

# **CLIMATE, POLITICS AND SCIENCE**

*An essay by Albert F. Jacobs*

**In Part One of this essay we are examining the roots of the UN initiative to control carbon dioxide emissions worldwide. Was it really focused on the environment?**

**Part Two investigates the relationship between politics and science. On technical issues, shouldn't good science guide the lawmakers?**

**Part Three explains how recent advances in science obviate the IPCC's model.**

PART ONE

## **IF "KYOTO" IS SO FLAWED, WHY DO SO MANY SCIENTISTS AND POLITICIANS SUPPORT IT?**

In this business that is called the Kyoto Protocol, it seems that the shakers and movers, the politicians and power seekers do not (want to) understand science and prefer cherry-picked opinion and research items to support decisions already taken.

The motive was probably developed in the early eighties within the United Nations (Maurice Strong and other Globalisation proponents) when they saw a cause being created by the "green" activist groups, which had been inflamed by a presentation of a young NASA scientist, Dr. James Hansen. Hansen had proposed that human/industrial carbon dioxide was increasing the greenhouse blanket to the extent that the globe would be warming up catastrophically. Trying to "control" this change of climate would allow the UN to further its goal of being the vehicle towards greater centralized power and to the transfer of wealth from rich to poor nations, thereby furthering the cause of "Global Governance". This particular opinion, while originally ridiculed, is now shared by many, as is the one that the Brussels bureaucrats of the European Union saw the prospect of economic advantage *vis-à-vis* the United States.

It should be realized that "human-caused global warming" is a *dogma* that underlies "Kyoto". It has never been proven. The assumptions of Hansen's temperature and carbon dioxide trend data have been repeatedly challenged by reputable colleagues, most recently by (respectively) Eschenbach and Beck. In addition, some historic and geologic correlations of temperature and carbon dioxide curves do not give a solution as to Cause and Effect.

It is not particularly good form for one scientist to accuse others of unethical or unprofessional behaviour. Scientific hypotheses are supposed to be discussed, challenges to be answered, and published papers subjected to peer-review. But the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), being a political organization, does not work according to the Scientific Method. The science work is done by institutional and university researchers on behalf of the IPCC under contract. This sourcing by directed government grants puts it at great danger of becoming "Government Science". To many, the expression "Government Science" is an oxymoron. In its early days, the IPCC's charter was established as an investigation of *human causes of climate change*. It never seriously considered other drivers that have affected the numerous changes in the planet's climate since its formation.

That is a shame, because in the field of Climate Science there are many sub-disciplines, from glaciology, paleontology, oceanography, astrophysics, isotope chemistry and meteorology to geophysics, computer science, demographics and statistics. Many of these people have contributed their work and viewpoints to the IPCC Working Groups and to the four Assessment Reports (ARs) that have been issued. These are good reports: They contain many divergent opinions. (Their thousands of pages can be seen at the [ipcc.ch](http://ipcc.ch) website).

However, this volume of work is unreadable for the public, the politicians and the media. Hence, the UN set its bureaucrats to work, assisted by some selected authors from the Working Groups, to create the "Summary for Policy Makers" (SPMs). As a critical Dr Vincent Gray (one of the officially appointed Reviewers of the UN reports) says: "It is not a summary *FOR* policy makers, but a summary *BY* policy makers".

In the creation of these SPMs, the expressions of contrary opinions, uncertainty of conclusions, and even recommendations "not to base official policy on the AR findings" are generally ignored. But the SPMs are what the media and the politicians absorb. The last SPM, early in 2007, was released with much fanfare, *months before* the underlying

scientific reports (the ARs) were made available, thus – in the IPCC's own explanation – affording the opportunity to bring the conclusions of the scientific reports in line with those of the political SPMs. A travesty of science practice.

In Canada, the SPM-based policy was taken lock, stock and barrel by Environment Canada bureaucrats and scientific management (up to the ADM level) and sold to Ministers Anderson, Chrétien and Dion, all lawyers, who had no power of judgment on this scientific subject; Chrétien only had an (admitted) "gut feeling" that this was what Canada should commit to. So much so, that – when signing up to the Kyoto process - he committed to more than was necessary.

The problem with the Scientists within Environment Canada was (and is) that they are mostly meteorologists and atmospheric physicists. These professionals are more focused on "weather", than on "climate". Many lack the background (and the concepts of space and time) needed to appreciate the lessons of long past climates that earth scientists have. They largely ignore the important astrophysical counter arguments and believe that computers can project the future.

It is no wonder that the *Friends of Science Society* was formed six years ago by a group of retired earth scientists who were aghast at the government's abuse of scientific principles of research. It has compiled and developed a base of scientific information and comment that can be accessed at [www.friendsofscience.org](http://www.friendsofscience.org)

To deflect criticism within Canada of the goings on at Environment Canada where, by that time, the bureaucrats and their political bosses had committed themselves to the Protocol, independent scientists were barred from all discussions and from the traveling consultations ("Stakeholder meetings") that were held before and after ratification. *Friends of Science* has been refused access to meetings, including last year's "COP 11" in Montreal; we are not considered to be "stakeholders". Even one of our Advisory Board members, Dr. Khandekar, a retired Environment Canada research scientist, was refused the opportunity to register as an interested scientist.

In the United States, various Senate and House subcommittees have been active in conducting hearings and inviting expert dissident advice. In Canada, no meaningful open discussion has taken place. "The Science has been decided" is the government's mantra. The discussion now is about implementation and carbon credits.

A lot of money can be made on both efforts.

Money and Power – not sound science – are propelling this wasteful and unnecessary enterprise. Thankfully, the voices of the dissenters have not been silenced. Many scholars from around the world continue to disseminate the sound scientific data that dispels the myth of manmade climate change and encourages initiatives that will really improve air and water quality. As the next round of climate change debate begins, let us hold our collective breath in the hope that science will ultimately prevail.

## PART TWO

### *SCIENCE IN THE SERVICE OF CIVILISATION ?*

Unusual characteristics affect the practice of Climate Science. Something that seems to set the discipline apart from the accepted standards of the "Scientific Method", not to speak of science ethics. It may be true that - in Climate Science - it is difficult to experiment with laboratory methods as is done in - say - physics and chemistry, but the almost total lack of such empirical testing has caused Climate Science to go overboard into the realm of computer simulations and political wishful thinking and manipulation.

Normally, a scientist's curiosity is aroused by something unusual he observes and which calls for an explanation. He gathers data, looks for causal relationships between various aspects of the question, develops a hypothesis that could explain what he is seeing and why - and then he tests his findings by trying to repeat his tests and his calculations and by challenging his own thought process, data handling, carefulness and conclusions. He might try to publish his hypothesis, which by now may have grown into a theory and he and his editor will invite knowledgeable colleagues to punch holes in it or otherwise comment. When most everyone thinks that he has really got something, his theory may be accepted. Not as "fact", mind you: someone may yet come along to disprove it later and it may then well sink to the bottom.

Discussion and challenge are the nature of scientific research. For centuries an established science "consensus" explained stomach ulcers as being caused by intake of one sort of food or another, by overeating, or by stress, aggravated by anti-inflammatory drugs like aspirin. This consensus was barely questioned, until – not even very

long ago - researchers challenged that concept and found that a substantial number of ulcers had their cause in infection by bacteria, *Helicobacter pylori*, requiring different treatment. There are many such examples in the medical field.

With reference to Climate Science in particular, it has been said: "When there is Consensus, it is not Science, and when there is Science, there is no Consensus".

Galileo, fighting the consensus of his day, would have agreed.

The hallowed principle of "Peer Review" of new research papers in the sciences prior to publication has always been held to be the guardian for quality and originality. It has come under considerable strain, - in some sciences more than in others. At times, it has failed. This problem has several causes.

Some see a decline in this "guardianship" as brought on by a lack of time, as active researchers with labs to run, post-grads to supervise, grants to apply for, papers to prepare, administrative work to perform and some classes to teach, find little time to review in much detail the papers written by others. Some are more conscientious than others, but inevitably things slip through the cracks.

Others point to the increasing multi-disciplinary nature of research, particularly in a field like climate science. Sub-disciplines ranging from astrophysics to micro-paleontology, from isotope geology to oceanography, from pure physics to meteorology, from computer science to statistics and from medieval history to glaciology, all feed into Climate Science, which had heretofore been the domain of atmospheric physicists alone.

Dr. Michael Mann's infamous hockey stick graph of temperatures since the year 1000, long a key poster child of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), also suffered from a few other problems. The first one is that tree ring analysis as a temperature indicator (an often used proxy method for periods before the advent of the thermometer) has enough problems of its own, as tree rings, which grow best in summer and daylight and which are subject to other variations of the tree's environment such as wind and humidity, are hardly a very confidence-inspiring comprehensive measuring stick. Then, computer processing of the data requires a thorough knowledge of statistics programs, which is not necessarily in the bag of tricks of a paleobotanist-cum-climatologist, nor of many of his colleagues-peer-reviewers.

Two Canadian statisticians, Ross McKittrick and Steve McIntyre, later examined the whole process that led to the hockey stick graph, found the data base deliberately "selective" and maintained that the computer program used would generate "hockey sticks" even from random data.

This harsh criticism was recently confirmed by the National Academy of Sciences, which recognized the last 400 year of temperature increase (which no one denies), but had little or no confidence in anything before 1600.

In 2006 the matter was also investigated (this time for a Committee of the US House of Representatives) by three professors of statistics from George Mason, Johns Hopkins and Rice Universities, who in their "Wegman Report" not only rejected the hockey stick on the same grounds as the two Canadians, but sharply criticized the process by which Dr Mann's research did get as far as it did.

Indeed, what happened to the peer review?

Is it true that as some have said that the corruptive influence of politics upon the scientific process makes the concept of "government science" an oxymoron?

In a discussion about "process", the conclusion of the three professors reads:

*<In our further exploration of the social network of authorships in temperature reconstruction, we found that at least 43 authors have direct ties to Dr. Mann by virtue of co-authored papers with him. Our findings from this analysis suggest that authors in the area of paleoclimate studies are closely connected and thus "independent studies" may not be as independent as they might appear on the surface.*

*It is important to note the isolation of the paleoclimate community; even though they rely heavily on statistical methods they do not seem to be interacting with the statistical community. Additionally, we judge that the sharing of research materials, data and results was haphazardly and grudgingly done. In this case we judge that there was too much reliance on peer review, which was not necessarily independent. Moreover, the work has been sufficiently politicized that this community can hardly reassess their public positions without losing credibility. Overall, our committee believes that Mann's assessments that the decade of the 1990s was the hottest decade of the millennium and that 1998 was the hottest year of the millennium cannot be*

*supported by his analysis.>*

Within the IPCC, which prides itself on its peer review and where all of this was going on, other problems drew the professors' attention. As Dr. Mann was the researcher, author, chair and representative writing the final section of the 2001 Assessment Report (AR3), the ad hoc committee of professors recommended:

*<Especially when massive amounts of public monies and human lives are at stake, academic work should have a more intense level of scrutiny and review. It is especially the case that authors of policy-related documents like the IPCC report, Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis, should not be the same people as those that constructed the academic papers.>*

"Climate" is defined as long-period weather patterns of usually 30 years or more. "Climate Change" would be a major change in that pattern by whatever cause. The IPCC was founded in 1985 and formalized in 1988 by the UN and the World Meteorological Organization to investigate the causes of climate change. It then defined Climate Change as that *change in climate that was due to human activity*. Thus, it tipped its hand by revealing a political motive. Although this regrettable restriction seems to have gradually disappeared from IPCC publications, it set the tone for an emphasis on human-generated greenhouse gases (GHGs), without paying due attention to possible other causes which were being investigated by independent researchers outside the UN body. In the IPCC there appeared to be little support for research in other drivers of climate change, primarily the natural forces that have dominated climate change throughout the existence of this planet. In fact, the emphasis was so much on the "most important GHG", Carbon Dioxide, that the reports were ignoring the fact that more than 90 % of the GHG actually consists of water vapour and clouds.

The most vulnerable aspect in the development of the IPCC theory through its four successive Assessment Reports (ARs 1990, 1996, 2001, 2007) has been its almost total dependence on General Circulation Models (GCMs). Using computer modeling is a widely spread practice in various scientific disciplines and it serves researchers well when checking the effect of feedback relationships between variables and when exploring interpretative possibilities and alternate explanations by running "scenarios". But computer simulations never actually prove anything. Because of the inherent complexities in

climate science, the computer models are an irresponsible simplification if they are used as “proof” and as an excuse for policy development.

“Climate” presents a complex, even near-chaotic set of interactions. Millions of input parameters are going into a model. These are of various levels of uncertainty and weight. Numerous program decisions are being made based on uncertain or sparse information to deal with feedbacks. Even the economic projections that go into the “base” of the models have been challenged (Castles and Henderson) because of unrealistic demographics concerning growth in the Third World.

Far be it from this writer to accuse any of the computer manipulators of unethical practices, but the temptations are great to skew the feedbacks or the brackets of parameter values in ways to achieve the results, required (read: pre-conceived) by the organization.

The scientific world remembers well how in the 1930s Tofim Lysenko , working in agronomics research, pushed aside scientific principles, methods and ethics by catering to the Soviet government’s wishes to create a theory and practice that rejected Gregor Mendel’s late 19<sup>th</sup> century genetics findings.

Within the science community there are many who believe that this syndrome is still a problem today. The honest IPCC researchers also know this. They wrote in their section of the 1996 Second Assessment Report (AR2):

*<None of the studies cited above has shown clear evidence that we can attribute the observed [climate] changes to the specific cause of increases in greenhouse gases.  
'No study to date has positively attributed all or part [of the climate change observed to date] to anthropogenic [man-made] causes.'  
'Any claims of positive detection of significant climate change are likely to remain controversial until uncertainties in the total natural variability of the climate system are reduced.>*

But this warning was deleted from the final published report. -  
And in the 2001 AR3:

*<The fact that the global mean temperature has increased since the late 19th Century and that other trends have been observed does not necessarily mean that an anthropogenic effect on the climate*

*system has been identified. Climate has always varied on all timescales, so the observed change may be natural>.*

At the same time the Summary for Policy Makers (SPM) states:

*<Most of the observed warming over the last 50 years is likely to have been due to the increase on greenhouse gases>.*

whereby the assignment of "likely", officially defined in IPCC rules as between 66 and 90 % chance, had not been the result of a probability assessment.

Elsewhere is a statement that warns that:

*<the uncertainty of the conclusions in this report are such that no policy decisions should be based on them.>*

Generally speaking, the SPMs are politically drafted documents, which reflect neither the uncertainty of the science nor any opinion that differs from the UN's aim: support for the Kyoto Protocol.

The clear danger here is that media and politicians do not read the thousands of pages of the ARs. They read the Summaries for Policy Makers (SPMs), and are told to conclude that "the Science has been Decided".

As Stanford climatologist Dr Stephen Schneider said in a 1989 interview with "Discover" magazine:

*<On the other hand, we are not just scientists, but human beings as well. And like most people we'd like to see the world a better place, which in this context translates into our working to reduce the risk of potentially disastrous climate change. To do that we have to get some broad-based public support, to capture the public's imagination. That, of course, entails getting loads of media coverage. So we have to offer up scary scenarios, make simplified, dramatic statements, and make little mention of any doubts we might have.>*

Al Gore had good teachers.

Current propaganda trivializes critics of the IPCC's brand of science and process as being "flat earthers", fringe sceptics and contrarians, if not in pay of "big oil", and who - at best - are bickering about the chairs on the deck of the Titanic, issues that do not affect the grand scheme of

anthropogenic Global Warming and its Kyoto Protocol 'solution'.

What are the IPCC's objectives?

Apart from an obvious lust for power in the form of "World Government", listen to Maurice Strong who is on record as having promoted the Global Warming scheme to divert western wealth to the Third World and who the Edmonton Journal is reported to have said:

*<Isn't the only hope for the planet that the industrialized nations collapse? Isn't it our responsibility to bring that about?>*

As Liberal Christine Stewart, Canadian Minister of the Environment once said:

*<No matter if the science is all phony, there are collateral environmental benefits .....[C]limate change [provides] the greatest chance to bring about justice and equality in the world.>*

And so the IPCC effort has pushed its rationale to combat carbon dioxide, a benign gas, present as 0.038% of the atmosphere and essential for life on earth. As for the science, it had been abused. No proof can be found in the scientific literature that CO<sub>2</sub> is a main cause of changing climates on earth. Research, which has culminated in the last five years, points firmly to the sun and the galaxy as the main sources of climate changes on our and other planets. And the recent evidence from Danish investigators in that field is empirical, something rare in Climate Science.

But the politicians are not listening. For someone who believes that the discipline of science has much to contribute to our well-being, that is hard to accept.

Meanwhile, in the last ten years the IPCC and various national governments have spent billions of dollars in tax money in selling a scientifically faulty concept, two billion dollars in Canada alone. The population and the press have been brainwashed into believing that what they have now have heard so often must be right. Joseph Goebbels would have been proud. Politics have come out at the top, science at the bottom.

No earth or space scientist with knowledge of the ever-changing climates of the past will believe that climate change can be stopped. For our money there is more gain to be achieved in adapting to irreversibly changing climate and in controlling pollution.

## PART THREE

### ADVANCES IN CLIMATE SCIENCE OBTVIATE THE IPCC MODEL

We have in the two previous parts examined the history of the Global Warming concern (now more cautiously called "Climate Change") and the way in which politics have influenced the progress of scientific investigation. We will now deal with some of the basic elements of the science work, in particular those investigations that have taken place outside the monopoly control of the UN IPCC organization, the Intergovernmental Panel for Climate Change.

There is not any significant amount of argument about the fact that some planet-wide warming does exist. It has been taking place at a rate of 0.6°Celsius per century (plus or minus 0.2°) over the last 130 years. Actual current temperature measurements are often uncertain and many stations are poorly controlled and concentrated in urban and developed areas. There is a paucity of data from deserts and oceans, forests and polar regions. Length of the record is also a serious limitation. Most records are no more than 50 years in length and only a thousand worldwide are 100 years in length and almost all of those are affected by the Urban Heat Island effect. In urban areas, heat-retaining concrete and asphalt cause anomalies of several degrees. Dr. Tim Ball *et al* , during his professorship in Winnipeg, measured temperature differences of this Urban Heat Island Effect between downtown Winnipeg and its outlying airport of at maximum of over seven degrees Celsius. These 100 year plus records dominate Jones' estimate of 0.6°C. More reliable remote sensing methods (satellites and radio-sondes), although only valid since 1978, find no great departure from the long term trend.

Before the general use of thermometers (1850) no direct readings existed. Temperature trend reconstructions are based on so-called "proxies": tree rings, leaf pores, sea shells etc, which have been subject to much argument as to their reliability. Tree ring development is a measure of more than just temperature as it relates also to location, wind, humidity and other local factors, but especially precipitation. The idea that tree rings only reflect temperature is a major part of the error in the reconstruction of past temperatures - the now infamous computer-manipulated "hockey stick", a poster child of the IPCC and Environment Canada. It claimed to deny the existence of a Warm

Period around 1000 AD, warmer than current temperatures, that was firmly established on historical and scientific grounds. It was thoroughly discredited because it failed the scientific standard reproducible results test, but it is also clear much of the problem was the assumption the rings only reflected temperature variation.

Much has been made of the temperature and carbon dioxide records derived from the deep Antarctic ice cores, which represent more than 400,000 years of atmospheric history in their inclusions. Recording climate changes through geologic time, it appears that CO<sub>2</sub> and temperature move up and down on the graphs in unison. But coincidence does not mean a causal relationship. Close examination shows that with changes in the graph's curves temperature moves first and CO<sub>2</sub> follows, sometimes 800 years later, showing a clear causal effect. While there are doubts about the fluid inclusions of the ice which provide the data, (as glacial ice is not a "closed system" - Jaworowski), such causal results have also been obtained independently by - among many others - Carleton's Dr. Tim Patterson, using isotope geology in lake sediments. There is only one conclusion: Carbon dioxide is not the main cause of warming. Some of the carbon dioxide in solution in the oceans (they contain an estimated 40,000 gigatons of carbon, or about 75% of the planet's available carbon) will get expelled when the sea surface warms by other means. There is also an influence on the carbon cycle of vegetation when the earth warms.

In recent years the basic data used by the IPCC has come under frequent attack. The way in which the magic Average Global Temperature is determined is open to criticism on many points (quite apart from inadequate corrections for Urban Heat Island influences mentioned above). Current "Global Temperature" numbers are also unreliable, as they are subject to gross extrapolations over "no data" areas such as deserts and oceans. A fair bit of statistical computer averaging goes into the final number. All this brought Essex and McKittrick to label it "T rex" as it tyrannises the warming argument. In addition the presumed level pre-industrial carbon dioxide content of the atmosphere has been challenged by the reconstitution of historic actual lab analyses. (Beck).

In summary, there is some global warming (and be glad we are still coming out of the LIA), it is part of a normal cyclic natural climate change pattern and it is not primarily due to greenhouse gases and certainly not primarily to carbon dioxide. Although, if one looks at the

US Historical Climate Network (1000 USHCN stations) one wonders where recently any warming has actually been measured. The question remains, what causes global warming and its historic variability of at least the last two centuries?

Before the IPCC began its work there were ample indications of solar and cosmic "drivers" of climate. It seems these did not fit the IPCC effort with its charter to look for global warming with a *human* cause. The researchers it chose insisted that variations in solar radiation could not be responsible for the catastrophic temperature increase their computers were predicting, because they were too small. However, they were only considering one aspect of solar influence on climate, electromagnetic radiation.

It was obvious to all objective observers that there was a high correlation between solar activity (as measured by sunspot numbers) and global temperature changes than there was between CO<sub>2</sub> and temperature. There had to be an amplifier at work, but the IPCC was not about to go and look for it. Indeed, they rejected the idea because there was no agreed on mechanism. In the recent IPCC report they rejected a mechanism identified by Svensmark and claimed it was not in the literature before their cut-off date. In fact the idea had been in the literature since 1991.

Astrophysicists outside the IPCC were hard at work finding out more about the sun, the ultimate source of our heat, what happens inside it and what effect it has on the radiation we receive from it. While observations of the solar surface, its corona and its emanations are clear enough – there is still much argument about the inner character of the sun and the forces that work there.

It is safe to say that "our variable star" is a chaotic ball of superheated electromagnetic plasma, in constant convulsion. Signs of that turmoil appear at its surface in the form of sunspots and solar flares.

It is possibly also correct to say that the electromagnetic solar radiation is not sufficient to drive the climate, but the more investigators looked at the whole issue of cosmic and solar influences on our climate, the more "amplifiers" they discovered. And the more they found a close correlation between the solar and galactic cycles and our climate variations.

A number of researchers, among them Jerusalem's Nir Shaviv, Ottawa's Jan Veizer and Eigil Friis-Christensen in Denmark, have

published on the influence that changes in the sun's magnetosphere have on the cosmic ray flux that reaches the earth from the galaxy. With greater solar electro-magnetic activity a deflection of cosmic rays takes place, thereby decreasing cloud cover. With fewer clouds, more heat is received on earth. Without the deflection, cosmic rays ionise particles in the troposphere thereby supplying condensation nuclei for water vapour and cloud formation.

Cosmic rays are ubiquitous in the space of the universe as remnants of violent stellar and supernova processes. The amount of cosmic rays received on earth is subject to variation as our solar system moves through the spiral arms of our galaxy. But what was actually happening?

In October 2006 came the news that by *"using a box of air in a Copenhagen lab, physicists trace(d) the growth of clusters of molecules of the kind that build cloud condensation nuclei [...] that may explain the link proposed by members of the Danish team, between cosmic rays, cloudiness and climate change "* says the press release by the Royal Society (London). In view of the paucity of opportunities to perform laboratory tests of climate processes, this is an extraordinary confirmation of the true nature of climate change, not requiring any CO<sub>2</sub> increases. Dr. Henrik Svensmark and his colleagues are to be congratulated on their breakthrough.

Other factors affect the sun-earth relationship. Almost a century ago Milutin Milankovitch published the result of a lifetime of calculations (no computer help for him!) on the behaviour of the earth as it orbits around the sun. Not only does the orbit vary from elliptical to near circular, but the earth's axis declination with respect to the orbital plane varies cyclically and its axis has a certain periodic wobble in it. Suffice it to say that the culminations of the respective cyclic changes that Milankovitch observed (100,000, 40,000 and 22,000 years) fitted very well with the various major glaciations stages of the Pleistocene.

This is nothing new and the IPCC ignore it in their computer models, because they say it works on a scale larger than the one that concerns us at present. This doesn't make sense when you are making predictions for 50 and 100 years. But almost in a refinement of the Milankovitch megacycles, the late Rhodes Fairbridge revival of some of Kepler's principles of planetary motion has encouraged much activity in the field of solar system dynamics. The crux of the matter is that alignment of the larger of the sun's planets affects the sun's position with respect to the barycentre (centre of gravity) of the solar

system.

As a result the sun is subject to what is called Solar inertial motion around the barycentre, affecting not only its distance to the earth. It seems that this also affects activity within the sun, and hence its sunspot numbers. Another link to climate in the planets.

It is to be hoped that a clearer picture will emerge from this "synchronised chaos", which may be a rather flippant description of the current state of affairs. What it may mean is the ultimate analysis of the multitude of galactic and solar cyclic forces which at time culminate, at times ebb away, but which at all times have their influence on the Sun and the climate on the planets orbiting around it.

Supporters of the Kyoto enterprise appear to want to ignore contrary evidence. They start their graphs in 1970 after the inconvenient 1940-1975 cooling period during which CO<sub>2</sub> rose rapidly; they ignore astrophysicists because they are not "climatologists"; they don't accept criticism from statisticians, though some IPCC researchers have been shown to abuse statistical methods; they stay away from the NOAA/NCDC (the prestigious American National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration / National Climatic Data Center) temperature records and the USHCN historical temperature graphs, because they don't fit their computer-based theory of catastrophic warming; they ignore evidence from the Indian and Pacific Ocean islands which show no sea level changes; they belittle the fact that ice masses in Greenland and Antarctica are getting thicker; they keep pointing to the disappearing ice cap of Kilimanjaro, even against the logical explanation of precipitation changes; they ignore historical conventional analyses of high atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> (1820, 1940) with no temperature consequences; and they refuse to abandon the link between hurricanes and supposed CO<sub>2</sub> related climate change, even though a connection with multi-decadal oceanic oscillations has been established.

And they hold to a concept of Global Warming, for which scientific proof has never been offered, but which is only supported by the self-fulfilling wish-dreams of computer simulations.

While the early IPCC predictions of up to 10° C per 100 years were reduced to a 1.5 - 5.8 degree range (and have been reduced further in the latest AR4 version in 2007), nothing like it has been observed anywhere in the almost twenty years that the UN effort has been underway. Besides reducing the range of scenarios each time they produce a new report, they allow the public to believe they are predictions. Science is the ability to predict and these failures occur

because it is a political not a scientific venture. Even the scientists allowed to participate are marginalized by the process of writing a Summary for Policymakers independent of the science report and releasing it to the public first. They are then requested that the science report be revised to ensure it agrees with the political summary.

None are so blind as those that do not want to see. The pillars are being knocked out from under the IPCC's "consensus science". Has the political and economic machine already blundered so far down the track that it has become unstoppable? Or – more hopefully – has the unreal political/economical talking shop in Bali hoisted itself on its own petard?

~~~~~

*Albert Jacobs did his doctoral exam in geology in 1954 at the University of Amsterdam.  
He is a Professional Geologist and a co-founder and past director of the Friends of Science Society*