

January 2006

## ***FOS MEMBERSHIP QUARTERLY NEWSLETTER No. 9***

***“FOS is dedicated to providing the public with honest scientific information about Climate change”***

### ***PRESIDENT’S MESSAGE***

Dr. Douglas Leahey

There are three issues I wish to address in this short message: Election Results, our Radio Blitz and our forthcoming Annual Luncheon.

#### **ELECTION RESULTS**

The election last month of a minority Conservative government signals a tremendous opportunity for those of us who want science to be part of public policy when it comes to climate change and the Kyoto Protocol.

Conservative Leader Stephen Harper twice signalled during the election campaign that he intended to replace Canada’s participation in the Kyoto Protocol with a “made in Canada” solution to “emission pollution”. That is encouraging, as it suggests the Conservatives understand that Kyoto is a failed policy, and the difference between pollution and CO<sub>2</sub>. But it’s still too early to declare a victory.

For our part, Friends has plans to increase our successful advertising and awareness campaigns. We believe that by educating the public about the fallacies of climate change theories and the Kyoto Protocol, we can weaken political support for Kyoto implementation. Then, we hope to persuade the government to revisit pollution policy by first studying the science. We’ll call on the government to set up a Blue-Ribbon panel of climate and environmental experts to do a full and thorough review of the facts on climate change, and emissions.

#### **RADIO BLITZ**

Our campaign is working. Before and during the election, Friends bought radio advertising in 5 major Ontario markets. Our message was that voters have not been given the facts on climate change, and that candidates need to be questioned on their intentions to spend billions on global warming theories. (The ads are still on our website for you to hear.)

The response was intense. Some radio stations faced pro-Kyoto interest groups who actually demanded that our ads be pulled! We received a great deal of hostile mail from activists stunned that we would challenge the pro-Kyoto status quo. At the same time though, positive mail poured in, and hits to our website soared into the stratosphere. We registered over 300,000 hits to our website in the first 12 days of January alone.

#### **ANNUAL LUNCHEON**

If you’ve checked your mail recently, you would have seen the invitation to our annual luncheon. This year on April 27<sup>th</sup>, our distinguished guest will be Dr. Chris de Freitas.

Chris de Freitas is an associate professor at the University of Auckland in New Zealand. For the past 13 years he has been an editor of the international science journal “*Climate Research*”. He has four times been the recipient of the New Zealand Association of Scientists, Science Communicator Award.

Buy tickets today for you, your colleagues and guests by emailing Karla MacNeil at [fos@telus.net](mailto:fos@telus.net)

## ***ON THE NEED FOR PUBLIC DEBATE***

As members of FoS are well aware we have been pushing for a public debate on matters pertaining to climate change particularly as they relate to the science. It is not sufficient for our government to rely solely on the UN's IPCC (International Panel on Climate Change). In this respect it is noteworthy that the British are currently vigorously pursuing this issue through the "Stern Review". Slightly amended excerpts from Peiser ([b.j.peiser@livjm.ac.uk](mailto:b.j.peiser@livjm.ac.uk)) on submissions to the Stern Review regarding the IPCC process are given below. (Our comments in bold).

“Under the direction of its member governments across the world, the IPCC prepares massive reports on the whole range of issues relating to climate change. It has established itself, in the eyes of governments, as their sole authoritative source of information, evidence, analysis, interpretation and advice in this area. It has acquired a monopoly position.

This is not a healthy situation. Even if the IPCC process was indisputably and consistently rigorous, objective and professionally watertight, it is imprudent for governments to place exclusive reliance, in matters of great complexity where huge uncertainties prevail, on a single source of analysis and advice and a single process of inquiry.

In any case, and as **members of FoS** are aware the IPCC process is not ideal: it is far from being a model of rigour, inclusiveness and objectivity. In particular, its treatment of **scientific** issues is seriously flawed. In this area, the IPCC is neither fully competent nor adequately representative. The built-in peer review process, for which the Panel makes loud claims, has shown itself inadequate.”

## ***SCIENCE NEWS***

### **MARS IS WARMING**

Daily Policy Digest, January 10,2006

The planet Mars is undergoing significant global warming which supports many climatologists' claims that the Earth's modest warming during the past century is due to a recent upsurge in solar energy, says James M. Taylor, of the Heartland Institute.

For three Mars summers, deposits of frozen carbon dioxide near the planet's south pole have shrunk from the previous year's size, suggesting a climate change in progress, says Taylor. Furthermore, documented changes from 1999 to 2005 show that Mars' climate is presently warmer, and perhaps getting warmer still, than it was.

Furthermore, the warming of Mars adds another level of uncertainty to claims that the Earth's modest recent warming is a result of human activity, says Taylor.

<http://www.heartland.org/Article.cfm?artId=17977&CFID=5195862&CFTOKEN=90852445>

---

## **GLOBAL WARMING: BLAME THE FORESTS!**

The Guardian, January 12, 2006

They have long been thought of as the antidote to harmful greenhouse gases, sufferers of, rather than contributors to, the effects of global warming. But in a startling discovery, scientists have realised that plants are part of the problem. According to a study published today, living plants may emit almost a third of the methane entering the Earth's atmosphere.

David Lowe, of the National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research in New Zealand, said the new work, published in *Nature*, is important for two reasons. "First, because the methane emissions they document occur under normal physiological conditions, in the presence of oxygen, rather than through bacterial action in anoxic environments", he wrote in an accompanying article. "Second, because the estimated emissions are large, constituting 10-30% of the annual total of methane entering Earth's atmosphere."

It will also intensify debates on whether targets in climate change treaties such as the Kyoto Protocol should be based entirely on carbon emissions, which are easily measured, or also take sinks into account, which remove carbon from the atmosphere but are more difficult to measure.

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/climatechange/story/0,12374,1684378,00.html?gusrc=rss>

*Other surprise results:*

### **AEROSOLS**

A recent study in *Nature* found cutting air pollution could trigger a surge in global warming. Aerosols cool the Earth by reflecting radiation back into space. Scrapping them would have adverse consequences.

---

## **NOT ALL GLACIERS LOST MASS OVER THE PAST QUARTER-CENTURY**

CO<sub>2</sub> Science – extracts Volume 8 Number 46: 16 November 2005

It is interesting to note... that at the apex of a global warming that has been characterized as the greatest of the past two millennia (Mann and Jones 2003), Maritime Glaciers at these two ends of the world have not been wasting away... Indeed, all of these huge land-based repositories of ice have been experiencing a phenomenal period of *growth*.

<http://www.co2science.org/scripts/CO2ScienceB2C/articles/V8/N46/EDIT.jsp>

---

## **CO<sub>2</sub>, METHANE AND TEMPERATURE: MORE INSIGHTS FROM THE DOME CONCORDIA AND VOSTOK ICE CORES**

CO<sub>2</sub> Science Volume 8, Number 49: 7 December 2005

In light of several real world observations, we conclude that if there is anything unusual about Earth's current climactic state... it is that it is so much *colder* in spite of there being so much more CO<sub>2</sub> and methane in the air.

<http://www.co2science.org/scripts/CO2ScienceB2C/articles/V8/N49/EDIT.jsp>

