

Events Have Debunked the Climate Scare

*By Christopher Monckton of Brenchley
Boston Globe*

PROFESSOR John Holdren wrote recently here that no one should heed the "few climate change 'skeptics' with any sort of scientific credentials". Yet, in 676 words, he did not offer even one scientific argument in favor of climate alarm.

In this reply, I offer nothing but scientific arguments. First, "global warming" began 300 years back. Humankind was not to blame. Warming stopped ten years ago. For the last seven of those years, all five major global surface temperature datasets show cooling. The cooling between January 2007 and January 2008 was the sharpest since records began in 1880.

Not one of the 22 costly computer models relied upon by the UN's climate panel predicted the present long cooling. Now scientists expect no more warming till 2015.

Today's temperature is 10 F below its peak during each of the past four interglacial periods; and up to 5 F below where it was in the Bronze Age, Roman, and mediaeval warm periods. For most of the past 10 000 years, temperatures were above today's.

The Sun was more active in the past 70 years than at almost any time in the previous 11,400 years. Even if it had not caused the warming that stopped a decade ago, the UN's climate panel has not convicted humankind. CO₂ occupies only one-ten-thousandth more of the atmosphere today than it did in 1750. In the Cambrian era, 550 million years ago, there was 18 times as much CO₂ in the air as there is today. Life thrived: otherwise we should not be here. The climate panel, in its 2001 report, admitted that "the observed changes may be natural".

The UN's models predict a human fingerprint - warming in the tropical mid-troposphere at thrice the surface rate. This fingerprint is absent from 50 years of radiosonde data and 30 years of satellite data. Whatever caused the warming in the 300 years ending in 1998, it was not us.

Why are the climate models so wrong? Because in 1963 it was proven impossible to predict the long-run future of the complex, chaotic climate unless we first know its initial state to a precision that is not attainable in the real world.

There is only one question that matters in the climate debate: By how much will temperature rise if we double the pre-industrial concentration of CO₂ in the air?

The answer to this question is an input to the computers, not an output from them. Models cannot predict future rates of warming, because they are told the answer in advance.

Even if minuscule increases in the concentration of a trace gas could impact temperature significantly, the peer-reviewed literature is near-unanimous in not predicting climate catastrophe. A High Court judge in London, finding against Al Gore's sci-fi comedy horror movie, said bluntly: "The Armageddon scenario that he depicts is not based on any scientific view."

Scientifically-baseless precautions are already starving millions as biofuels, which the UN at first recommended and now calls a "crime against humanity", have pre-empted agricultural land, doubling staple cereal prices in a year.

The UN's proposed "precautions" would work no better than the "precautionary" ban on DDT, which killed 40 million worldwide - mostly children - before the World Health Organization ended the ban in 2006.

The strategic harm to humanity caused by killing the world's poor and destroying the economic prosperity of the West would far outweigh any conceivable climate benefit from Warner-Lieberman.

Adaptation as – or, rather, if – necessary would be far more cost-effective and less harmful.

Futile schemes by bureaucrats to mitigate imagined "global warming" will have no more effect on the climate than King Canute's command to the tide not to come in and wet the Royal feet.

We must get the science right or we shall get the policy wrong. There is no manmade "climate crisis". It is a non-problem. The correct policy approach to a non-problem is to have the courage to do nothing.

The Viscount Monckton of Brenchley advised Margaret Thatcher in the 1980s that Her Majesty's Government should check whether "global warming" might become a problem and, if so, whether we could or should do anything about it. His movie, "Apocalypse? .NO ! ", is available from www.demanddebate.com