

UN activist scientists hype data

As you continue to scratch beneath the surface of the alleged global warming "consensus" more discoveries await.

Alabama State Climatologist Dr. John Christy of the University of Alabama in Huntsville, served as a UN IPCC lead author in 2001 for the 3rd assessment report and detailed how he personally witnessed UN scientists attempting to distort the science for political purposes.

"I was at the table with three Europeans, and we were having lunch. And they were talking about their role as lead authors. And they were talking about how they were trying to make the report so dramatic that the United States would just have to sign that Kyoto Protocol," Christy told CNN on May 2, 2007.

Former Colorado State Climatologist Dr. Roger Pielke Sr. also detailed the corruption of the UN IPCC process on September 1, 2007:

"The same individuals who are doing primary research in the role of humans on the climate system are then permitted to lead the [IPCC] assessment! There should be an outcry on this obvious

conflict of interest, but to date either few recognize this conflict, or see that since the recommendations of the IPCC fit their policy and political agenda, they chose to ignore this conflict. In either case, scientific rigor has been sacrificed and poor policy and political decisions will inevitably follow," Pielke explained.

He added: "We need recognition among the scientific community, the media, and policymakers that the IPCC process is obviously a real conflict of interest, and this has resulted in a significantly flawed report."

Kyoto represents 'authentic global governance'

Politics appears to be the fuel that runs the UN IPCC process from the scientists to the bureaucrats to the delegates and all the way to many of the world leaders involved in it. And another key to the motivation of the UN was explained by former French President Jacques Chirac in 2000:

Chirac said Kyoto represents "the first component of an authentic global governance."

These growing critiques of the politicized IPCC process have been echoed by the UK's Lord Nigel Lawson - former Chancellor of the Exchequer and a Member of the House of Lords Committee that reviewed the IPCC process.

Lawson called for the abolishment of the UN's IPCC process.

"I believe the IPCC process is so flawed, and the institution, it has to be said, so closed to reason, that it would be far

better to thank it for the work it has done, close it down, and transfer all future international collaboration on the issue of climate change..." Lawson said in 2005.

Extravagantly Funded Warming Crusade Follows Ice Age Fears

The huge organizational and funding advantage that proponents of climate alarmism enjoy over scientific skeptics has led to a pretty elaborate and impressive façade of "consensus." Many climate skeptics have been excluded from key roles in the politicized IPCC process and largely ignored by the media unless they are being demonized as "flat Earther's" or accused of being part of a well funded industry campaign. But in reality, it is the climate fear peddlers that enjoy an overwhelming funding advantage over skeptics.

Since the late 1980's when global warming fears rose out of the scorched frost of the 1970's coming ice age scare, an international organized effort and tens of billions of dollars have been spent promoting the warming fear gravy train.

Paleoclimate scientist Bob Carter estimates proponents of global warming fears worldwide have received over \$50 billion from international sources and the U.S. over the last two decades.

"In one of the more expensive ironies of history, the expenditure of more than \$US50 billion on research into global warming since 1990 has failed to demonstrate any human-caused climate trend, let alone a dangerous one," Carter wrote on June 18, 2007.

The U.S. alone spends over \$5 billion a year on research directly or indirectly related to global warming. Adding to these totals of funding man-made climate fears are large foundations like the Heinz Foundation, international governments, the United Nations, worldwide universities and individuals like billionaires like Richard Branson, and George Soros.

In fact, if you want to get a study funded today on anything from suicides to butterflies, researchers are finding that they better somehow link the issue to global warming and it will increase your chances of securing funding dramatically.

Meteorologist James Spann suggests scientific objectivity is being compromised by the "big cash grab" of money flowing to proponents of man-made climate fears. I previously noted that NASA's James Hansen received a \$250,000 award from the Heinz Foundation.

"Billions of dollars of grant money are flowing into the pockets of those on the man-made global warming bandwagon. No man-made global warming, the money dries up. This is big money, make no mistake about it. Always follow the money trail and it tells a story," Spann wrote on January 18, 2007.

The imbalance of money between the promoters of climate fears and skeptics is so large that one 2007 U.S. Department of Agriculture grant of \$20 million to study how "farm odors" contribute to global warming exceeded ALL of the money the groups skeptical of climate fears allegedly received from ExxonMobil over the past two decades.

CNN's Anderson Cooper noted my campaign funding sources in a program just this week, but he failed to investigate the huge financial advantage proponents of man-made global warming have over skeptics.

Hundreds of skeptical scientists to be heard in upcoming Senate report

Later this fall, my staff on the EPW committee will also be releasing a report detailing the hundreds of scientists, many of them affiliated with the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) process, who have spoken out recently to oppose climate alarmism. The report will feature the scientists -- many of them who have finally had it with claims that "all scientists agree" -- in their own words. The report will be complete with the scientists' biographies and web links for further reading.

This new research and the hysteria created by the UN, Gore and the media have prompted frustrated scientists to finally fight back in the name of a rational approach to science.

Climate rationalists or skeptics do not need to engage in smoke and mirrors to state their case and we will be offering the world a chance to read and decide for themselves, unfiltered from the increasingly activist and shrill lens of media outlets like NBC News, Newsweek, Time, CBS News, ABC News, CNN.

I have stood on this floor for years detailing all the unfolding science that debunked climate alarm. These scientific developments of 2007 are the result of years or decades of hard work by

scientists skeptical of man-made climate fears. Finally reaching the point where we can watch the alarm crumble is very satisfying.

Skeptics called 'traitors'

Despite the massive scientific shift in favor of skeptics, proponents of climate fears are increasingly attempting to suppress dissent by skeptics.

During Gore's LIVE Earth concert in July, environmental activist Robert F. Kennedy, Jr. said of climate skeptics:

"This is treason. And we need to start treating them as traitors."

Heidi Cullen of The Weather Channel called for denying certification of any meteorologists skeptical of climate fears

And in August, NASA's resident alarmist James Hansen called skeptics 'deceitful' & 'court jesters.' This is the same activist Hansen who conceded in a 2003 issue of Natural Science that the use of "extreme scenarios" to dramatize global warming "may have been appropriate at one time" to drive the public's attention to the issue --- a disturbing admission by a prominent scientist.

Other climate fear promoters have called for Nuremberg-style trials for those expressing man-made global warming skepticism.

In September, the Virginia State Climatologist skeptical of global warming lost his job after a clash with the Governor. Dr. Patrick Michaels claims he was censored by the governor

because he held a different view of climate science.

Michaels said: "I was told that I could not speak in public on my area of expertise, global warming, as state climatologist."

If the advocates for climate change alarm are so confident the science is on their side, why are they so afraid of debate? Why do they resort to such low brow name calling and intimidation?

The reason is obvious. The latest scientific findings are refuting climate fears and prompting many global warming activists to try desperate measures to silence the debate. When they do agree to debate the scientific facts, the alarmists lose and lose badly. In March, an audience of several hundred in New York City was persuaded to the view that global warming was not a "crisis" following a public debate with scientists.

When I became Chair of the Environment and Public Works Committee four and a half years ago, I vowed to make science one of the cornerstones of my agenda - to ensure that policy is based on sound science. And as I continue on as Ranking Member of EPW, I have continued this goal.

I think it is probably fair to say that no other federal legislator has devoted as many hours addressing Congress about the science of climate change. I have spent this time because sound policy requires understanding, and what climate policy direction we choose will have enormous consequences not only for our nation, but for the world.

ENERGY RATIONING CAN'T WORK - EVEN IF ALARMISTS WERE RIGHT

I would like now to address a question that I'm asked repeatedly. "Senator Inhofe, what if you're wrong and the alarmists are right? Isn't it better to adopt carbon restrictions to stop carbon dioxide emissions just in case?" My answer is always the same: what if I am right? They never seem prepared for that question.

But let me address their question. Let's assume for a moment that the alarmists are right, which of course they are not, but let's assume they are for the sake of discussion. It still makes absolutely no sense to join Kyoto or any successor treaty or to adopt climate restrictions on our own. Not only does it not make economic sense, it does not make environmental sense. Let me explain.

CARBON MANDATES DON'T REDUCE TEMPERATURES

First, going on a carbon diet would do nothing to avert climate change. After the U.S. signed the Kyoto Protocol in 1997, Al Gore's own scientist, Tom Wigley of the National Center for Atmospheric Research, calculated that Kyoto would reduce emissions by only 0.07 degrees Celsius by the year 2050. That's all. 0.07 degrees. And that's if the United States had ratified Kyoto and the other signatories met their targets.

But we didn't and they won't. Of the 15 original EU countries, only two are on track to meet their targets. And even one of those, Britain, has started increasing its emissions again, not decreasing.

Similar calculations have been done to estimate other climate bills. The Climate Change Stewardship Act that was defeated 38-60 last year would have only reduced temperatures by 0.029 degrees Celsius, and another bill modeled on the National Commission on Energy Policy (NCEP) report would have only reduced temperatures by 0.008 degrees Celsius. That's right – 0.008 degrees Celsius, or less than one percent of one degree.

A LESSON IN ECONOMICS

The high costs that would be borne under carbon constraints are unjustifiable to achieve miniscule temperature reductions – and that's if the alarmists are right about the science. How much more unjustifiable would they be if I and the growing number of skeptical scientists are right?

The fear-mongering about global warming has turned commonsense on its head. In its December 7th, 1998 issue, Time magazine named Henry Ford one of the 20th Century's 100 most influential builders. Yet just this month, Time named the 1909 Model-T car the worst environmental product of the century. Time acknowledges that the car supercharged the American economy and put it on wheels, but states "That's just the problem, isn't it?" The consequences keep piling up, it says. In short, Time now endorses the view that our world would be better off if we had never advanced technologically – if we were still dependent on the horse and cart as we were in 1909.

Now, most people don't agree with such extremist views. But at the core of the question, "shouldn't we do something just in case," the same calculus is at

work. What if Henry Ford had not created the Model T out of fear of unknown consequences... just in case?

It isn't just that our major cities don't each have to deal with the sanitation and disposal issues of tens of millions of pounds of horse manure – one of many real environmental problems a century ago that the automobile eliminated. It extended to every aspect of life.

When the Model T first rolled off the assembly lines near the beginning of the 20th Century, the average American's life expectancy was 53 years. Today the average American can expect to live 78 years, or 25 more than a century ago. And we're not just living longer lives, but healthier, more secure lives. The average American's real standard of living climbed from \$5,300 a year in 1913 to \$32,000 a year in 2005. That's an enormous jump.

And the carbon-based society is responsible for that. Advances in medicine, food production, building construction, services and the manufacture of clothing, furniture and other goods have all been made possible by the mobility brought about by the transportation sector and the electricity provided by power plants.

The advances over the last Century are not simply interesting historical facts. They show us not only why we are a prosperous nation, but a roadmap to a prosperous future. Threats to prosperity have real consequences for how well and how long Americans will live. Whatever actions we take today, we must also safeguard the well-being of America's families now and into the future.

The United States Senate has acknowledged this when it passed two similar resolutions establishing a standard for passing global warming legislation. In 1997, the Byrd-Hagel Sense of the Senate, which passed 95 – 0, resolved that the U.S. should not be a signatory to any international agreement that would result in serious harm to the U.S. economy or did not mandate reductions from the developing world. Similarly, the Bingaman Sense of the Senate, passed in 2005, resolved that the U.S. should address global warming as long as it will not significantly harm the United States economy and encourages comparable action by other nations that are major trading partners and key contributors to global emissions.

Neither the Kyoto Protocol nor a single bill before Congress meets these criteria – not one. They range from costly to ruinous. But they all fail to meet the requirements of Byrd-Hagel or Bingaman.

Both the Energy Information Administration (EIA) and Wharton Econometric Forecasting Associates analyzed the costs of Kyoto when it was signed, and the costs were staggering. For instance, EIA found the annual cost would be up to \$283 billion a year, and that's in 1992 constant dollars. Wharton put the cost even higher, at more than \$300 billion annually, or more than \$2,700 per family of four each year.

The estimated costs to comply with carbon legislative proposals in the U.S. would also be unreasonable. The NCEP approach would do nothing to lessen global warming even according to the alarmists, but according to EIA, it would

still cost more than 118,000 American jobs simply to make a symbolic gesture.

And according to an MIT study, the Sanders-Boxer bill would cost energy sector consumers an amount equal to \$4,500 per American family of four. The same study found the Lieberman-McCain bill would cost consumers \$3,500 per family of four. Similarly, EIA found that it would have cost 1.3 million jobs. A new EPA analysis shows the Lieberman – McCain bill would cost up to half a trillion dollars by 2030 and \$1.3 trillion by 2050.

Now environmentalists will tell you that's okay. Dan Lashof of the Natural Resources Defense Council says that EPA's analysis of the Lieberman-McCain bill show "it is affordable." Although EPA finds that fuel costs will increase by 22 percent, he calls fuel impacts "pretty modest" – Now activists inside the Beltway may think big jumps in gas prices are no big deal, but I doubt the people living in the real America would agree.

THE POOR BEAR THE BIGGEST COSTS

What few Americans realize is that the impact of these policies would not be evenly distributed. The Congressional Budget Office recently looked at the approach taken by most global warming proposals in Congress – known as cap and trade – that would place a cap on carbon emissions, allocate how much everyone could emit, and then let them trade those emissions. Let me quote from the CBO report:

"Regardless of how the allowances were distributed, most of the cost of meeting a cap on CO2 emissions would be borne

by consumers, who would face persistently higher prices for products such as electricity and gasoline. Those price increases would be regressive in that poorer households would bear a larger burden relative to their income than wealthier households would."

Think about that. Even relatively modest bills would put enormous burdens on the poor.

The poor already face energy costs much higher as a percentage of their income than wealthier Americans. While most Americans spend about 4 percent of their monthly budget on heating their homes or other energy needs, the poorest fifth of Americans spend 19 percent of their budget on energy. Why would we adopt policies which disproportionately force the poor and working class to shoulder the heaviest burdens through even higher energy costs?

PERVERSE EFFECTS: THE CEMENT EXAMPLE

Carbon caps would also fundamentally alter the way we live. Take the case of the cement industry and its relation to our daily lives. Cement is experiencing tremendous growth in demand, and with that demand, new jobs are being created. Cement is essential to the maintaining and revitalizing of our aging infrastructure. Highways, bridges, and water and sewage systems are all built with cement. Already our ability to meet our infrastructure needs is under tremendous stress due to the high costs and sheer number of these necessary projects across the nation.

Cement is not only an energy efficient building material, the making of cement has become efficient as energy

consumption used in manufacturing cement has dropped by one-third. But the fact remains that CO₂ emissions are an inherent part of the cement manufacturing process. Currently, there is no feasible means to separate the CO₂ emissions from the remainder of the cement process exhaust gases and sequester it – nor will there be for the foreseeable future.

Putting a cap on carbon emissions would drive cement manufacturing overseas. Because manufacturing processes are far less efficient in developing countries, more energy is used and more carbon dioxide emissions are emitted – so ironically, shifting needed production off-shore through imposition of a carbon cap on our nation will cause emissions to significantly increase, not decrease.

And with the price increases in cost of obtaining cement, how will we maintain our highways? Which highway and bridge maintenance projects will remain undone? Finding the funding for necessary projects is always a difficult task, and advocates of a carbon mandate would make us unable to meet our needs. That would be bad enough if we actually reduced emissions globally, but it is unconscionable to cripple our nation in this way when the policy will actually increase global carbon emissions.

EMISSION GROWTH CHALLENGE: THE DEVELOPING WORLD

Many times I have heard that America is the biggest emitter of carbon dioxide and thus is the problem. But that is no longer true. Earlier this year, China surpassed the United States as the world's largest emitter of carbon.

Only 6 years ago, it was estimated that China's emissions would still lag those of the United States in 2040. China's emissions growth is explosive and climbing upward.

Just to put things in perspective, the United States did not build a single new coal-fired power plant in the last 15 years up to 2006, although there are now some efforts underway to change that. In comparison, according to the New York Times, "China last year built 117 government-approved coal-fired power plants – a rate of roughly one every three days, according to official figures." We won't complete that many in the next decade.

India's emission increases are not far behind China, and Brazil is not far behind them.

The fact is that if these countries do not curb their rapidly accelerating emissions growth, then embracing a carbon diet and sluggish economic growth by developed countries will accomplish nothing. Moreover, many of the carbon reductions achieved through lost manufacturing jobs in developed countries are simply emitted elsewhere as jobs are created to make the same product in countries that do not ration energy. The U.S. emissions as a measure of productivity are far lower than China's. Cement manufacturing is a perfect example. Every job sent there will increase emissions, not lower them.

The same is true for Europe, which, while more carbon intensive than the United States, is far less intensive than China. This point was made last year by the European Union's industry

commissioner Günter Verheugen, who worries about British competitiveness.

In fact, China is growing at such a rate that even if the United States, Europe and the rest of the developed world were to eliminate every ton of its emissions and become zero emitting countries within a few decades – a clearly ruinous goal – emissions would still be higher than today because of rapidly growing emissions in the developing world. Think about that – even if we shut down our economies completely, emissions would still rise.

MISSPENT WEALTH

Some will say we simply need to educate the developing countries. But the fact is, they understand all too well that there are more important priorities. As Lu Xuedu, Deputy Director General of China's Office of Global Environmental Affairs, said in October 2006:

“You cannot tell people who are struggling to earn enough to eat that they need to reduce their emissions.”

Prodipto Ghosh, Secretary of India's Environment Ministry, expressed the same sentiment when he said:

"Removal of poverty is the greater immediate imperative [than global warming]."

These views are consistent with the findings of the Copenhagen Consensus. In 2004, a Danish environmentalist who believes global warming is a serious problem brought together eight of the world's leading economists, including 4 Nobel laureates, and 30 specialists on many of the world's leading problems.

They analyzed the world's biggest issues and ranked them on the cost-effectiveness of directing societal wealth or resources toward these problems. Of the 17 issues studied, HIV/AIDS, malnutrition, malaria, and sanitation topped the list as the best investments, while climate came in last and was ranked as a bad use of resources.

SO WHAT'S THE PATH FORWARD?

So what's the path forward? I categorically will oppose legislation or initiatives that will devastate our economy as well as those that will cost jobs simply to make symbolic gestures purely to start us down the ruinous economic path of energy rationing.

I believe such measures will be defeated because the approach is politically unsustainable. We are seeing the first signs of that in Europe right now. Even if the alarmists were right on the science – which they are not – their command-and-control approaches sow the seeds of their own failure. As long as their policies put national economies in the cross-hairs, they will stoke the fires of opposition and eventually collapse of their own weight.

Stabilizing emissions can not happen in 20, 40, or even 60 years because our world's infrastructure is built on fossil fuels and it will continue to be so for a long time to come – the power plants and other facilities being built now and in the future will emit carbon for a half century after they're completed.

Quite simply, the technology does not exist to cost-effectively power the world without emitting carbon dioxide. And I

and many others who reject climate alarmism or ineffective yet expensive solutions will block efforts to implement mandatory carbon restrictions.

I find it unfortunate that so many politicians and climate advocates focus on trying to resurrect a mandatory carbon cap policy in the face of its demonstrated failure in practice in the countries that have adopted it. In the process, they are ignoring the best path forward.

There is only one approach so far that I know of that will work – it is the Asia-Pacific Partnership on Clean Development and Climate. Why? Because this approach serves multiple purposes – it will reduce air pollution, expand our energy supply, increase trade, and along with these other goals, reduce greenhouse gases as a byproduct. Others might put this list together differently in terms of priority, but my point is that the Asia-Pacific Partnership meets the criteria for success – it is a politically and economically sustainable path forward that addresses multiple issues in the context of their relation to other issues. Perhaps other approaches in the future will meet these criteria as well, but the APP is currently the only one that does.

Any international post-Kyoto agreement the United States enters into must make the concepts embodied in the APP a cornerstone of that agreement.

CONCLUSION

###

In conclusion, I would simply point out that climate alarmism has become a cottage industry in this country and many others, but a growing number of scientists and the general public are coming around to the idea that climate change is natural and that there is no reason for alarm. It is time to stop pretending that the world around us is headed for certain doom and that Kyoto-style policies will save us – when in fact, the biggest danger lies in these policies themselves. As I have noted, new studies continue to pile up debunking alarm and debunking the very foundation for so called “solutions” to warming.

I know this was a long, long speech, but I just want the real people, not the money driven liberals and the Hollywood elitists, but the real people who are out there raising their families and working hard to know that help is on its way and that all the UN and media driven hype to sell American down the river will fail.

And that truth, as Winston Churchill said, “is incontrovertible, ignorance can deride it, panic may resent it, malice may destroy it, but there it is.”

Why am I willing to subject myself to all the punishment by the rich left extremists? The answer is, for my family. Kay and I have 20 kids and grandkids and we don't want them to have to pay a tax 10 times larger than the largest increase in the history of America. A tax that is based on flawed science. It's for them.