

Snippets for Mr Gumner MP and others in need of seeing the truth about man-made climate change.  
9 October 2009, by Hans Schreuder, Darsham, UK

---

The IPCC has been complicit in the scaremongering and exaggeration. The IPCC is a governmental institution that selectively accepts and rejects critical comments from expert reviewers of its reports, as my climate science colleagues and I can prove, having been part of the IPCC-managed review process. Surprisingly, given the great costs and social impacts of emissions reducing policies, there is no government “ombudsman” or any means to “audit” what is going on in the IPCC, or to tell if all the extravagantly funded research has been a good investment.

The IPCC has been a major driver of global warming hysteria, which has overshadowed concern for real global-scale problems. It is a matter of social responsibility if limited resources could have been better spent on uncontroversial environmental problems such as air pollution, poor sanitation, provision of clean water and improved health services - which we know affect hundreds of millions of people.

Carbon dioxide concentration in the atmosphere is currently higher than at any time in the past 600,000 years, yet global temperature was much higher during all the major warm interglacial periods that occurred during this time, despite much lower levels of carbon dioxide.

Government decision-makers should have heard by now that the basis for the longstanding claim that carbon dioxide is a major driver of global climate is being questioned. If they have not heard, one wonders where they obtain advice on climate matters. Apparently, much of it comes from the eight-member Climate Committee of the Royal Society of New Zealand. At least six of the eight members of that Committee are people with direct or indirect links to the IPCC, or have actually been part in the IPCC process of reporting. Thus, it is not surprising that the Committee’s view coincides that of the IPCC, with no semblance of independence.

The belief that science can be determined by “authorities” proclaiming to speak on behalf of entire scientific communities belongs to the medieval period.

In a letter to the New York Times, Dr. Martin Hertzberg, an atmospheric scientist who featured in the 2009 ‘U.S. Senate Report of More Than 700 Dissenting Scientists on Global Warming’, accuses the newspaper of “continuously regurgitating fear-mongering, anecdotal clap trap of global warming propagandists”. He said “your coverage of the climate issues is a reflection of either extreme negligence or simply scientific illiteracy”. But the real reason may be simpler: talk of impending climate catastrophe is interesting, whereas sober analysis of climate data is boring. **Prof. Chris de Freitas, NZ**

---

<http://climatechange1.wordpress.com/>

Solar power is good for hot water systems, remote properties, navigation beacons, recharging portable batteries, growing grass and drying the washing. Wind power is good for pumping water, flying kites and racing yachts. Neither can be relied on to run the trains, the factories, the smelters or the hospitals. Any society foolish enough to rely on these medieval energy sources deserves to freeze in the dark. Naturally, if enough money is extracted from consumers or taxpayers, we could build enough storage capacity or backup generating capacity to provide continuous power from these intermittent power sources. But the cost is prohibitive because the backup facility needs to cope with 100% of the Green Power capacity. This duplication doubles the capital cost of Green Power, but neither the Green Plant nor the backup plant is used efficiently: one or the other is always idle. If Australia is stupid enough to mandate 20% of the electricity market for Green Power, electricity costs will escalate, backup gas prices will soar, industry will emigrate and jobs will disappear. If the market is unwilling to build Green Power facilities without mandates or subsidies, there is a good reason for it. **Fred Singer, President, SEPP**

---

Green jobs? Where?

<http://newsvote.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/business/8287987.stm>

The Labor Department said the US economy lost 263,000 jobs in September, which was more than had been expected.

The jobless rate is now at a fresh 26-year high of 9.8%.

The number of people out of work has risen by 7.6 million since December 2007 to 15.1 million.

---

## CAP-AND-TRADE: EUROPE'S GREEN SUICIDE

Europe is a great big sieve, leaking carbon, worries the European Commission. It has identified 146 holes that must be filled — heavy industry, businesses that use lots of fuel to make stuff that we need: metal, chemicals, glass and cement. It also includes textiles, aircraft, jewellery and toys.

Carbon leakage is making a nonsense of Europe's Emissions Trading System (ETS) — the mechanism that enables businesses to trade permits to emit carbon dioxide. Worse still, the ETS is exposing Europe's corroded underbelly and the rot that is infecting huge tracts of industrial plant as companies shift their spending from an over-regulated Europe to places further east.

In Brussels, the competitive threat is viewed as carbon leakage — the import of goods from countries outside the ETS and from states that have not made a big commitment to reduce CO2 emissions.

The European Commission is missing the point. It is not carbon that is leaking, but investment. Billions of dollars of potential investment in heavy industry, notably refining and petrochemicals, is moving east in search of lower costs — and carbon trading is making the money drain flow faster.

The popular prejudice in Britain is that chemicals is a sunset industry, an embarrassing industrial legacy that soon will be buried by the service sector and some fanciful "green manufacturing", powered on alternate Wednesdays by windmills. For decades our government has condoned this nonsense, but the truth is that chemicals is big business for Europe. The European Union runs a huge trade surplus in chemicals, €37 billion in 2007 — more than €70 billion, if you include pharmaceuticals.

Unfortunately, the surplus is gradually shrinking. Asia, which for many years was a net importer of chemicals, is now in balance and is moving into surplus. China, with the assistance of American and European petrochemical companies, is building plant to satisfy domestic demand. In the Middle East, meanwhile, they have been building export industries — manufacturing bulk plastics and oil products for export to Asia and to Europe. They are building scale while we are shrinking. [...]

What is happening at Teesside in England and at Berre-l'Étang in the South of France is the gradual disintegration of a great industry that was slowly assembled over decades. When ICI assembled its plant at Wilton, it knew it was for the long term. The plant lasted longer than the company itself, but finally it is being disassembled. We still need the products, but someone else will make them, out of sight and out of mind. **Carl Mortished: World business briefing**

FULL STORY at <http://business.timesonline.co.uk/tol/business/columnists/article6863776.ece>

---

Mr Gumner, further to your reply and with all due respect for the sources of information that you and your colleagues use, I implore you to set up a meeting with the undersigned to go through the actual evidence in hand, point by point, so that you may obtain a more balanced view of what does and what does not influence the climate or global warming, such as it is.

Attached are yet more reports by reputable climate scientists and climate researchers which you need to take seriously because it is by now blatantly clear that the UN IPCC is not a scientific organisation at all, it is an *intergovernmental* organisation with its only goal the furthering of global governance, a stated UN objective via Agenda 21, Globio and MDG Monitor amongst others.

As a member of the UK Parliament, you owe it to your constituents and to the country to stop the UK being run from afar by unelected bureaucrats using incorrect scientific information to curb the emissions of carbon dioxide from fuels that are the proper source of energy for our precious planet earth.

There is no way whatsoever that carbon dioxide has the physical properties capable of warming the atmosphere more than the original solar radiation was capable of and there is also no way whatsoever that the atmosphere makes the earth warmer than it should be due to an imaginary greenhouse effect, despite what your best scientific advisers may tell you. Our atmosphere acts as a shield to prevent over-heating during the hours of sunlight and over-cooling during the hours of darkness.

Yours sincerely,

Hans Schreuder