

# **Section 3**

## **Does the Science Support the ‘Climate Crisis’?**

# 3a Is the Climate Crisis Real?

## Introduction

‘Climate Crisis’ has replaced ‘safe and effective’ as the new mantra across the UK. However, as was the case with ‘safe and effective’, no evidence is ever provided in support of the statement; rather the statement is simply presented as fact.

So, what is the evidence for the ‘climate crisis’? Is there a consensus amongst climate scientists? Are carbon neutral policies scientifically valid?

## Informed decision making

We know there are many independent climate scientists whose voices are marginalised, silenced and ultimately cancelled. This being the case, are your local councillors able to make an informed decision or is bias built into the system?

It is of paramount importance that councillors are informed of these alternative views, some of which are detailed below.

## 2012 – Open letter to the United Nations

In 2012, a group of more than 125 scientists sent an open letter to the United Nations warning the then UN Secretary General’s (Ban Ki-Moon) ‘scientific evidence’ on weather and climate was refutable. The letter can be read here:

<https://financialpost.com/opinion/open-climate-letter-to-un-secretary-general-current-scientific-knowledge-does-not-substantiate-ban-ki-moon-assertions-on-weather-and-climate-say-125-scientists>

The climate hysteria was not supported by the evidence yet the position of the 125 climate scientists was ignored and the agenda of fear continued relentlessly.

The main points from the open letter are as follows:

- The UK Met Office released data illustrating there had been no statistically significant global warming for almost 16 years;
- During the 16 year period referenced above the U.S. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) stated carbon dioxide concentrations rose by nearly 9% to constitute 0.039% of the atmosphere;
- The hypothesis that emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> by humans caused or will cause dangerous warming of the planet were not supported by the evidence;

- The incidence and severity of extreme weather has not increased;
- Funds should be diverted from the climate crisis agenda to strengthening infrastructure to withstand naturally occurring weather events;
- Analysis of unbiased observational data did not support the projections of future global warming that the computer models indicated;
- the NOAA “State of Climate in 2008” stated that, if there were 15 years or more without any statistically significant warming of the planet, then it would be sufficient to illustrate there exists a discrepancy between observation and computer modelling precautions. 16 years without warming (first bullet point above) proved that the models were wrong. (<https://www1.ncdc.noaa.gov/pub/data/cmb/bams-sotc/climate-assessment-2008-lo-rez.pdf>)

The UN ignored the 125 scientists.

### **2019 – Speech by Greta Thunberg to the United Nations**

In 2019, Greta Thunberg made an impassioned speech to the UN regarding her fears of impending disastrous climate change representing a climate emergency citing it as ‘a mass extinction’. On the same day, 500 prominent scientists and professionals sent a registered letter to the UN Secretary General advising that there is no climate emergency and, as was said in 2012, climate policies should focus on benefiting peoples lives by building resilience to the inevitable natural climate events, which, of course, can be devastating.

The letter stated that the current models of climate change which international policy is based upon are ‘unfit for their purpose’. Consequently, the trillions of dollars spent on climate policy are both pointless and dangerous because they undermine the economic system (thereby putting lives in danger). The specific points about climate change stated in the letter were as follows:

- Natural, as well as anthropogenic factors, cause global warming;
- Warming is far slower than predicted;
- Climate policy relies on inadequate models;
- CO<sub>2</sub> is not a pollutant, rather it is a plant food which is essential to all life on the planet. Photosynthesis is a blessing - more CO<sub>2</sub> is beneficial for nature, greening the earth. Additional CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere has promoted growth in global plant biomass. CO<sub>2</sub> is also good for agriculture - increasing crops worldwide;
- Global warming has not increased natural disasters;
- Climate policy must respect scientific and economic realities; and
- There is no climate emergency, therefore there is no need to panic.

The full text of the registered letter can be read here:

<https://clintel.nl/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/ecd-letter-to-un.pdf>

The press release at the time can be read here:

<https://clintel.nl/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/ecd-press-briefing.pdf>

The full list of the 500 signatories can be read here:

<https://clintel.nl/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/ED-brochureversieNWA4.pdf>

Like the 125 scientists from 2012, the UN ignored the 500 scientists from 2019.

### **2023 – Net Zero based on invalid science**

The authors of the paper, which can be read in full at the link below, maintain that the global movement to eliminate fossil fuels and its emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> and other greenhouse gases commonly referred to as ‘Net Zero’ is based on invalid science. Furthermore, that Net Zero policies threaten the lives of billions of people.

Some of the paper’s findings are as follows:

- Whilst Net Zero proponents regularly report that extreme weather is more severe and frequent as a consequence of climate change, the evidence shows no increase. In fact, in some cases, there is a decrease in extreme weather events;
- Computer models that underpin all government Net Zero policies are inaccurate. Consequently, the trillions of dollars subsidising renewable energy, electric cars and trucks, home heating, appliances and many other products are pointless and a monumental waste of funds;
- Scientific research which does not support the ‘consensus’ narrative of harmful anthropogenic global warming is routinely censored and excluded from government reports such as the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (‘IPCC’) (another United Nations agency) and the National Climate Assessment;
- Conclusions of the IPCC that contradict the narrative of catastrophic global warming from fossil fuels are rewritten by government bureaucrats for public reports to support the false narrative of Net Zero;
- The numerous benefits of modest warming and increasing CO<sub>2</sub> are routinely deleted or minimised in governmental reports;
- Elimination of fossil fuels and the implementation of Net Zero policies across the globe mean the elimination of fossil fuel-derived nitrogen fertilisers and pesticides that will result in about half the world’s population not having enough food to eat. Many would starve.
- Overwhelming scientific evidence showing there is no risk of catastrophic global warming caused by fossil fuels and CO<sub>2</sub> is ignored when Net Zero policies are pursued.

<https://co2coalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/Challenging-Net-Zero-with-Science-digital-CO2-Coalition.pdf>

It is evident from just these three examples that there is no ‘consensus’ on climate change and that the science is by no means ‘settled’.

In reality, challenging the prevailing narrative on climate change among the scientific community is commonplace, however, those dissenting voices, as was stated at the outset of this piece, are side-lined in preference for the voices of the climate alarmists.

## **3b. An Inconvenient Truth – Al Gore: Science or Propaganda?**

The section below is an extract lifted from Ken Gregory's essay entitled 'Climate Change Science Essay' which can be found in full on the Friends of Science website (link in the resource section).

We have chosen to highlight this section of the essay because of the high-profile nature of the film and profound impact it has had on public opinion. The film is the former United States Vice President Al Gore's attempt at 'educating' the public about global warming. The findings of the film are inaccurate - it's time to address those inaccuracies.

Please take particular note of the British High Court ruling (with respect to the British Government's decision to distribute the film to schools) which can be found towards the end of the extract.

'Al Gore's film 'An Inconvenient Truth' (AIT) is grossly misleading about climate change. Nearly every major statement made in the film is one-sided, exaggerated, or plainly false. Despite this, it has had a huge effect on public opinion even though most scientists agree it is misleading.

Some of the problems with AIT are as follows:

- It implies, that during the past 650,000 years, changes in carbon dioxide levels largely caused changes in global temperature, whereas the causality mostly runs the other way, with CO<sub>2</sub> changes trailing global temperature changes by hundreds to thousands of years. There is no mention of the fact that global temperatures were warmer than the present during each of the past four interglacial periods, even though CO<sub>2</sub> levels were lower.
- The images presented show what 20 feet of sea level rise would do to the world's major coastal communities but there is no credible evidence of an impending collapse of the great ice sheets. We do have fairly good data on ice mass balance changes and their effects on sea level. NASA scientist Jay Zwally and colleagues found a combined Greenland/Antarctica ice loss sea level rise equivalent of 0.05 mm per year during 1992-2002. At that rate, it would take a full century to raise sea level by just 5 mm.
- It presents the hockey stick reconstruction of Northern Hemisphere temperature history used by the IPCC, according to which the 1990s were likely the warmest decade of the past millennium. It is now widely acknowledged that the hockey stick was built on a flawed methodology and inappropriate data.
- It assumes a linear relationship between CO<sub>2</sub> levels and global temperatures, whereas the actual CO<sub>2</sub> warming effect is logarithmic, meaning that each 100 ppm increase in

CO<sub>2</sub> levels adds less warming than the previous 100 ppm increase. A 100 ppm increase to 600 ppm increases temperatures by 63% of a 100 ppm increase to 400 ppm.

- It claims that the rate of global warming is accelerating, whereas the rate has been constant for the past 30 years to 2002 (roughly 0.17°C per decade), and there has been no warming from 2002 through to 2014.
- The film claims Lake Chad in northern Africa is drying up due to global warming. Over 20 million people use it as their source of water but it has an average depth of only 1.5 to 4.5 metres. This lake has actually been dry multiple times in the past: in 8500 BC, 5500 BC, 2000 BC and 100 BC. Shrinkage has also occurred due to a rapidly expanding population drawing water from it as well as the impact of the introduction of irrigation technologies and local overgrazing. These causes are neither global nor warming and are utterly independent of CO<sub>2</sub>. In addition, Africa as a continent experienced a dramatic shift towards dryer weather in the end of the 19th century which is not generally attributed to CO<sub>2</sub>.
- The film distracts views from the main hurricane problem facing the United States: the ever-growing concentration of population and wealth in vulnerable coastal regions, which is partly a consequence of federal flood insurance and other political subsidies.
- Global warming is blamed for the decline (since the 1960s) of the Emperor Penguin population in Antarctica, implying that the penguins are in peril and their numbers dwindling as the world warms. In fact, the population declined in the 1970s and has been stable since the late 1980s.
- The film never explains why anyone should be alarmed about the current Arctic warming, considering that our stone-age ancestors survived and likely benefited from the much stronger and longer Arctic warming known as the Holocene Climate Optimum.
- It presents one climate model's projection of increased U.S. drought as authoritative even though another leading model forecasts increased wetness. Climate model hydrology forecasts on regional scales are notoriously unreliable. Most of the United States, outside the southwest, became wetter during 1925-2003.
- Global warming is blamed for the record number of typhoons hitting Japan in 2004. Local meteorological conditions, not average global temperatures, determine the trajectory of particular storms and data going back to 1950 show no correlation between North Pacific storm activity and global temperatures.
- It claims that global warming endangers polar bears even though polar bear populations are increasing in Arctic areas where it is warming and declining in Arctic areas where it is cooling. In fact, 11 of the 13 main groups in Canada are thriving, and there is evidence that the only groups not thriving are in a region of the Arctic that has

cooled. Polar bears have survived the Holocene Climate Optimum and the Medieval Warm Period; both periods were significantly warmer than today's climate.

- It warns that a doubling of pre-industrial CO<sub>2</sub> levels to 560 ppm will acidify sea water so much that all optimal areas for coral reef construction will disappear by 2050. This is not plausible. Coral calcification rates have increased as ocean temperatures and CO<sub>2</sub> levels have risen, and today's main reef builders evolved and thrived during the Mesozoic Period when atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> levels hovered above 1,000 ppm for 150 million years and exceeded 2,000 ppm for several million years.
- Global warming is blamed for the resurgence of Malaria in Kenya even though several studies have found no climate link and attribute the problem to decreased spraying of homes with DDT and anti-malarial drug resistance.
- It claims that 2004 set an all-time record for the number of tornadoes in the United States. Tornado frequency has not increased; rather, the detection of smaller tornadoes has increased. If we consider the tornadoes that have been detectable for many decades (category F-3 or greater), there actually has been a downward trend since 1950.
- The film cites Tuvalu, Polynesia, as a place where rising sea levels force residents to evacuate their homes. In reality, sea levels at Tuvalu fell during the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.
- There is no mention that global warming could reduce the severity of winter storms, also called frontal storms, because their energy comes from colliding air masses (fronts) by decreasing the temperature differential between colliding air masses.
- Natural variability occurs in the Arctic climate but this is ignored. Neither is it mentioned that Arctic temperatures during the 1930s equalled or exceeded those of the late 20th century. Or that the Arctic, during the early to mid Holocene era, was significantly warmer than it is today.
- The University of Missouri professor Curt Davis that found an overall Antarctic ice mass gain during 1992-2003 but, again, this is ignored.
- NASA satellites show an Antarctic cooling trend of 0.11°C per decade since 1978 but this is not mentioned.
- It calls carbon dioxide the most important greenhouse gas yet water vapour and clouds are the leading contributors and account for over 70% of the greenhouse effect.
- It claims ice cap on Mt. Kilimanjaro is disappearing due to global warming even though satellite measurements show no temperature change at the summit.

This is only a partial list of errors, omissions and exaggerations. See [here](#) for more from the Competitive Enterprise Institute and [here](#) for an article listing 35 errors in AIT by Christopher



Monckton of Brenchley.

The decision by the British government to distribute the film ‘An Inconvenient Truth’ to schools has been the subject of a legal action. The British High Court found the film to be false or misleading in 11 respects.

In order for the film to be shown, the High Court ruled in October 2007 that teachers must make it clear to their students that:

1. The film is a political work and promotes only one side of the argument.
2. Nine inaccuracies have to be specifically drawn to the attention of school children.

The inaccuracies are listed [here](#).

Al Gore and the IPCC shared the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize ‘for their efforts to build up and disseminate greater knowledge about man-made climate change, and to lay the foundations for the measures that are needed to counteract such change’. Irena Sendler was considered for the prize for saving 2500 children and infants from the Nazi Warsaw Ghetto and the extermination camps during World War II. She was not selected. See her story [here](#).